

**THE FIVE POST-KLEISTHENEAN
TRIBES; CORNELL STUDIES IN
CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY, NO.
VIII**

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

ISBN 9780649366088

The Five Post-Kleisthenean Tribes; Cornell Studies in Classical Philology, No. VIII by Fred Orlando Bates

Except for use in any review, the reproduction or utilisation of this work in whole or in part in any form by any electronic, mechanical or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including xerography, photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, is forbidden without the permission of the publisher, Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd, PO Box 1576 Collingwood, Victoria 3066 Australia.

All rights reserved.

Edited by Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd.
Cover @ 2017

This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out, or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form or binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.

www.triestepublishing.com

FRED ORLANDO BATES

**THE FIVE POST-KLEISTHENEAN
TRIBES; CORNELL STUDIES IN
CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY, NO.
VIII**

Cornell University

Ithaca, New York

CORNELL STUDIES

IN

CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

EDITED BY

**BENJAMIN IDE WHEELER, CHARLES EDWIN BENNETT,
AND GEORGE PRENTICE BRISTOL,**

No. VIII

THE FIVE POST-KLEISTHENEAN TRIBES

BY

FRED ORLANDO BATES, PH.D.

PUBLISHED FOR THE UNIVERSITY

BY

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

1898

THE
FIVE POST-KLEISTHENEAN TRIBES

BY

FRED ORLANDO BATES, PH.D.

FELLOW OF CORNELL UNIVERSITY

CORNELL STUDIES IN CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY, No. VIII

COPYRIGHT, 1898,
BY CORNELL UNIVERSITY

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

ITHACA, N. Y. :
PRESS OF ANDRUS & CHURCH,
1898.

Classical
Direct
12-27-49
69261

tr. to FOUR
6-11-99

GRAD

PA

25

.C81

v. 8

1898

BUHR

PREFACE.

The subject of the post-Kleisthenean tribes is one which, so far as I know, has never been treated as a whole. It is only within recent years that sufficient material has been brought together to enable one to determine much that is certain in regard to them. This is especially true of Antigonis and Demetrias which were in existence such a short period—a little over a century—that a very limited number of monuments throwing light on their history has been preserved to us. Though there is no treatise covering all five tribes, a few articles dealing with special phases of this question are to be found in various periodicals. A brief review of the most recent and important of these will give some idea of what has already been accomplished in this field.

Dittenberger¹ investigated the question of Ptolemais, Attalis, and Hadrianis, with special reference to the demes constituting them and the method pursued in re-allotting demes to form the new tribes. He noticed that in the case of Hadrianis, eleven of its old demes were taken one each from the first eleven of the twelve tribes already in existence. He conjectured that the twelfth one, Oinoe, was taken from Attalis, formerly the twelfth tribe. Starting with this clue he found that the same principle could be applied in a general way to the other two tribes, Ptolemais and Attalis. He therefore concluded that each of the old tribes contributed a given quota, usually one deme, towards the formation of the new one. When Dittenberger wrote this article it was universally believed that Ptolemais was created in honor of Ptolemy Philadelphus, as stated by Pausanias, and hence prior to 247 B. C. Historical evidence pointed to a date not later than 265 B. C.

Beloch² was the first to formally discredit this general belief in regard to the date of Ptolemais. He held that Ptolemais was created in honor of Ptolemy Euergetes (247-222 B. C.). On

¹ *Hermes* IX. (1875) p. 385 ff.

² *Neue Jahrbücher* 129 (1884), p. 481 ff.

historical grounds he determined that the exact date was somewhere between 229 and 222 B.C. In this article he apparently assumes that after Ptolemais was created, the two tribes, Antigonis and Demetrias, were merged in one, for in the archon lists for the 8th and 11th years, according to his arrangement of them, he classes Atene under Antigonis.

The latest view in regard to the date of Ptolemais is that expressed by Köhler in the Supplement to Vol. II of the *Corpus Inscriptionum Atticarum*.¹ He maintains that the tribe was created after 222 B.C. during the reign of Ptolemy Philopator (222-205 B.C.).

Neither Dittenberger nor Beloch devoted any special attention to Antigonis and Demetrias. This study was reserved for Kirchner² who tried to determine what demes were allotted to the two tribes. The article is remarkable for the number of demes which the author apparently discovers as belonging to Antigonis and Demetrias,—ten to the former and nine to the latter. In some cases, however, the evidence adduced is far from conclusive. Kirchner furthermore proceeds upon the theory that a deme may belong to more than one tribe at the same time. Such an order of things is *prima facie* unnatural and, I believe, not in accord with the facts.

Thus it will be seen that there is still room for investigation in this field. It is the purpose of this treatise to collect and interpret the evidence which bears on this question. Because of the unreliability of much of the testimony of ancient writers on this subject, the bulk of the material has been taken from inscriptions. Only when these fail have the statements of the writers been taken as a guide, and then with some reservation. It is not expected that all the difficulties will be satisfactorily removed, but it is hoped that the investigation may contribute to a more accurate knowledge of the subject. Whether that object has been attained must be left to the reader to decide.

Accompanying the special discussion of each deme a table is added containing a chronological arrangement of the inscriptions in which the deme is mentioned in such a connection that its tribe is indicated or determinable from the context. These inscriptions

¹ See his note to No. 385 c.

² *Rheinisches Museum* 47 (1892), p. 550 ff.

are generally taken from the *Corpus Inscriptionum Atticarum* and in view of their number the usual abbreviation, C. I. A., has generally been omitted wherever there is occasion for citing this work. All citations, then, not self-explanatory must be understood as referring to this publication. In cases where the reference is duplicated, either in the same inscription or in another, only one citation is made. The statements in regard to the topography of each deme are, for the most part, necessarily dependent on the investigations of scholars in this particular field, most prominent among whom are Milchhöfer and Löper.

In the matter of dating the inscriptions, I have relied on the list of archons given by Mr. W. S. Ferguson (*The Athenian Secretaries*, Cornell Studies, Vol. VII., pp. 50-58) for the period 307/6-96/5 B.C. inclusive. For other periods I have followed Schöffer's list of archons in his article *Archontes* in Pauly-Wissowa *Real-Encyclopädie*, Vol. II. (1896), p. 565 ff. Where no archon's name or other indication of the exact year is given in the inscription, I have accepted in general the judgment of the editors of the *Corpus Inscriptionum Atticarum*.

For handy reference Appendixes are added showing the official order of tribes at different periods and their constituent demes, together with their demotika. The redistribution of demes is also indicated.

To Professor B. I. Wheeler, of Cornell University, for guidance and suggestions during this investigation, and for kindly criticism both of manuscript and proof, I wish here to recognize my obligation. I am especially indebted to Mr. W. S. Ferguson, Fellow of Cornell University, for valuable counsel and assistance. I would also thank Professor G. P. Bristol, of Cornell University, for his aid in reading the manuscript and proof.

ITHACA, N. Y., June 27, 1898.

F. O. B.

