

## THE ORDER OF THE DORIAN *PHYLAI*

NICHOLAS F. JONES

A CONSTANT feature of the Greek polis was the organization of the citizen population by systems of *phylai*, or tribes, and various constituent subdivisions. Collectively termed the "tribal organization," these units functioned as the apparatus for participation in civic affairs. Through the *phylai*, responsibilities and privileges could be distributed in such a way that, theoretically at least, no one individual or group might receive more or less than its share. Procedurally, however, the matter could not rest here, since, given the involvement of the several *phylai*, there still remained the question of precedence. In what order would the *phylai* stand in the phalanx? Be named in a list? Hold a magistracy? Preside over the Council? Where adequate documentation is available, it is clear that such questions were sometimes resolved by reference to an official tribal order. Whether the *phylai* participated simultaneously as a group, or serially over a period of time, the official order made for a regular and equitable procedure. It is the purpose of the present article to show that a tribal order, unique in form but comparable in principle to attested instances, was generally applied to the traditional tribal organization of Dorian states: Dymanes, Hylleis, and Pamphyloi.

### I

The present thesis, as will become apparent, is not supported by abundant evidence. Its acceptability, accordingly, will depend in part upon the existence and particular character of tribal orders already recognized. For this reason, and in the absence of a synoptic treatment elsewhere, it is best to begin with a survey of what is currently known. This preliminary discussion includes Dorian states insofar as the traditional tribal organization is not involved.

By far the best attested example of tribal order is provided by the system of *phylai* instituted at Athens by Cleisthenes at the end of the sixth century B.C. Some examples will illustrate the nature and scope of its applications.

The fundamental form was the fixed official order. Of uncertain origins, its earliest documented use is in 490 B.C. at Marathon where, according to Herodotus' account (6. 111. 1), the ten tribal regiments were deployed in the phalanx "as the *phylai* were numbered," that is, from the one wing to the other in the official order.<sup>1</sup> Whether or not the order was somehow

To Ronald Stroud and Sterling Dow I am grateful for much helpful criticism. The final preparation of the manuscript was supported by a Faculty Research Grant from the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, University of Pittsburgh.

1. A rather different reading is offered by W. K. Pritchett, *Marathon* (Berkeley and Los Angeles,

incorporated in the composition of the grave stelae on which, Pausanias tells us (1. 32. 3; cf. 1. 29. 4), the names of the Athenian dead were arranged *kata phylas*, is not known. Such, however, was the regular Athenian practice about the middle of the century and later, as a series of extant lists of fallen shows (e.g., *IG*, 1<sup>2</sup>. 940, 943, 947–50). Somewhat different in principle are a number of other documents similarly arranged according to the official order but in which no procedural basis for the order is discernible: e.g., the catalogues of performers of liturgies (*IG*, 2<sup>2</sup>. 417), of *diatetai* (*IG*, 2<sup>2</sup>. 1924–27), of dedicators? (*IG*, 2<sup>2</sup>. 1945), of cleruchs (*IG*, 2<sup>2</sup>. 1952), of ephebes (*IG*, 2<sup>2</sup>. 2039, 2052, etc.), and of *bouleutai* (B. D. Meritt and J. S. Traill, *The Athenian Agora* XV [Princeton, 1974], nos. 42, 61, etc.). Comparable in this respect, also, are the lists of magistrates who were selected on a tribal basis. In the tables of archons, for example, whereas the three senior officers stand in the order of their rank, the six *thesmothetai* normally follow in their tribal order (e.g., *IG*, 2<sup>2</sup>. 1706, 2336; cf. S. Dow, “The List of *Archontes*, *I.G.*<sup>2</sup> II, 1706,” *Hesperia* 2 [1933]: 418–46; “The List of Athenian *Archontes*,” *Hesperia* 3 [1934]: 140–90; “The First Enneëteric Delian Pythais,” *HSCP* 51 [1940]: 111–24). So also the *symproedroi* (e.g., *IG*, 2<sup>2</sup>. 832; cf. S. Dow, “The Preambles of Athenian Decrees Containing Lists of *Symproedroi*,” *Hesperia* 32 [1963]: 335–65). Taken together, these texts warrant the conclusion, important for our study, that the Athenian tribal order, above and beyond its procedural applications, might also have a purely documentary usage. The mere presence of tribal affiliations, in other words, prompted adherence to the official sequence.

The fixed tribal order could, in addition, be rotated in a continuous cycle. Since W. S. Ferguson’s epochal discovery in 1898 of the tribal cycle of the secretaries of the Council, the principle of tribal rotation has been found to operate over a wide range of Athenian civic functions. Pertinent here are the numerous secretarial posts and priesthoods that were regularly filled in largely uninterrupted cycles extending collectively from no later than 443 B.C. into the third century A.D. Other applications brought into play an extensively used variation on the simple rotation. The so-called “sortition” cycle, in which the actual order within a single rotation was determined by lot, governed the sequence of the prytanies in the Council; it also constituted the basis for the selection of certain other secretaries and priests, and possibly of the three senior archons.<sup>2</sup> On the strength of these and other instances, Ferguson was led to conclude that, where sufficient evidence available, we would find that the one or the other method was employed for all offices filled by allotment.<sup>3</sup>

1960), p. 147. Pritchett argues that Herodotus’ word ἀριθμούντο refers, not to the official order, but to a roll call attending the marshaling for battle. The context of Herodotus’ remark, however, favors the traditional interpretation. On the specific order of the regiments, see below, p. 207.

2. W. S. Ferguson, *Athenian Tribal Cycles in the Hellenistic Age* (Cambridge, Mass., 1932), pp. 48–54.

3. Ferguson, *Athenian Tribal Cycles*, p. 49. For the Athenian tribal cycles, a convenient summary of earlier work may be found in W. B. Dinsmoor, *The Athenian Archon List in the Light of Recent Discoveries* (New York, 1939), pp. 3–14. The continuation of the cycle of the prytany secretaries into the third century A.D. was demonstrated by J. A. Notopoulos, “Studies in the Chronology of

In sum, the overwhelmingly abundant and consistent Athenian evidence justifies the generalization that in those procedures and documents (connected or not with procedure) in which the *phylai* played a part, the official order was normally observed.

Less well understood are the uses of tribal order at Athens prior to Cleisthenes and elsewhere in Greece at all times. Early Athens and some of the city-states of Ionia shared a system of *phylai* called Geleontes, Hopletes, Argadeis, and Aigikoreis, but whether or not they followed a common official order, or even individual tribal orders, is open to question. For Athens, a corrupt passage from Euripides *Ion* 1579–81 has been taken as significant:<sup>4</sup> Γελέων μὲν ἔσται πρῶτος· ἔτα δεύτερος/† . . . †/"Οπλητες Ἀργαδῆς τ', ἐμῆς τ' ἀπ' αἰγίδος / ἔμφυλον ἔξουσ' Αἰγικορῆς (OCT). But the speaker, Athena, in foretelling the careers of the four sons of Ion, declaring that they will be ἐπώνυμοι γῆς κάπιφυλίου χθονὸς / λαῶν (1577–78), appears to refer only to the order of birth. This may or may not have had anything to do with an official order of the old Attic *phylai*; nor can it easily be assumed that the poet would have wished to reflect constitutional procedure, particularly since the four *phylai* had by now long since ceased their active participation in Athenian government. Among Ionian settlements, at Cyzicus, where (as elsewhere in the Ionian states and their colonies) two new names, Boreis and Oinopes, appear alongside the four inherited *phylai*, a number of documents of varying date give the order Geleontes, Argadeis, Aigikoreis, Boreis, Oinopes, Hopletes (see *CIG*, 2. 3663–65, with Boeckh's commentary). This disposition is confirmed by a list of ephebes (discovered in 1967 and so unknown to Boeckh) of the year A.D. 221 from Odessus, a Milesian colony.<sup>5</sup> The names are arranged under a row of figures in relief which bear the inscriptions, from left to right, Oinopes, Boreis, Romaioi, Geleontes, Argadeis, Aigikoreis, Hoplets (*sic*). The two sequences differ only in respect to the placement of the later additions, the Ionian Oinopes and Boreis and the Imperial Romaioi, a variation that can easily be explained as the result of the independent adoption of these *phylai* subsequent to the arrival of the "Ionians" at their historical centers. In the identical sequence of the Attic-Ionic names, however, there is some reason to suspect the existence of a common inherited order.<sup>6</sup> This inference,

Athens under the Empire," *Hesperia* 18(1949): 1–9. Otherwise, discoveries and study subsequent to Dinsmoor's publication have done little to change the general picture.

4. E.g., W. S. Ferguson, *The Athenian Secretaries* (Ithaca, 1898), pp. 2–3.

5. G. Mihailov, *Inscriptiones Graecae in Bulgaria Repertae* I (Sophia, 1970), pp. 108–112, no. 47 bis.

6. Mention should also be made here of the *phylai* of Perinthus, which comprised both traditional elements (viz., Aigikoroï, Boreis, and Geleontes) and local innovations (e.g., Makedones, Akarnanes), and which bore ordinal numerals First, Second, etc., evidently with reference to an official order (for sources, see E. Szanto, *Die griechischen Phylen*, SAWW, vol. 144, no. 5 [1901], p. 53). Boreis was numbered Fifth (for the attribution to Perinthus of the source, G. Doublet, "Inscriptions de Paphlagonie," *BCH* 13 [1889]: 316–17, no. 26, previously assigned to Heraclea Pontica, see L. Robert, "Études d'épigraphie grecque," *RPh* 62 [1936]: 113–17 = *Opera Minora Selecta*, vol. 2 [Amsterdam, 1969], pp. 1192–94). Although under the circumstances this isolated numeral can have no significance for the present discussion, the mere fact that these *phylai* were numbered offers some support for the hypothesis of a common inherited order.

valuable in itself, would provide support for the contention that the Dorian states collectively observed a common tribal order, though of a different sort, wherever the traditional *phylai* occurred.

The remaining testimony may be grouped by region, beginning with the Greek homeland. At Messene the existence of a tribal order seems to be indicated by the agreement between two lists of the *phylai* in a document of the late second or early first century B.C., *IG*, 5. 1. 1433 + (= *SEG*, 11. 1033, 15. 226). For Tegea the matter is put beyond doubt by a text of the third century B.C. which, because it bears on the present hypothesis in a special way, is reserved for comment below. Corinth is to be included too, since three markers of the mid-fifth century B.C., *SEG*, 25. 331a, b, and 332, inscribed with letters that are generally thought to stand for the *phylai* or other civic divisions, have a second line reading "one" or "two." Despite indications that these numerals do not directly concern the tribal apparatus,<sup>7</sup> the possibility remains that they perform a function pertinent to the present discussion.

In the West, at Corcyra, ca. 500 B.C., divisions of the population of uncertain identity, but probably *phylai* are subdivided by units designated in our documents by a feminine ordinal adjective, for example, πέμπτα, ἑκτά heβδέμα, probably with reference to the ordering of the smaller units within the larger body.<sup>8</sup> Temple records from Epizephyrian Locri dated 350–250 B.C. reveal a constant order of three groups of demes, which are with certainty to be identified as *phylai*, and possibly also cycles of demes in the eponymous archonship.<sup>9</sup>

From Sicily a number of catapult bullets belonging to the period of the First and Second Slave Wars, (*IG*, 14. 2407, 1–26; M. Guarducci, "L'Istituzione della Fratria," *MemLinc* ser. 8, 2 [1938]: 166, no. xxxv, 9; A. Ferrua, "Analecta Sicula," *Epigraphica* 3 [1941]: 265–66, no. 32 [= *IG*, 14. 2407, 16?]), bear the inscriptions "First," "Second," and "Third" *phyle*. Since no fourth or other *phyle* occurs, it would be reasonable to conclude that the texts, which are written in Doric, refer to the traditional tribal organization of one of the island's Dorian cities, perhaps Syracuse as G. Kaibel (*IG*, 14, p. 608) suggested. We would thus have here, what is lacking elsewhere, explicit evidence for the ordering of the Dymanes, Hylleis, and Pamphyloi. But the identification must remain tentative pending the evaluation of the positive testimony.

Among Aegean states, Rhodes with the synoecism of the island in 408/7 B.C. adopted in place of the assumed original Dorian tripartite division a two-level territorial organization consisting, on the one hand, of individual tribal systems for the *poleis* Ialysus, Camirus, and Lindus, and, on the other, of an island-wide system in which the three cities (and their territories) themselves served as *phylai*. At the higher level, the eponymous priests of Helios were selected in a triennial rotation among the three groups

7. See my article, "The Civic Organization of Corinth," forthcoming in *TAPA* 110 (1980).

8. See P. Calligas, "An Inscribed Lead Plaque from Korkyra," *ABSA* 66 (1971): 79–94.

9. See D. Lewis, "Preliminary Notes on the Locri Archive," *Klio* 52 (1970): 247–53.

of demes that constituted the three state *phylai*.<sup>10</sup> In a similar manner, at the *polis* level, were chosen the eponymous priests of Athena Lindia and the *damiourgoi* of Camirus.<sup>11</sup> For Ephesus a list of early Imperial date (E. L. Hicks, *The Collection of Ancient Greek Inscriptions in the British Museum*, vol. 3 [Oxford, 1890], pp. 207–9, no. 578) is arranged under tribal rubrics in an order that its editor correctly recognized as official (p. 69). Less certain, however, is the case of Erythrae, for a phrase in Pausanias (7. 5. 12 τῶν φυλῶν . . . ἡ τρίτη) has usually been taken to mean "one of the three *phylai*," that is, without reference to order.

Concerning tribal subdivisions, at Cos, in addition to the evidence bearing on the Dorian *phylai* discussed below (*j, k, l, m*), the Pasthemidai *pratoi*, an *enata* or Ninth, occurs in a sacral context of uncertain significance (text *j*, line 6). If, as I shall argue elsewhere, the Coan Ninths were identical with the *chiliastyes* or Thousands mentioned in this and other Coan texts, a parallel may exist at fifth-century B.C. Miletus, for with the formulations Ἀργαδῶν πρώτη (T. Wiegand, "Dritter Vorläufiger Bericht über die von den Königlichen Museen Ausgrabungen in Milet," SDAW [1904], p. 85) and Ὀπλήθων δευτέρης (G. Dunst, "Zu den altmilesischen Phylen," *Forschungen und Fortschritte* 35 [1961]: 272–73) editors usually supply χιλιαστὺς (or -ύς). Less clear is the exact significance of certain late fourth-century B.C. texts from Chios in which the groups, probably *phylai*, Chalazoi and Totteidai, appear to have fallen into divisions *protoi*, *deuteroi*, and perhaps others, which in turn comprised units designated by single Greek letters, that is, numerals, Α, Β, Γ . . .,<sup>12</sup> but in the former instance there is at least a superficial similarity with the Coan and Milesian cases. All probably reflect procedures of ranking or ordering of some kind.

What testimony remains is confined to the East, and is of Imperial date.<sup>13</sup> At Perinthus, again, are attested thus far the *phylai* Second, Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth (for sources, see n. 6). Prusias ad Hypeum in Bithynia had twelve *phylai* which, if Dörner's analysis is accepted, were ordered in a fixed sequence on a historical basis.<sup>14</sup> At Ancyra copious testimony reveals a system of twelve *phylai*, each designated by an ordinal numeral or numerical adjective (e.g., *IGRR*, 3. 173–208 *passim*). At Dorylaeum in Phrygia a dedication (A. Koerte, "En Phrygie," *GGA* 159 [1897]: 400, no. 44) is made in the name of φυλῶν ἡ πρώτη Μητρῶας. Dubious, however, is the φυλὴ ι, or Tenth, alleged to exist at Bithynium-Claudiopolis in Bithynia (*CIG*, 2. 3802 = *IGRR*, 3. 72), at Nacoleia in Phrygia (*MAMA*, 5. 204), and at Sillyum in Pamphylia (*IGRR*, 3. 801). In each instance the phrase occurs as subject, and, as has been noted, it is quite possible, indeed probable

10. See L. Morricone, "I Sacerdoti di Halio," *ASAA* 27–29 (1949–1951): 351–80.

11. See P. M. Fraser, "The Tribal Cycles of Eponymous Priests at Lindos and Kamiros," *Eranos* 51 (1953): 23–27.

12. See W. G. Forrest, "The Tribal Organization of Chios," *BSA* 55 (1960): 172–89.

13. I confine my attention to Asia Minor. One could go farther afield, but to no real point. At Alexandria, for instance, the phratries (as nowhere in Greece, to my knowledge) were numbered: *PTeb* 879.

14. "Prusias ad Hypium," *RE* 23 (1957): 1137–38.

in view of the absence of any other ordinal, that the iota is not a numeral but the final letter of the nominative termination.<sup>15</sup>

Taken together, this testimony is impressive in its range of distribution and of chronology. It appears to justify the conclusion that the phenomenon was both widespread and persistent, an inference that receives strong additional support from the apparent absence of evidence (known to myself) for *failure* to observe some sort of ordering principle, although in most cases (of course) neither a positive nor a negative determination is possible. Were our evidence more extensive, tribal order would in all probability be recognized as a frequent, if not invariable, concomitant of tribal organization.

It is against this background that I wish to examine the tribal systems of the Dorian states. For many of these is attested a tripartite division by the *phylai* Dymanes, Hylleis, and Pamphyloi, whose origins are usually placed prior to the dispersal of the Dorians to their historical centers. As at Athens, the Dorian tribal organizations were intimately bound up with the functioning of the several departments of *polis* government. A noteworthy illustration is provided by a late third-century B.C. proxeny decree from Acragas, in which the dating formulas include the entry *προεδρενούσας τὰς φυλὰς / τῶν Ἑλλέων* (IG, 14. 952, lines 4–5). Evidently the *phylai* took turns, as at Athens, in providing a presiding committee of the Council. Other examples relevant to the evidence under review will be introduced in due course. Taken together, these indications of the civic uses of the Dorian *phylai* lend substance to our inquiry by demonstrating beyond any question the need for some sort of ordering principle.<sup>16</sup>

To date, only two statements on the subject are to be found in the scholarly literature, both concerning the island state of Cos. W. Paton and E. L. Hicks in an appendix to their Coan corpus alluded to an “official order,” even though the order suggested was not supported by the very texts that they cited. Later, the same “officielle Reihenfolge” was recognized by R. Herzog, but on no better authority.<sup>17</sup> In actual fact, there exists not for Cos, nor for any other Dorian state that continued to observe the inherited tripartite division, adequate evidence that a single, fixed order (similar to that exemplified in the Athenian catalogues and lists) was ever observed. Still, the existence of a regular procedure of some kind is, in the light of the above-mentioned general consideration, to be suspected, and we are at liberty to carry the investigation further.

15. The point is well made in connection with Bithynium by F. K. Dörner, *Bericht über eine Reise in Bithynien*, Oesterreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Denkschriften, 75.1 (Vienna, 1952), pp. 41–42, no. 84, citing the evidence for the variant orthography.

16. Additional support for the tendency is provided by the lists of festivals. These have been studied by E. J. Morrissey in a dissertation, “Studies in Inscriptions Listing the Agonistic Festivals” (Harvard University, 1974; summary in *HSCP* 79 [1975]: 367–70). Greatest attention was given to the first position, less to the lower positions, though in some cases seven or eight levels of distinction are discernible.

17. W. R. Paton and E. L. Hicks, *The Inscriptions of Cos* (Oxford, 1890), p. 341; R. Herzog, *Heilige Gesetze von Kos*, Abh. Preuss. Akad. d. Wiss. (Berlin, 1928) p. 42. Paton and Hicks supported their claim by reference to the inscriptions in their corpus numbered 39 and 65 (texts *k* and *m* below). Ironically, the alleged “official” order Hylleis–Dymanes–Pamphyloi (*k*) is found in no other document and, as we shall see, was a deviation from traditional Dorian practice.

## II

I have surveyed the evidence for tribal organization in the Dorian states and have collected all the pertinent texts. These, examined in detail below, comprise all those sources in which the names of the three *phylai* occur (or may be thought to have occurred) and in which there is some reason to think that a deliberate attempt was made to reflect a regular order of precedence. The latter qualification has had the practical effect of excluding a few nondocumentary texts that, whatever other importance they may possess, are manifestly without such a purpose.<sup>18</sup> The resulting catalogue numbers thirteen items: eleven (*a, c-l*) in which the order of the *phylai* is certain or at least probable, and two (*b, m*) in which, for different reasons, the order followed in the document is not recoverable. The findings may be conveniently tabulated:

Dymanes—Hylleis—Pamphyloi: *a, e, g, l*

Hylleis—Pamphyloi—Dymanes: *c, d, f, h*

Pamphyloi—Dymanes—Hylleis: *h, i*

Dymanes—Pamphyloi—Hylleis: none

Hylleis—Dymanes—Pamphyloi: *k*

Pamphyloi—Hylleis—Dymanes: *j*

Incomplete text: *b*

Uncertain reading: *m*

Cursory inspection reveals a pattern: the first three arrangements of the names, accounting for ten collocations of the *phylai* in nine texts, represent the same relative sequence of names, that is the same tribal order, only begun at different places. In the second group of three arrangements, representing the other possible sequence, on the other hand, occur only two examples—actually two fragments of the same Coan religious calendar. Now, given the marked variations in provenience, date, and subject matter within the body of texts as a whole, could there be some significance to this pattern?

That there is indeed such significance is strongly suggested by a document of the beginning of the second century B.C. from Calymna, text *h* below (see for references). Only partially preserved, the stone bears a catalogue of names arranged according to the island's three demes. The registers of Pothaia and Panormos are fragmentarily preserved in consecutive text; presumably there was also a register for the third deme, Orkatos, which

18. Tyr. frag. 19 West, lines 7-9 (deployment of the Spartan army by the three *phylia*); Hdt. 5. 68 (renaming of the Sicyonian *phylai* by the tyrant Cleisthenes); Steph. Byz. s.v. "Dymanes" (on the names of three *phylai*). In none of these passages is there the slightest reason to suspect that the author wished to reflect an official order such as that under discussion. That the lists in Herodotus and Stephanus support the present thesis is accordingly best attributed to accident. Some idea of the pitfalls involved here may be obtained through comparison of an established tribal order, that of the Cleisthenic organization, with the several literary accounts in which the names of the *phylai*, in one connection or another, are listed: see A. E. Raubitschek, "The Gates in the Agora," *AJA* 60(1956): 280, n. 4. Marked variations similarly occur among the various literary discussions of the four Ionian *phylai* at Athens: see A. Boeckh, *CIG*, 2. 3665 commentary.

may have stood either at the head or at the end of the catalogue. Each deme register is divided, in turn, into separate tribal lists, each comprising *gynaikes*, *parthenoi*, *aneboi*, and in one case an *ephebos*. Of interest here is the arrangement of the preserved tribal lists. The Pothaia register opens amidst the Dymanes, who are immediately followed by the Hylleis. In the very next line commences the Panormos register. For this deme the Hylleis list is preserved entire, after which come a few entries for the Pamphyloi before the text fails. On the basis of these remains, the inscription's most recent editor, M. Segre, restored the entire catalogue in the following fashion (I omit the groupings *gynaikes*, *parthenoi*, etc.):

<i>Pothaia</i>	<i>Panormos</i>	[ <i>Orkatos</i> ]
[Pamphyloi]	Hylleis	[Dymanes]
Dymanes	Pamphyloi	[Hylleis or Pamphyloi]
Hylleis	[Dymanes]	[Pamphyloi or Hylleis]

Regarding the Pothaia and Panormos lists, for which the disposition of the tribal registers is assured, the text affords incontrovertible evidence for deliberate manipulation of the arrangement of the names of the *phylai*. Segre grasped this, but in reconstructing the Orkatos list allowed the possibility that the relative sequence of names did not correspond to that of the preserved lists. Be that as it may, the actual remains guarantee two lists in consecutive text in which the same sequence is observed but in which that sequence has been rotated. Similar in principle to the cycle, the procedure implicit in the present document differs, with one exception, from all known examples of tribal order reviewed above in that here the rotation is not continuous (as would be true, say, of a catalogue of the secretaries of the Athenian Council) but embodied in a series of separate lists. The one exception is from Tegea, a list (*IG*, 5. 2, 36) dating to the third century B.C., in which consecutive annual groups of *politai* are arranged according to a fixed order, which rotates forward one *phyle* each year. This parallel offers support for an hypothesis suggested by the Calymnian catalogue: that the Dorian *phylai*, wherever found, followed a common, traditional order that might, on occasion, be rotated in such a way that in any given document any of the three *phylai* might hold first, second, or third position.

### III

The texts are presented here, grouped by state.<sup>19</sup> The majority consists of catalogues and lists of various kinds comparable to the Athenian examples discussed above, and, as in some of those instances, it is not clear in every case what procedure, if any, constituted the basis of the order. Still, where

19. For the reader's convenience I have appended to the texts discussed in section III abbreviated references to the several collections, handbooks, etc., in which they may be consulted. The less familiar of these are: Michel: C. Michel, *Recueil d'Inscriptions Grecques* (Brussels, 1900); Prott, *LGS*: I. de Prott (ed.), *Leges Graecorum Sacrae e Titulis Collectae I* (Leipzig, 1896); Schwyzler: E. Schwyzler, *Dialectorum Graecarum Exempla Epigraphica Potiora* (Leipzig, 1923); Sokolowski, *LSCG*: F. Sokolowski, *Lois Sacrées des Cités Grecques* (Paris, 1969); Ziehen, *LGS*: vol. 2 of Prott, *LGS* (Leipzig, 1906).



available, information is included bearing on the participation of the *phylai* in civic activities, particularly those cases in which tribal order might have come into play. Along the way, also, two reforms in tribal order are posited. The one, at Argos, concerns only the fourth, non-Dorian *phyle*, and is accordingly of relatively minor significance. The other, of crucial importance, pertains to the two exceptional documents from classical Cos.

#### ARGOS

During the Archaic period several Peloponnesian and Isthmian states extended the privileges of citizenship to non-Dorian elements by the addition of a new *phyle*, or two, to the existing Dorian system. At Argos the fourth *phyle* was named the Hyrnathioi.

Abundant evidence testifies to the involvement of the *phylai* in Argive affairs. The *damiourgoi*, the chief magistrates before the democracy, appear to have represented the earlier threefold division; later, the four *hiaromnamones* (below, *a*), the enlarged tribal organization. The aristocratic Council of Eighty, as its numerical title indicates, and possibly also the *Boule*, were similarly constituted along tribal lines. Within the military organization the cavalry commanders directly represented the four *phylai* (*d*), and two lists of fallen (*b* and *c*) are arranged under rubrics *kata phylas*. Both lists, however, may postdate a reform (discussed below) by which the presumed original tribal regiments were replaced by the five *lochoi* that appear at Mantinea in 416 B.C.<sup>20</sup>

(*a*) IG, 4. 517 (Michel 861; Schwyzler 96[1]; SEG, 11. 303; C. D. Buck, *The Greek Dialects*<sup>3</sup> [Chicago, 1955], no. 82; L. H. Jeffery, *Local Scripts of Archaic Greece* [Oxford, 1961], pp. 164–65, 170, no. 32). This inscribed stone base from the Heraeum, tentatively dated ca. 460–450 B.C. by Jeffery, bears an inscription stating that both the (lost) bronze stele and the base itself belong to Hera Argeia. There follow the names of the four *hiaromnamones*, who presumably had made the dedication. Each is identified as a member of one of the four *phylai* in the order, from top to bottom, Dymanes, Hylleis, Hyrnathioi, and Pamphylai.

(*b*) D. W. Bradeen, *The Athenian Agora XVII. Inscriptions: The Funerary Monuments* (Princeton, 1974), pp. 7–9, no. 4 (SGDI, 3266; IG, 1<sup>2</sup>. 931–32; SEG, 10. 407; Jeffery, *LSAG*, pp. 164, 169, no. 30; R. Meiggs and D. Lewis, *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions* [Oxford, 1969], no. 35). This stele was erected in the Cerameicus to commemorate the Argive allies who had fallen alongside the Athenians at Tanagra in 458/7 B.C. The catalogue of names, arranged in columns, begins at the upper left under the rubric ἑλλεῖς in line 3. Presumably there were similar rubrics for the other three *phylai*, but they are not preserved.

(*c*) C. Kritzas, in ΣΤΗΛΗ in memoriam N. Kontoleon (forthcoming). List of fallen. Ca. 415–385 B.C. (extreme limits). The order of the *phylai*, from left to right, is [ἑλλεῖς–Π]αμφύλαι–ὑρνάθιοι–Δυμᾶνες.

20. For sources and interpretation, see M. Wörle, "Untersuchungen zur Verfassungsgeschichte von Argos im 5. Jahrhundert vor Christus" (diss., Erlangen, 1964), pp. 11–31.

(d) *SEG*, 11. 293 (*SGDI*, 3282, 3319; Michel 1065; *IG*, 4. 487, 488; Schwyzer 86). Dated to the fourth or third century B.C., this inscription from Nemea records a dedication (of an *aparche* to Zeus?) made in the names of the Argive ilarchs or cavalry commanders. The text, which was not completely inscribed, is of doubtful interpretation. A total of seven individuals is indicated: the single ἱλαρχος ἐπιλέκτας of the Hylleis, two ilarchs of the Pamphylai, two of the Hyrnathioi, and two others in line 5 for which only one name, but no *phyle*, was inscribed. W. Vollgraff reasonably suggested, ("Ad Titulos Argivas," *Mnemosyne* 58 [1930]: 35–37, no. 9) that this last line, which is manifestly unfinished, would have run in full: ἱλάρχω Δεξιστρατος [ὁ δέῖνα, Δυμάνων φυλᾶς]. On this reconstruction, the order will have been Hylleis (the *epilektas*), Pamphylai, Hyrnathioi, and Dymanes.

Although in all three documents in which the four names are preserved or can be restored, the suggested pan-Dorian convention is observed, difficulties arise concerning the disposition of the Hyrnathioi. One wonders, in the first place, to what position in the order the *phyle* was originally assigned. But the answer would depend upon the determination of the original fixed order which, as will be seen, cannot be established with any certainty. In any event, the example of Athens cautions us against preconceptions. The five *phylai* added at various times to the tenfold Cleisthenic system were placed at the beginning (Antigonis I and Demetrias II), middle (Ptolemais VII, Hadrianis VII), and end (Attalis XII) of the existing order.

More troublesome is the fact that the Hyrnathioi appear after Hylleis in text *a*, but after the Pamphylai in texts *c* and *d*. On the present thesis, rotation of the official order would have obviated the need for any given *phyle* to alter its position within the sequence. We are forced to assume that at some point there occurred a deliberate change in the position of the fourth *phyle*.<sup>21</sup> The earlier date of text *a*, namely ca. 460–450 B.C. (on the basis of letter forms), suggests the possibility of a reform between that time and the publication of text *c*, after ca. 415 B.C.

A suitable occasion for such a change can be found. At some time in the 460s, but no later than 462 B.C., a ruling oligarchy was replaced by a democratic government. M. Wörle's careful sifting of the evidence has shown that, among other changes, the new constitutional arrangements eventually were to include the replacement of the *phyletikon* by the phratry-name and the abandonment of the four tribal regiments in favor of the five *lochoi*.<sup>22</sup> If the transition to democracy involved the *phylai* to such an extent, it is reasonable to assign to this same period a rearrangement of the tribal sequence. As to the motives behind such a reform we have no clue; they probably involved matters of tribal precedence and procedure on which our few sources do not even begin to provide us with adequate

21. Alternatively, it might be inferred that the position, not of the Hyrnathioi, but of the Pamphylai was changed. However, since the fourth *phyle* is involved, it is easier to assume that it was the one affected. For our purposes, it really makes very little difference how one views the situation.

22. Wörle, "Untersuchungen," pp. 120–24 (establishment of democracy). 124–29 (new constitutional forms).

information. But whatever the circumstances, the inherited pan-Dorian order of the three old *phylai* remained undisturbed.

Skeptics may hesitate to accept such an hypothesis, but the early history of the Cleisthenic tribal order affords an assured parallel. The order observed so persistently in the numerous documents and cycles mentioned above can be traced back no further than 447 B.C. (*IG*, 1<sup>2</sup>. 943; Meiggs-Lewis, *SGHI*, no. 48, for the date), and was certainly not the order instituted by Cleisthenes: both literary evidence for the deployment of the Athenian phalanx at Marathon (including Hdt. 6. 111. 1) and inscribed markers from the Agora and Piraeus dated to not long before the middle of the fifth century B.C. (*IG*, 1<sup>2</sup>. 885; *SEG*, 10. 371–74, 21. 108–13 [Agora]; *IG*, 1<sup>2</sup>. 897–901 [Piraeus]) reveal an entirely different sequence.<sup>23</sup> Here, too, we are obliged to think in terms of a reform of which the motives are beyond recovery. It is possible, however, that questions of status were at issue: the alleged "privilege" of Aiantis, for example, was discussed even in antiquity (Plut. *Quaest. conv.* 1. 10 [*Mor.* 628–29]). But as to the fact of the change there can be no doubt. The suggestion of a contemporary change at Argos, newly democratic, and at a time when the tribal organization was clearly undergoing revision, is unobjectionable on grounds of substance.

#### EPIDAUROS

As at Argos, the Epidaurian tribal organization underwent major reform. The system's expansion, however, was accomplished not by the addition of a fourth *phyle* but by the replacement of one of the Dorian triad, Pamphyloi, by two new *phylai*, Hysminatai and Azantioi. Thus, it is not possible, on the supposition of a rotating tribal order, to say whether or not the two surviving *phylai* preserved the traditional sequence. Nonetheless, the Epidaurian evidence is important in that it provides at least one occasion for the use of tribal order: a number of proxeny decrees of the late fourth or early third century B.C. (*IG*, 4<sup>2</sup>. 1. 96; *SEG*, 11. 412) are dated by boards of *κατάλογοι βουλᾶς* representing subdivisions of the four *phylai*; that is, in a manner comparable to the Athenian prytanies, chairmanship of the Council was shared among the subdivisions, hence among the *phylai* themselves. This practice implies the existence of a regular procedure whereby the privilege of the chairmanship was equitably distributed.<sup>24</sup>

#### MEGARA

Megara, unlike some of her neighbors, did not enlarge her tribal organization, at least not through the addition of a *phyle*. Regrettably, very little is known of the functions of the Megarian *phylai*, although, in connection with text *e*, it should be noted negatively that the contemporary military

23. A. E. Raubitschek, "The Gates in the Agora," p. 281. The markers establish the relative sequence Hippothontis (VIII)–Akamantis (V)–Aiantis (IX). Raubitschek demonstrates the compatibility of this sequence with certain of the literary evidence, including Herodotus.

24. The nature of the procedure is unclear. Study of the relevant documents, which cannot be cited at length here, reveals no consistency in the sequence of the four names: see *IG*, 4<sup>2</sup>. 1. 28, 106 (*SEG*, 18. 154, 25. 389), 108 (*SEG*, 18. 154, 25. 390), *SEG*, 25. 394. The use of lot is to be suspected.

organization was structured on a fivefold basis (cf. K. Hanell, *Megarische Studien* [Lund, 1934], pp. 138–44).

(e) Unpublished casualty list. Ca. 430 B.C. (C. Edmonson). This text, according to its prospective editor C. Edmonson (*per litt.*), records a number of names listed in a single column under the rubrics, from top to bottom, [Δυμᾶνες], ἑλλῆς, [Π]άμφυλοι.

(f) *IG*, 4<sup>2</sup>. 1. 71 (*SGDI*, 3025; Michel 20; *IG*, 4. 926; *SIG*<sup>3</sup>, 471; Schwyzler 157; Buck, *Greek Dialects*, no. 99; *SEG*, 11. 402; 13. 251, 281; 23. 193). Dated by K. J. Beloch to the period 242/241–236/235 B.C. (*Griechische Geschichte*<sup>2</sup> [Stuttgart, 1927], 4.2: 24), this document from Epidaurus records an arbitration by Megara of a territorial dispute between Epidaurus and Corinth. At the conclusion of the decision are listed the names of 151 Megarian dicasts arranged under headings by the three *phylai*. The order, from top to bottom, is Hylleis, Pamphyloi, Dymanes (lines 32, 49, 67). Below the catalogue comes a shorter list of thirty-one boundary commissioners drawn from the dicasts. Although the second list lacks the use of the tribal names as headings, the commissioners are nonetheless grouped by *phylai* and the groups are arranged in the same order.

#### ISSA

(g) *SIG*<sup>3</sup>, 141 (*SEG*, 17. 312, 19. 435). Early in the fourth century, Issa, an island off the Dalmatian coast colonized from Syracuse, sent out her own colony to a neighboring island, Corcyra Nigra, the provenience of our document. A decree of the Issaians, the text deals with the distribution of the colony's lands. At the conclusion of the decree proper follows a catalogue of the Issaians who "took possession of the site and walled the city," that is, the first colonists (line 17). These names are arranged in three columns under tribal rubrics in the order, from left to right, [Δυμᾶ]νες, [Ἑλλῆ]ς, Πάμφυλοι.

#### CALYMNA

(h, i) M. Segre, "Tituli Calymnii," *ASAA* 22/23 (1944–45): 127–36, no. 88 (*SGDI*, 3593); 136–39, no. 89AB. Segre's publication of the inscriptions of Calymna includes twelve fragments of catalogues (nos. 85–96) representing at least ten different documents. Nine of the fragments preserve the name of at least one of the Dorian *phylai*, and two, nos. 88 and 89AB, two or more in consecutive text. No. 88 (h) was discussed above. No. 89 (i) appears to have been of a similar arrangement, but the register of only one of the three demes, Panormos, is preserved. The order of the *phylai*, from top to bottom, is Pamphyloi, Dymanes, and Hylleis (A, lines 1, 17, 23). That in no. 88 (h) this was the sequence observed not for Panormos but for Pothaia may be taken as a further indication of deliberate rotation of the traditional order.

#### COS

Cos presents the one substantial difficulty for the present hypothesis. Four problematic documents, of which one (j) is unmistakably concerned with

procedure, show that about the middle of the fourth century B.C. the suggested pan-Dorian convention was not observed (*j*, *k*), while early in the second century B.C., and possibly again in Imperial times, the tribal order conformed to that of other Dorian states (*l*, *m*?).

(*j*) Herzog, *Heilige Gesetze von Kos*, pp. 5–10, no. 1 (E. Hicks, "A Sacrificial Calendar from Cos," *JHS* 9 [1888]: 332–37; W. Paton and E. Hicks, *The Inscriptions of Cos* [Oxford, 1890], no. 37; Prott, *LGS* I, no. 5; *SGDI*, 3636; Michel 716, *SIG*<sup>3</sup>, 1025; Schwyzer 215A; Buck, *Greek Dialects*, p. 108; Sokolowski, *LSCG*, 151A). Part of an extensive compilation of *leges sacrae* of the mid-fourth century B.C., the Batromios calendar is a well-known, and problematic, document. The first nineteen lines, pertaining to the nineteenth of the month, enjoin an elaborate procedure for the selection of an ox to be sacrificed to Zeus Polieus. Presiding over the rite are a priest and a panel of *hieropoioi*, before whom representatives of the three *phylai* are instructed to proceed one at a time with three of the oxen until one is chosen. Herzog's readings in lines 7 and 9–10 leave no doubt but that the first *phyle* to enter the agora is to be the Pamphyloi. Unfortunately, however, the stone has been damaged in the very areas in which the names of the other two *phylai* would be expected to appear:

. . . Π[άμ]-

10      [φ]ύλοι δὲ ἐπελάντω βοῦ[ς τρεῖς τοῦ]ς καλλίστους, αἱ μ[έγ κα]  
           τοῦτω γ κριθῇ τις· αἱ δὲ [μή, 'Υλλεῖς τρ]εῖς ἐλάντω, αἱ μέγ [κα τ]-  
           [ο]ύτω γ κριθῇ τις· αἱ δὲ μ[ή, Δυμᾶνες τρ]εῖς τοὺς λοιποὺς . . .

Which *phyle* belongs in which gap depends, it is clear, on the lengths of the lacunae. Study of the apographs printed in Hicks' editio princeps and in Paton and Hicks' corpus shows the two spaces to be very nearly equal in length; Herzog, in reediting the inscription, succeeded in reducing both by two letter spaces. In his text above, the restoration of Hylleis in line 11 and Dymanes in line 12 results in a total of ten bracketed letters in each space. But if the names were interchanged, the restorations would be eleven and nine letters long respectively, which is clearly unsatisfactory. The order Pamphyloi–Hylleis–Dymanes, accordingly, may be taken as assured.

(*k*) Herzog, *Heilige Gesetze von Kos*, pp. 11–12, no. 3 (Paton and Hicks, *Inscriptions of Cos*, no. 39; Prott, *LGS*, 1, no. 7; *SGDI*, 3638; Michel 718; *SIG*<sup>3</sup>, 1027; Schwyzer 251C; Sokolowski, *LSCG*, 151C). A second fragment of a religious calendar, also part of the fourth-century compilation, calls for the sacrifice of three sheep *kata phylas*: that of the Hylleis at the Heraeum, that of the Dymanes *παρὰ τὰ Ἀναξίλεια*, and that of the Pamphyleis in Eitea at the Damatreum (lines 2–5). Although the rites themselves, which are to be performed at three different places, do not bring into play the tribal order, the order of their mention in our document is unlikely to have been arbitrary. The order Hylleis–Dymanes–Pamphyloi, like that in the previous text, violates the proposed pan-Dorian convention.

(*l*) G. Pugliese Carratelli, "Il Damos Coo di Isthmos," *ASAA* 25/26 (1963–64): 183–201, nos. 26A, B (Paton and Hicks, *Inscriptions of Cos*, nos. 367, 368; *SGDI*, 3705, 3706; Michel 1003; Ziehen, *LGS*, 2. 1, no. 130; *SIG*<sup>3</sup>, 1023; Schwyzer 253; Sokolowski, *LSCG*, 173). Our earliest evidence

for the observance of the traditional tribal order at Cos is provided by a decree and accompanying catalogue from the deme of Halasarna. The two documents are dated to the early second century B.C. In a (for us) obscure clause, the authors of the decree are described as “the *phylai* that participate in the rites of Apollo and Heracles in Halasarna” (lines 3–6). The decree calls for the composition of a register of the participants in the cults, to which end each claimant is to supply specific personal information including his tribal affiliation. Turning to the catalogue, we find 179 names distributed unevenly among three partially preserved alphabetized lists. All three lists present the data required by the decree, with the exception of the tribal affiliation. Paton and Hicks offered the reasonable explanation that the stewards had simplified the procedure by composing a separate register for each *phyle*, with the name of the *phyle* standing at the head as a rubric; sadly, in no instance has the beginning of a list been preserved.

Other evidence, however, is available which sheds light on the identification and order of the *phylai* in both decree and catalogue. Paton and Hicks observed that to the first list of the catalogue belong the priest and *hieropoioi* of Apollo recorded in another Coan inscription.<sup>25</sup> Since the decree specifies the *phylai* to which Apollo and Heracles are sacred, presumably only two *phylai*, it follows that the second list is that of the *phyle* of Heracles. This *phyle*, further, may be identified with the Hylleis, for it is at the Heracleum that they, in an earlier text (*k*), are instructed to perform a sacrifice. Thus far we shall follow Paton and Hicks. What of the third list? No mention is made of a third *phyle* in the decree. Paton and Hicks argued (*Inscriptions of Cos*, pp. 257–59) that the final register consisted of certain individuals who had not by virtue of their tribal affiliation been accorded access to the rites but who had nonetheless acquired the right to participate through intermarriage with heiresses of the other *phylai*. That these individuals’ *phyle* was the Pamphyloi has now been put beyond doubt by Pugliese Carratelli’s identification of one of the names in the list, Nicomachus, son of Nicomachus, with a man of the same name designated Pamphylos in an unpublished contemporary catalogue of subscribers (“Il Damos Coo di Isthmos,” p. 155). The *phyle* of Apollo, accordingly, must be the Dymanes. In the decree, therefore, the order observed is Dymanes, Hylleis; in the catalogue, Dymanes, Hylleis, Pamphyloi.

(*m*) Paton and Hicks, *Inscriptions of Cos*, no. 65 (*SGDI*, 3654). Of Imperial date, this dedication has the unusual form of three inscribed shields carved in low relief upon a rectangular plaque, each bearing the

25. Paton and Hicks, *Inscriptions of Cos*, pp. 259, 280, on no. 370. Although of the seven Coans named in the text only one, Stratippus, son of Hieron (line 6), actually recurs in the catalogue (II, no. 37 in Pugliese Carratelli’s edition), five of the others (lines 1, 4, 5, 8, 9) are clearly related to him.

The editors’ additional arguments (p. 259) for identifying the *phyle* of Apollo with the Dymanes are, however, without force. This connection can be established only by process of elimination. The Calymnian catalogue to which they refer, text *h* above, neither relates to the “*sacra* of Apollo” nor gives precedence to the Dymanes. Nor can the tradition that Apollo was the founder of Halicarnassus be legitimately combined with Stephanus’ notice (s.v. Ἀλικαρνασσός; see G. L. Huxley, “On Stephanus of Byzantium s.v. Ἀλικαρνασσός,” *GRBS* 6 [1965]: 213–14) that Anthes settled Halicarnassus from Troezen λαβὼν τὴν Δυμάνων φυλὴν.

name of a general. At the top of each shield, immediately above the name of the dedicator, stands a monogram. The three monograms were interpreted by Paton and Hicks as, from left to right, Dymanes, Hylleis, Pamphyloi. Yet the interpretation fails to be supported by the editors' own uncial text, according to which the symbols on the first and second shields both resemble the Roman letter X, probably a ligature of the rough breathing and upsilon, the device in use on Calymna for Hylleis. Conceivably, one or the other is a mistake for  $\tilde{\chi}$  (i.e., Dymanes), but the possibility must be left open that this phyle was for some reason not represented. The third symbol, on the other hand, is clearly a monogram of *pi* and *mu* (i.e., Pamphyloi). While, therefore, the editors' interpretation might be correct, clearly not much faith can be placed in it.

Why Cos would have failed to subscribe to a pan-Dorian tribal order is a question for which I have no answer. Yet in view of the variations observable elsewhere even within single organizations, such as the Athenian, that only one state, in the most remote region of the Dorian expansion, should prove exceptional is not particularly surprising. Even so, a single exception by itself might be taken by some, especially in consideration of the relative scarcity of evidence, as decisive against the theory. But the plain fact is that early in the second century B.C. the Coan tribal order agrees with the suggested traditional order. No other state for which we have evidence underwent such a change. We are at liberty to entertain the possibility, accordingly, that the change was deliberate and carried out precisely in order to correct a deviation from traditional Dorian practice. That is, should a satisfactory occasion be found, the change itself might provide further support for the theory.

A major development in later Coan history, with which such a reform might be connected, was the establishment of the *homopoliteia*, or common government, between Cos and her smaller neighbor to the north, Calymna. Surviving documents show that this event took place sometime between the 220s and the time of the Cretan War, ca. 204–201 B.C.<sup>26</sup> That this chronology would suit the dates of three of the four Coan texts under consideration (*j*, *k*, *m*) there can be no question. The Halasarna decree and catalogue, however, are shown by both their form and general content to be virtually contemporary with the formation of the union. But that the catalogue is of slightly later date is proved by the appearance in it of a number of persons elsewhere identifiable as Calymnians who are nonetheless enrolled—in spite of the instructions of the decree—without any indication of foreign (i.e., non-Coan) origin (Pugliese Carratelli, "Il Damos Coo di Isthmos," p. 157). With the creation of the *homopoliteia*, Calymna had been reduced to the status of a Coan deme and her former citizens were by now indistinguishable from other Coans.

The suitability of this development to a Coan tribal reform is indicated

26. For the terminus post quem, see G. Klaffenbach, review of "Tituli Calymnii," by M. Segre, *Gnomon* 25(1953): 456; for the ante quem, *SIG*<sup>3</sup>, 567, with the interpretation of Paton and Hicks. *Inscriptions of Cos*, p. 353.

by the evolution of the Calymnian tribal organization. In the fourth century Calymna had observed a unique system of four or more indigenous *phylai* and six or more demes.<sup>27</sup> But documents of the second century B.C. (e.g., *h*, *i*) attest the presence of the Dorian tripartite division and only three demes. Reversion to the traditional organization (which, presumably, had already preceded the indigenous *phylai* and demes) is an extraordinary event, not paralleled to my knowledge by any other state. Such a change could only have been imposed from without, and no more likely occasion is at hand than the establishment of the *homopoliteia* with Cos. If Calymnians were to become Coans, the two tribal organizations would necessarily have to be made homogeneous, and the obvious solution, indeed the only possible solution, was for the Calymnians once again to become Dymanes, Hylleis, and Pamphyloi. Now, as our documents show (*h*, *i*), the new Calymnian Dorian tribal organization observed the pan-Dorian tribal order. I suggest that it was also at this time that Cos, while requiring Calymnians to adopt the Coan civic organization, was obliged to adjust her own errant tribal order to conform to that of other Dorian states. If, as is quite possible, Cos reinforced her demands with reference to "the ancestral practice of the Dorians" (or the like), it is clear that she will have had little other choice. Whatever were the reasons, therefore, for Cos' previous idiosyncrasy, not only the fact of the change but also the circumstances of that change might lend indirect support to the present hypothesis.

Our examination of the documents has been fraught with difficulties at practically every turn. But, in the final analysis, only one text, the Coan shield dedication (*m*), remains uncertain as to reading; and for the two attested anomalies, at Argos and Cos, plausible occasions and motives for reform have been suggested. In sum, although the earlier tribal order of Cos remains unaccounted for, the primary evidence as a whole is otherwise consistent with the observance of a tribal rotation such as is implicit in the Calymnian catalogue (*h*).

#### IV

We now turn to a final question, one of larger significance. What account can be offered for the evolution of this complex—and, except for the Tegean example, unparalleled—institution?

A rotating tribal order necessarily implies the prior existence of a single, fixed order. Furthermore, the observance of the convention throughout the Dorian region shows that that fixed order must, like the *phylai* themselves, have antedated the dispersal of the Dorians to their historical centers. Its origins, accordingly, are best sought in a primitive hierarchy or ranking of the *phylai*. At such an early date, distinctions in status were still likely to be felt and to be reflected in institutions. For this reason, also, it is better to assume that the practice of rotating the order—a sophisticated and, as will be suggested, egalitarian device—did not evolve until well into the historical period.

27. For the indigenous Calymnian *phylai*, see Segre, "Tituli Calymni," pp. 41–42.



Have we any clues concerning the disposition of the original order? Since eponymous ancestors were claimed for the three *phylai*, one might look to myth, if not for the origins, at least for an early reflection, of a prehistoric hierarchy. Yet the surviving versions of "The Return of the Heracleidae" yield no such hints. The order of birth of the eponyms, for example, is not recorded. Nor is it clear what, if anything, is to be made of the detail that, while Dymans and Pamphylos were the natural sons of Aigimios, Hyllos, the son of Heracles, was adopted (Steph. Byz., s.v. "Dymanes"). Though patently aetiological in origin (e.g., "Pamphylos"), the myth as we have it reveals no attempt to rationalize a hierarchy.

If, however, the investigation is restricted to the historical record, it may be safely inferred that the Pamphyloi were regarded as in some sense inferior. At Epidaurus, it was that *phyle* which, as we saw, at an early date gave way to the non-Dorian Hysminatai and Azantioi. Similarly at Cos, Paton made a strong case for the inferiority of the Pamphyloi in the Halasarna documents discussed above (text 1). The inference is also supported by the name "Pamphyloi" itself, which evidently designates an amalgam of various elements, perhaps in contrast to the purer strain of the Dymanes and Hylleis. Between the latter two *phylai*, however, despite the ingenious efforts of historians and linguists alike, no such distinction can be established.<sup>28</sup> Certainly there is no trace in our extant documents of any substantial difference in status. Even so, one might be tempted to hypothesize an original fixed ranking of the *phylai* in which the Pamphyloi stood in the least prestigious position, namely Dymanes-Hylleis-Pamphyloi.

Since any fixed tribal order, wherever applied, would serve to maintain, perhaps even to strengthen, differences in status among the *phylai*, it would naturally have become subject to the egalitarian tendencies that brought about the transformation of aristocratic institutions through much of Greece. Tribal systems permeated the major departments of *polis* life, and consistently to give priority to the same *phyle* in government, in the military organization, and in religious matters would not have been tolerated for long. No doubt certain Dorian communities regarded the inherited tribal system as beyond all hope of effective reform, for in a number of states, notably Corinth, Corcyra, Cyrene, and Rhodes, the tripartite division was abandoned altogether. Where the old *phylai* were retained, it was in all likelihood only at the cost of substantial change.

Athens illustrates how, with the retention of the conventional tribal order, the privileges associated with particular places in that order might be distributed more equitably among the *phylai*. Among the numerous applications of rotation to the tribal order are several in which the sequence does not begin with Erechtheis (I). In the manner characteristic of the democracy, the first *phyle* might, in some instances, be determined by lot. Alternatively, the tribal order could be reversed, which changed not only

28. For a sampling of suggested etymologies and interpretations of the three names, see O. Lagerkrantz, "Die drei Dorischen Phylennamen," *Streitberg Festgabe* (Leipzig, 1924), pp. 218-23; and H. Frisk, *Griechisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch* (Heidelberg, 1960-72), s.vv.

the starting point but the following sequence as well. Certain other cycles commenced with whatever phyle would, according to the previous mode of appointment, have normally filled the post or served the function. Finally, in still other cases, the priesthoods of Delos, for example, a number of related cycles operated simultaneously, and in order to achieve a sort of "horizontal" equality, no two cycles were allowed to begin at the same place in the official order.<sup>29</sup> All four variations, while preserving in quite different ways the traditional tribal order, reflect at the same time a common determination to ensure the equality of its constituent members.

A similar determination may have lain behind the adoption of tribal rotation among the Dorian states, though the specific form of that rotation cannot be paralleled in Athenian documents. That is, the Dorian tribal order might be rotated in single applications, whereas there is extant no Athenian list or catalogue that does not commence Erechtheis (I). Here one's doubts are raised, not concerning the Dorian states, but concerning Athens. Given the pervasive use of sortition in the fifth-century democracy, how could this inherently elitist practice have endured? The Dorian states were, if anything, more progressive than their "radical" contemporaries. They also, like Athens, may have observed the use of tribal cycles, though our evidence of course does not begin to approach the volume required to support such speculation. Even so, our scattered individual instances of single rotations of the fixed order are comparable in spirit to the variations in Athenian procedure cited above.

The suggested rotating pan-Dorian tribal order, in the final analysis, represents a compromise between a traditional aristocratic hierarchy and an emerging egalitarianism in *polis* government. Organization by *phylai* was, of itself, neither inherently aristocratic nor democratic—every developed *polis* had its *phylai* or their equivalent. Rather the character of a government was determined, not by the presence or absence of such a system, but by the degree to which participation in it was extended to the free population and, equally importantly, by the nature of its specific constitutional procedures which, as we have stressed, frequently involved the *phylai* in one way or another. In times of change, a state might carry out a wholesale reorganization of its tribal apparatus. A less radical approach was simply to alter the existing system, and an inherited hierarchy of *phylai* would stand high on the list for reform. Rotation of the fixed order provided the easiest and least disruptive means to this end. Of such an expedient the Calymnian catalogue (*h*) affords an unmistakable instance. The pattern presented by the remainder of the extant evidence, classical Cos alone excepted, is explicable on the assumption that the same procedure was adopted, independently or by imitation, by other Dorian states, among which, in later times, was Cos herself.

Before the publication in 1898 of *The Athenian Secretaries*, the role played by the *phylai* in the Cleisthenic civic organization was very imper-

29. Sources for these perturbations may be found in Dinsmoor, *The Athenian Archon List in the Light of Recent Discoveries*, pp. 11–12.

fectly understood. Ferguson's great achievement was to show how the tribal order, above and beyond its uses on specific occasions, could be manipulated to ensure equality among the *phylai* in time. For the Dorian states, too, a desire to attain an equal distribution of responsibility and privilege, though not always of course over the entire free population, is similarly implicit in the very existence of their tribal systems. Yet it has never been understood how, in these states, such an equal distribution might have been accomplished. The proposed rotating tribal order, which would have affirmed the equality of the *phylai* in its every application, fills that gap in our understanding.

*University of Pittsburgh*