IG II² 2490, THE EPAKREIS AND THE PRE-CLEISTHENIC TRITTYES

1. THE INSCRIPTION

0 unintelligible traces of letters? non-stoichedon

1 [_____ _ ai Μονιχονήι μηνι _____]  
[_____ _μηδενός · · · δοσε δ’[άν _____]  
[_____ _άργυριον στήσει τός ε[ _____]  
[_____ _κατασκέυης το άργυριον _____]  

5 [_____ _ξαστός αυτών καὶ τό χώριον _____]  
[_____ _α έφ’ ὅστο ἢ κό άργυριον λα[ _____]  
[_____ _νοι, τεθηκότας τά ἐπιδεῖκνα, vac.?]  
vac. ‘Εσπακρέων τριττύφτ] vac. ?]  
vacat

Description

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

Editions

L. Ross, Die Demen von Attika (Halle, 1846), vi; K. Pittakes, Εφημερίς Αρχαιολογική (1853), 884–5, no. 1410; A. R. Rangabé, Antiquités Helleniques (Athens, 1855), 136–7, no. 448; IG II 1053; IG II² 2490.

1 I would like to thank the personnel of the Epigraphical Museum, especially Mr. Kritzas, Mrs Karapa-Molisani and Mrs Choremi, for permission to study IG II² 2490 (inventory number EM 8693) and for all their assistance. Many thanks are also due to C. Crowther (who gave me access to a squeeze kept in CSAD), A. Mathaiou (for fruitful suggestions), P. Liddel, R. Parker, P. J. Rhodes and P. Thonemann for reading drafts of the present paper, and for the useful comments made by CQ’s anonymous referee. Any fallacies or errors are, of course, mine.

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

On the upper edge of the stone, roughly above the letter sequence XIΩ, I could discern some traces that may belong to letters, but may well be random fractures on the surface of the stone. Part of the upper stroke of sigma is visible. The lower diagonal of kappa is partly preserved. καὶ is clear on the stone: καὶ IG. Before ἐφ’ ὁτε the trace of a stroke slanting downwards and to the right can be discerned (seen also in Köhler’s majuscule text in IG II 1053). It could belong to any of the letters A, K, λ, or Χ, but textually it can only be an alpha, hence my transcription. In IG II 1053.

Commentary

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

Line 1: If this line involves, indeed, some sort of dating rubric, one is tempted to restore [καὶ ἔτη καὶ νέα] or a similar dative, but this should have been accompanied by a (partitive) genitive of time, not a dative. The dative without preposition is unusual, but something like [τῷ μισθωμα ἀποδιδόναι Μονιχῶι] μὴ[ν] would render the spirit of the text. The odd interpunct in line 2 (two vertical dots, a single centred dot, and two further vertical dots) marks, in all likelihood, the end of a clause. I take the preceding pronoun[mὴ]δένδρος to refer to an utter prohibition on any potential obstructors of the fulfilment of the contract. I can think of no better restoration than [μὴ καλώματος μὴδένδρος], but the phrasing is admittedly unusual and with no real parallels.

1. J. S. Traill, Demos and Trittyes: Epigraphical and Topographical Studies in the Organization of Attica (Toronto, 1986), 107, provided new readings of lines 7–8 of the text under examination (not in SEG).

2. IG II2 2490 is described as pactonis instrumentum in the corpus and as ‘record of a property-lease’ by Traill (n. 3); see also M. Guarducci, Intorno ad una iscrizione del demo attico di Plotheia, Historia Studi per l’antichità classica 9 (1935), 213; D. Behrend, Attische Pachturkunden. Ein Beitrag zur Beschreibung der μισθωμα nach der griechischen Inschriften (Munich, 1970), 100; and in particular M. B. Walbank, ‘Leases of public land’, in Agora XIX (Princeton, 1991), 156, who notes: ‘Documents issued at about this time by political bodies include a decree of the trittys of Epakeiros … the fragmentary nature of the document makes restoration impossible.’


4. IRhamnous 179.16–18, ἔξεστι Ζήνων Ο Λυττοχεί [κτορόφισκαι τοις θεοις οιοί έν Ρωμούντο καθάπερ εἶπο τῇ δρόμῃ ύπό μηθείον κοινοφικτέων], is both very late (83/2 B.C.) and not an exact parallel. For clauses protecting the lessees’ rights see IG II2 2492.29–31, εάν δέ τις εἰς τως ἐπιφανείς παρά τάσκε τῶν συνδέσκει, προ τό έτο έξελείν τά πεπτάρκατα, εάν | οι ὑποδικόν τοις μισθωταῖς τῆς βλάβης, and SEG XXXVII 77.24–8.
Lines 2–4: The clause in line 2 is formulaic, demands a subjunctive and something along the lines of "could be envisaged," but any restoration should take line 3 into account. The word "ἀργυρίον" should probably be taken together with the preceding clause, a comma should be inserted thereafter, and another object should be sought for the infinitive "στήσαι." The subject of "στήσαι" should be the adjacent masculine accusative. One possibility is to restore "τάς ἀσμικητάς," this ubiquitous office (τός ἀσπαρκέας) is a less likely restoration. We still lack the object of the infinitive. In Attic inscriptions what officials are ordered to "στήσαι" is almost without exception a stele. The problem is how to connect such a promulgation with the succeeding wording. The expression [καταστήόντας τό ἄργυρίον], 'those paying down the money', is reminiscent of payment formulae found in inscribed leases where they refer to lessees. In the lease document of the deme Teithras one reads: "στήλην δὲ στήσαι ἐν τῷ Ἀκρόπολις καὶ ἀναγράφας τοὺς μειουθαμμένους τὰς χαλκία καταστάσει καὶ [τός μικρόθωρος ὅπως ἐκατοσκόπους μὲ [μικρόθωρος] τασαίς." To the best of my knowledge, this is the closest parallel to our text can find. In this light a plausible and epigraphically tenable restoration of lines 2–4 could be: "ὅπως δὲ [ἀν] καὶ ἐιδώσων ἀποστέασθαι τοὺς ἀργυρίους, στήσαι τός ἀσμικητάς στήλην ἐν πόλει καὶ [ἀναγράφας τός καταστήόντας τό ἀργυρίον]." Note that in contrast to the finite act of setting up a stele the recording of the lessees appears to be envisaged as an ongoing procedure, to judge from the present participle [καταστήθων], something that necessitates the restoration of the present infinitive "ἀναγράφειν." The supplement [ἐν πόλει], that is 'on the Acropolis', is based on the find-spot of the inscription, for which see the penultimate paragraph of this article.

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

7 Cf. IG II 1165.17–18, ὅπως δὲ [ἐ]κάστος αὐτῶν ἀποστέασθαι τάς χαλκίας κτήματα; SEG XXIV 151.2–4, ὅπως δὲ τά ἀργυρία τά δημόσια τά καὶ ἐιδώσων ἀποστέασθαι τά ἀργυρίαν τά καὶ τά προσώπα.

9 ἸΒαθυμοῦς 180.15–16, τίς μίσθωσιν καταστήσασιν.

10 SEG XXIV 151.21–4 (the text I provide here is slightly improved after autopsy of the stone).

11 For a similar structure see IG II 1184.18–22, ὅπως δὲ ἐν γῇ [γῇ] γνωστὰ ὑπὲρ τῶν δήμων τῶν Χολοργησίων κατὰ τὰ γραμμάτα ἐπιτέλουσαν ἀποστέασθαι χρώμα, στήσασα στήλην καὶ ἀναγράφας τὰ πόλεων τῆς ὕφασμα.

11 If τὸ χωρίῳ is not the direct object of ἀναγράφας in the accusative, then it might be a partitive genitive (for example, τὸ χωρίῳ τῆς μίσθωσιν); cf. Köhler in IG II 1053.
designation of the archonship in which the transactions in question would have taken place restoring τοὺς ἄρχοντας ἐφ᾽ ὅτοι. At any rate, the relative clause's verb, plausibly restored as λαμπάνων, unlike most previous editors I prefer a present, not an aorist, subjective in compliance with the present participle κατατέθοντος.12 could have the masculine noun ending in έχων (line 7) as its subject. Köhler tentatively suggested τριττύραχοι, but, given the participation of demes like Plotheia and Semachidai in the religious association of Epakreis, ἰδιαράχοι is equally plausible, if not better.13 In this respect, the demarchs would have acted as collectors of rentals due to the trittys. Such a role for demarchs with regard to their own demes' leased property is known from both epigraphic and literary sources.14 Given the experience that demarchs would have acquired as a result, it seems conceivable that they would have been the demes' financial representatives in the cultic association of Epakreis.15

The penultimate line of the document makes a mention of τὸ ἐπίδεκατον. The term ἐπίδεκατον usually designates the one-tenth of fines or confiscated properties set aside for gods—in Athens mainly for Athena—as a tithe, but nothing in our text suggests penalties of any kind.16 As an adjective, often substantivized, ἐπίδεκατον can also have the meaning of ‘one-tenth’, received as interest-rate.17 However, this would presuppose loans and there are no grounds for envisaging lending activities in our text. Finally, ἐπίδεκατον can equal the simple δέκατον, merely a tenth fraction.18 Probably the lessees were obliged to pay in advance 10 per cent of the rent or...
one-tenth on top of that. Whether that was a deposit or a tax and where exactly it had to be paid cannot be inferred. In order to keep roughly on a par with the line length suggested above I would tentatively restore lines 6–7 as follows: [καὶ τὸν ἀρχοντή ἀφ’ ὅτα ἄργυρον λαμβάνωσαν οἱ αἱ ἔνδομαρχοντος ἐνδομαρχεῖς, τεθηκότας τὰ ἐπίδεκαστα. ναὶ;].

No internal information is offered by the text such as would enable us to date the inscription. The editor of IG II² simply noted ante med. s. IV a. This chronology is apparently based on the lettering. Indeed, sigma has its upper and bottom strokes slanting. The right and left strokes of mu are also slanting. The central horizontal of epsilon is shorter than the upper and bottom ones. The same date is confirmed by the rare interpunct found in line 2. From a grammatical point of view an interesting feature is the persistent use of O instead of the diphthong OY throughout the text, and more precisely, in the article τοῦ. The relative pronoun ὅτα and the word ἀνεξίτης. The last of these especially, with its inherited long diphthong being represented by an omicron, would pinpoint an early date. Taken together these traits suggest a higher rather than a lower chronology within the first half of the fourth century B.C.: c. 375 B.C. looks like a reasonable terminus ante quem.

It goes without saying that the restorations above are merely offered exempli gratia and cannot be used as a guide to determine the full length of the missing text, since this is dependent on the exact phrasing which cannot be established. I have decided to restrict my various supplements to the line-by-line commentary and not to incorporate them in the main epigraphical text, so as to let the reader follow my interpretation of the document without imposing it upon him or her. In any case, although IG II² 2490 is a financial document, it is not a lease of a particular landholding to a specific individual. The generic terms in which the financial transactions are phrased and the anonymity of the lessees suggest an overall handling of the trittys’ landed property. In this sense it stands close to texts like IG II² 2498, a lease of various temene in the Piraeus. Strictly speaking, it could be classified as a decree, especially in view of the ὅπως ὅ [ἂν] final clause.

---

19 I understand the subject of the perfect participle τεθηκότας to be [τὸς καναστικότας] of line 4.

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

21 For the restoration cf. IG II² 80.13–14: οἱ δὲ πρωτόενει] [οἱ δὲ πρωτοψάλουσες προσαγόντως; IG II 1187.22–3: ἔμενε δὲ αὕτη καὶ μερίδα ἐκ τῶν οἰκών καθάπερ Ἐλευσίνιος τῶν δήμαρχων] τὸν ἄργυρῳ δήμαρχον. Alternatively one could supplement ἐφ’ ὅτα τὸ ἀργυρίῳ λαμβάνωσαν οἱ ἄργυρον ἐκάστοτε δήμαρχον, for which cf. IG I 110.19–20: καὶ τὸν ἀρχοντή τῶν Ἐκ Σαλάθου δέ ἄργυρον ἐκάστοτε.

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


24 Self-evidently the whole effort is further impeded by the absence of a stoichedon pattern.

25 So already Pittakes in Ἐφημερίς Ἀρχαιολογική (1853).
II. THE IDENTITY OF THE TRITTYS OF THE EPAKREIS

*IG II² 2490 has long been considered as a leasing document of the Epakreis, or, to be more precise, of a Cleisthenic trittys that bore this name, by virtue of the concluding words of the inscription (‘Ἐπακρεῖον τριττῦς’).* However, we know that an enigmatic religious association called Epakreis was also active during the fifth and fourth centuries.26 However, we know that an enigmatic religious association called Epakreis was also active during the fifth and fourth centuries. It has not been noticed that the trittyes had no financial functions either, since their first and foremost *raison d’être* was the military organization of the citizens within the framework of the tribal system.28 In the light of this it seems implausible that a Cleisthenic trittys would have been owner of landed property or that it would have been involved in financial transactions of the kind implied in *IG II² 2490* (see commentary above). On the contrary, the land-leasing mechanism underlying our document is well attested for religious associations such as *orgeones* or *genos*, the most famous example being the sacrificial calendar of the Salaminioi.29

This should hardly come as a surprise. That the old pre-Cleisthenic trittyes as well as the four old Ionian tribes kept operating on the sacred level even after their alleged abolition that resulted from the reforms of 508/7 is known from the official Athenian fasti. Therefore, the *trittûs Λευκοσαινίων*, along with the Ionian tribe *G(e)leontis*, are attested as receiving from the state a sacrificial sheep on the fifteenth of Hekatombaion.30

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

27 *IG I² 258* (see n. 15 above); SEG XXXII 144. See Thompson (n. 26), 150–2; Parker (n. 26), 330.

28 Only much later, in the Hellenistic period, are *trittûrâphoi* attested as disbursing money for the erection of decrees or statues (e.g. *IG II²* 641.29–32, εἰς δὲ τὴν ἀλατομόν τῆς στῆλης δόθησα τοῖς ἑξεταστήν καὶ τοῖς τριττûραφοις ∆∆ ΔΡΑΧΜΑΣ; also *IG II²* 646.44–7; *IG II²* 648.3–6). However, this function looks like a late invention and, in any case, does not affect my point, since it does not relate to the trittyes as such. For the organizational importance of the trittyes with regard to the navy and the infantry see Siewert (n. 26), 141–5.

29 Cf. the lease of the *orgeones* of Egetes (*IG II² 2499*) and that of the *orgeones* of Hypodektes (*IG II² 2501*); *genos* Salaminioi: P. J. Rhodes and R. Osborne, Greek Historical Inscriptions, 404–323 Δ (Oxford, 2003), no. 37.

the term trittys could be used in its older sense even in the classical period, when, strictly speaking, the word denoted a group of demes that roughly constituted one-third of a given tribe. Clearly, this terminological inconsistency should account for the confusion of modern scholars who have almost unquestioningly taken the ‘Επακρέων τριττός of IG II² 2490 as referring to the Cleisthenic tribal sub-unit. Instead, IG II² 2490 should be interpreted as a document issued by the religious association ‘Επακρέων τριττός that aimed at raising revenues for whatever religious activities the group was engaged in. It is self-evident that this reinterpretation of IG II² 2490 allows us to classify precisely the cult-group Epakreis: they were not just a local cult association, they were one of the surviving old, pre-Cleisthenic trittyes.

Yet, if my identification of the ‘Επακρέων τριττός of IG II² 2490 is sound, there are some unexpected implications for our knowledge of Athenian political organization. As it happens, there is now no firm proof that a Cleisthenic trittys called Epakreis ever existed. In fact, it was a series of erroneous assumptions and readings of the epigraphic and literary sources that misled historians into believing that a trittys called Epakreis did exist in classical Athens and made them try to place this trittys in its appropriate tribe. However, IG I¹ 1128 has now been dissociated from the alleged trittys Epakreis. Similarly, another badly preserved boundary stone, where the name Epakreis was heavily restored, has now been edited without any mention of that name; but, of course, the restoration had been made by virtue of the supposed existence of a Cleisthenic trittys called Epakreis. Cleisthenic trittyes are one of the least attested institutions of ancient Athens and we are far from knowing all thirty names of them. Therefore, one cannot entirely dismiss the possibility that the pre-Cleisthenic trittys Epakreis did, after all, lend its name to a newly created Cleisthenic trittys, even to the extent that the two groups might have partly overlapped, but this can only be a speculation. It is worth noting, however, that there is no evidence that the other attested pre-Cleisthenic trittys, that of the Leukotainioi, ever gave its name to a Cleisthenic one. In sum, unless some future epigraphic find reveals otherwise, we must for the time being consider the Cleisthenic trittys Epakreis as a modern scholarly invention and exclude it from any discussion regarding Athenian tribal substructure.

The study of the Epakreis can be pursued further. There was never any doubt that the deme Plotheia was member of the cultic association ‘Επακρέεις, now ‘Επακρέων τριττός. The deme’s location south of the modern village Stamata, in north-eastern Attica, is certain owing to epigraphic finds. The best monograph on the Cleisthenic trittyes is still that by Siewert (n. 26), despite the criticism of D. M. Lewis, Gnomon 55 (1983), 431–6. On the basis of a fragment of...
Philochorus *apud* Stephanus Byzantius, some historians have hesitatingly suggested that the deme Semachidai was also a participant in the same group. This has now to be accepted as unquestionably true. Scholarly reticence in endorsing this identification derived partly from the aforementioned confusion about the alleged Cleisthenic trittys and partly from the fact that Philochorus mentioned an *'Επακρία*, rather than the *'Επακρεία* (or the *'Επακρέων τριττύς*). This should never have been a problem, for, in similar fashion, the pre-Cleisthenic cultic association *Τετραπόλεις* could also designate themselves by the geographical term *Τετράπόλεις*. Incidentally, the term *'Επακρία* occurs in another passage of Philochorus cited by Strabo.

According to that, the mythological king Cecrops was the first to settle the population of Attica in twelve poleis, i.e. the following... eleven: *Κεκρόπια, Τετράπόλεις, Ἑπακρία, Δεκάλεια, Ἑλευσία, Άβαδα, Θρίκος, Βραυρῶν, Κόλυμβας, Σφηττός, Κηφισιός*. Jacoby following Looper supplemented "Τετράκωμοι" after *Τετράπόλεις* and his suggestion has generally been endorsed. The supplement seemed to create no problems considering the order of the cited poleis, since no geographical pattern could be recognized. This is not entirely true. Leaving Jacoby's supplement aside for the moment, we can identify at least two clusters of adjacent Cecropian poleis, namely *Τετράπόλεις, Ἑπακρία, Δεκάλεια* in north-eastern Attica, and *Θρίκος, Βραυρῶν, Κόλυμβας, Σφηττός* in the south-east/east. This does not necessarily prove Jacoby wrong. The assumed palaeographical error could have occurred even if the word *Τετράκωμοι* preceded, rather than followed, the word *Τετράπόλεις*.

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

---

38 *FGrH* 328 F206: Steph. Byz. s.v. Σμαχάδαι - δήμος Αττικῆς ἀπὸ Σμᾶνχαν, ὡς καὶ ταῖς παλαιστήσιν ἐπιστημονικῶς διόνυσος, αὖ ὡς αἱ ἑτερεῖς κατὰ τὸν δήμον. Ἐπιλύεται δὲ τὴν Ἐπακρίαν πρὸ τοῦ δήμου.

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

40 Jacoby in *FGrH* 328 F94 following Löper (n. 39).


42 This order would neatly comply with Phot. *Lexicon*. s.v. *Ἐπακρία* - δύομεν χώρας πλησίον *Τετραπόληνς* κατέμενη.

Epakria to suggest the figure three, and, presumably, the source of the entries was following a genuine tradition.\(^{46}\) Second, it has long been recognized that the term trittys initially designated a tripartite unit and only later came to acquire the meaning ‘a third of’.\(^{47}\) It is, therefore, a reasonable guess that the cultic association 'Επακρεις/Επακρέων τριττός consisted of three members.\(^{48}\) But given that Plotheia and Semachidai were the first two, which was the third participant deme? There are three serious candidates. The Plotheians participated in the festival of Anakia and it is tempting to see the deme of Anakaia as the missing member of the Epakreis, but, unfortunately, the deme’s location is unknown and the connection cannot be otherwise sustained.\(^{49}\) Then there is Ikarion, which definitely satisfies the geographical criterion.\(^{50}\) Moreover, Ikarion is linked to Semachidai via the mythological tradition about Dionysus and his reception in Attica.\(^{51}\) The problem is that none of our sources indicates Dionysiac cult practised by the Epakreis.\(^{52}\) The final candidate deme is Hekale, the centre of a cultic association where the neighbouring demes used to gather to honour Hekaleian Zeus.\(^{53}\) Neither the exact name of the association nor those of the participating demes have survived, but one wonders whether it is the Epakreis who underlie this tradition.\(^{54}\) Hekale was located in north-eastern Attica, near Plotheia. It has traditionally been placed in Mygdaleza and, indeed, the most recent document of the Epakreis was discovered in a Byzantine church in that region, but owing to lack of firm evidence the topographical question has to remain open.\(^{55}\) Two further points are worth commenting upon. First, \textit{IG} II\(^2\) 2490 was discovered on the Acropolis and, despite the notorious tendency of stones to move around, it is hard to see how an inscription from north-eastern Attica would have found its way to Athens. Apparently the inscription was set up on the Acropolis or somewhere nearby.\(^{56}\) The reason must have been that the Epakreis performed some religious

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

\(^{47}\) \textit{LSJ} s.v. τριττός; cf. Lambert (n. 13), 256, n. 50 with the earlier bibliography.

\(^{48}\) So already Wilamowitz-Moellendorf (n. 13), 154 with n. 23.

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


\(^{51}\) Steph. Byz. s.v. Συμαχιδαι (see n. 35 above); cf. Guarducci (n. 4), 212. Hopper (n. 43), 218, and Humphreys (n. 39), 229, whose identification of the Epakreis as a phratry I obviously reject.

\(^{52}\) Unless Wilamowitz-Moellendorf (n. 13) was right to restore \textit{ες} Διονύσσα in \textit{IG} I\(^2\) 258.38, but even then the Dionysiac connection might refer exclusively to the Plotheai and not to the Epakreis; cf. Guarducci (n. 4), 214–15.

\(^{53}\) Parker (n. 26), 111.

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

\(^{55}\) E. Tsophopoulou Gkine, ‘Παλαιοχριστιανική βασιλική στὴ θέση ὥς Μυγδαλέον Αττικῆς’, \textit{ΑΡΧ. ΕΦ.} (1980) [1982], 94–5. Traill (n. 37), 46, located Hekale at Mygdaleza, but idem (n. 3), 131, moved it to Koukounari, but only after he identified Mygdaleza as the site of Anakaia for which see n. 49 above.

\(^{56}\) See my restoration [Ευ πτέλη] in lines 2–4 of \textit{IG} II\(^2\) 2490 in the Commentary above; for the importance of the Acropolis as a place where inscribed documents were displayed see P. Liddel, ‘The places of publication of Athenian state decrees from the fifth century BC to the third century AD’, \textit{ZPE} 143 (2003), 79–81.
function within the framework of the polis. Unfortunately little is known about their communal rites, apart from their celebration of the relatively obscure Apollonia.\textsuperscript{57} However, it is worth noting that this festival was probably non-annual (penteteric),\textsuperscript{58} as was the trieteric sacrifice offered by the trittys of the Leukotainioi.\textsuperscript{59} With the latter I come to my second point. Back in the 1930s the publication of the fragment of the Athenian \textit{fasti} that referred to the Leukotainioi shook various scholarly certainties. The trittys’ name, the ‘White-Ribboned’ or ‘White-Fillet Men’, appeared to contradict an antiquarian tradition that went back to the Atthidographers and according to which the old trittyes had some form of local basis.\textsuperscript{60} On the contrary, Ferguson argued and almost every single historian concurred, old trittyes were not local units and were probably named after whatever religious or military functions they performed.\textsuperscript{61} In that respect my identification of the Epakreis as one of the pre-Cleisthenic trittyes appears to reinstate early scholarly theories about the territoriality of these associations given the obvious geographical connotations of the name Epakreis (roughly ‘the Hill-Dwellers’). Moreover, it enables us to revisit and question Ferguson’s etymological interpretation of the term \textit{Alexwotainios}. As it happens, the word \textit{taxa} far from denoting exclusively a ribbon, has also the meaning of ‘a strip or tongue of land’.\textsuperscript{62} It surely makes much more sense to understand the Leukotainioi as ‘the Dwellers of the Strip of White Land’,\textsuperscript{63} and render back to them their long overdue territoriality.\textsuperscript{64} 

\textsuperscript{57} Parker (n. 49), 461.

\textsuperscript{58} Guarducci (n. 4), 211; R. Parker, ‘Festivals of the Attic demes’, in T. Linders and G. Nordquist (edd.), \textit{Gifts to the Gods,} Proceedings of the Uppsala Symposium 1985 (Uppsala, 1987), 140; id. (n. 26), 330 (but read ‘penteteric’ for ‘trieteric’).

\textsuperscript{59} Ferguson (n. 31), 154; Lambert (n. 30), 376. As a matter of fact, it is not impossible that \textit{IG II²} 2490 was generated by the new situation that arose from Nicomachus’ revision of the Athenian sacrificial calendar (for which see Parker [n. 26], 43–5, 218–20, and S. C. Todd, ‘Lysias against Nikomakhos’, in L. Foxhall and A. D. E. Lewis (edd.), \textit{Greek Law in its Political Setting: Justification not Justice} [Oxford, 1996], 101–31); the lettering certainly does not exclude such a connection.

\textsuperscript{60} Territoriality of old trittyes: G. Gilbert, \textit{The Constitutional Antiquities of Sparta and Athens} (London 1895), 105; G. Busolt and H. Swoboda, \textit{Griechische Staatskunde} (Munich 1926), 2770; \textit{RE} 2nd ser. VII.A (1939), s.v. Trittyes, 332–5 (H. Hommel). [Arist.], \textit{Ath. Pol.} 8.3, 21.2–3, fr.3 (Kenyon) certainly thought that the old trittyes had some form of local basis.

\textsuperscript{61} Ferguson (n. 31), 151–3; F. R. Wüst, ‘Zu den \textit{πρώταγες τῶν θυσιάρχων} und zu den alten attischen Trittynen’, \textit{Historia} 6 (1957), 188; P. J. Rhodes, \textit{A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenion Politeia} (Oxford, 1993), 68; Parker (n. 26), 112–13 (agnostic about the exact undertones of the name ‘the White-Fillet Men’); Lambert (n. 13), 256–7 (name alluding to military functions).

\textsuperscript{62} \textit{LSF} s.v. \textit{taxa} II (see also P. Chantaine, \textit{Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque: Histoire des mots, avec un Supplément} [Paris, 1999], s.v. \textit{taxa}); cf. the cognate adjective \textit{πορτάνιος} (defined as ‘forming a long narrow strip of land’ in \textit{LSF}); s.v.

\textsuperscript{63} Or the ‘Whitelanders’ as opposed to the ‘Highlanders’ (i.e. the Epakreis).

\textsuperscript{64} Both \textit{taxa} and \textit{πορτάνιος} very often designated areas near water (mainly by the sea). The ‘Strip of White Land’ might then have been a headland (perhaps a sandy cape?). There is a famous case of another archaic association, the \textit{geno/nauclery} Koleis (see Parker [n. 26], 304–5), that derived its name from a promontory (arguably the group’s territorial basis), although Lambert (n. 54), 192–3 now advocates caution regarding the connection of the Koleis with the Cape Kolias. But there is a further interesting approach to the name Leukotainioi, which was brought to my attention by Robert Parker: French structuralists have pointed out the significance of white clay as a ritualistic disguise that emphasizes marginality (Parker [n. 49], 216 with n. 108 broaches the issue, providing the relevant modern bibliography). Could it be then that the Leukotainioi were such a ‘marginal’ religious group and that clay was the white element of their strip of land? The patently ‘marginal’ connotations of the name Epakreis would appear to tally well with this interpretation.
To recapitulate, IG II² 2490 is a financial document of the tripartite pre-Cleisthenic trittys of the Epakreis, and not of a homonymous Cleisthenic association. Such an association never existed. The trittys of the Epakreis is none other than the Epakria of Philochorus’ fragments and the Epakreis of the fifth-century Plotheian decree IG I¹ 258. Both this document and IG II² 2490 attest to the Epakreis and/or their constituent parts using a combination of income-generating lending and rentals to subsidize their manifold cultic activity. The paradigm of the Leukotainioi and common logic suggest that the Epakreis would have featured at some point in the official Athenian sacrificial calendar, just as the paradigm of the Epakreis, common logic, and cautious etymology suggest that the Leukotainioi (and possibly all pre-Cleisthenic trittyes) had a territorial character. But already in the early fourth century B.C. both groups—and no doubt the other old trittyes—had become parochial, and probably withered and eventually vanished in the late classical period.
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