

Margaret Reesor
June 1950

The Local Divisions of Attica

Before the time of Solon, Attica was organized by trittyes and phratries. The phratries were groups of families related by blood, and were divided, in turn, into γένη, smaller associations united in loyalty to a mythical ancestor. Although from the inscriptions which record the decrees of various γένη, we know that by the time of Cleisthenes their members were scattered over various demes, it is probable that in the earlier period the γένη were connected with a definite locality.¹ The trittyes may have been divisions of the Athenian people on the basis of locality but the evidence does not make this clear.² The Eupatridae, who were probably, as Wade-Gery suggested, the descendants of these men who formed the first council of the Athenian state at the time of the synoecism of the twelve Attic towns, controlled the government in the pre-Solonian period.³ They elected the πολυβασίλεις from their own number,⁴ and chose the nine archons.⁵ We can see, therefore, that political power in the pre-Solonian period was in the hands of groups of families in specific districts.

The evidence that we have on the Attic γένη who looked after the cults on the acropolis and at Eleusis throws some light on the important place that the γένη had in Attic religion at this time. The Eteoboutadae, for instance, cared for the cult of Poseidon Erechtheus on the acropolis.⁶ Βουτῆς, the eponymous hero of the γένος, was called in Hesiod the son of Poseidon and Hephaestus.⁷ In classical times paintings representing the Boutadae were on the wall of the north porch of the Erechtheum.⁸ Associated with Erechtheus were Cecrops and his three daughters, Herse, Aglaurus and Pandrosus. The Eteoboutadae may have

been connected with the Hersephoroi who attended Herse the daughter of Cecrops and with the arrephoroi, a group of maidens of noble families who carried sacred objects from the Erechtheum to the sanctuary of Aphrodite and back again.⁹ Politically the importance of these cults is attested by the fact that the *ἐϋνήβοι* took their oaths at the sanctuary of Aglaurus,¹⁰ and that the name *Βουκολεῖον* was given to the residence of the king archon.

Prominent also in the early cult of Athens were the *Βουθύγαί* who looked after the sacred plough in the *Βουθύγετον* on the slopes of the acropolis below the propylaea.¹² They may have been connected with the priesthood of *Ζεὺς ἐμ Παλλάδιῳ*,¹³ and consequently with the *Παλλάδιον*, the Athenian court in charge of cases involving involuntary homicide. The *Πραξιεργίδαι* provided maidens to wash the garments of the old wooden statue of Athena Polias;¹⁴ from the *Θαλαμισαί* were chosen the officials who slew the victims at sacrifices;¹⁵ the *Ἀμυνανδρίδαι* had a priest of Cecrops.¹⁶

The wide connections of the Mysteries at Eleusis with neighboring Attic demes indicate the very important position that it held in early Attica. The cults at Eleusis were controlled by the Eumolpidae and the Kerykes. Connected with them were the *Εὐδαίεμοι*, who looked after the altar of *Εὐδάλειμος*,¹⁷ and the *Εὐεῖσαι*.¹⁸ There were Eleusinea at Athens, Paeania, Brauron and Marathon.¹⁹ In addition Eleusis seems to have had ties with Erchia and Lakiadae. The eponymous heroes of the *γένος Κροκωνίδαι* and *Κοιρωνίδαι* were regarded as sons of Triptolemus and consequently connected with Eleusis. Demosthenes refers in one passage to a Theognis of the *Κοιρωνίδαι* and in another calls him an Erchian.²⁰ The fact that one member of the *γένος Κοιρωνίδαι* lived in Erchia would not, of course, prove that the deme was the center of the whole *γένος*. But a passage in Stephanus of Byzantium to the effect that the eponymous hero of Erchia had entertained Demeter makes it

probable that there was a cult of Demeter there.²¹ This may have been the seat of the *κοιρωνίδαι*. Lakiadae, a small deme on the sacred way between Athens and Eleusis, was the place where, according to one tradition, Phytalus received Demeter into his home.²²

There is some evidence to show that the cult of Eleusis was connected with the *ἱεραὶ κοινότητες*, Peiraeus, Phaleron, Xypete and Thymoetadae. Pausanias mentions a temple of Demeter at Phaleron.²³ Rubensohn argued that the words *φαλεροῦ δὲ ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς* which are found in a 5th century inscription published by *κουρουνιώτης*²⁴ refer to the temple mentioned by Pausanias, and that the temple was, in fact, an Eleusinion.²⁵ He went on to argue that the ceremonies on the second day of the Eleusinia were connected with this temple. Demophon who brought the Palladion to Xypete is called a son of Celeus in the Homeric Hymn to Demeter.²⁶ We know further that a priest of Eleusis offered sacrifices at the Dionysia in the Peiraeus.²⁷

The Mysteries of Agrae in the deme Agryle, which Ferguson believes might have been the site of one of the twelve phratries of Attica, were under the control of Eleusis.²⁸ One inscription mentions the sacrifices made by the epimeletae of Eleusis at the Mysteries at Agrae.²⁹ The epistatae of Eleusis received an *ἀπαρχή* from the Mysteries there.³⁰ Although loans made by the Mysteries at Agrae to the treasurers of the other gods were credited as an asset of Agrae rather than of Eleusis, it is possible that the epistatae of Eleusis arranged for the loan.³¹

At Athens itself, Eleusis seems to have had connections with the *Διονύσια ἐν Νίμφαις*. We know that Eleusis offered sacrifices at this festival³² and that on the day of *χόες* a distribution of wine was made to the slaves at Eleusis.³³ Of the four epimeletae who assisted the

king archon in supervising the Eleusinian Mysteries and the Διονύστῃ ἐν Λίαναις, two were elected from the Eumolpidae and the Kerykes. The connections of Eleusis with the Διονύστῃ ἐν Λίαναις must date to the 7th century B.C. The fact that the king archon rather than the eponymous archon was in charge of the Mysteries and the festival of Dionysus, and that Eleusis was associated with the earlier festival Διονύστῃ ἐν Λίαναις rather than with the Διονύστῃ ἐν ἑστῆμ point to that date.

Very little is known about the γένη in the country districts of Attica. The Ἴκαρίαις looked after the worship of Dionysus at Icaria;³⁴ the Περυρασίαι were at Aphidna;³⁵ the Κορνήσιαι may have been connected with Ἄλι Αἰθυρίαις;³⁶ the Ἐρυοχθονίαι were at Prasiae.³⁷ Undoubtedly the influence of the cults spread to neighboring demes. We know, for instance, that the demes of Pitythus, Gargettos and Acharnae participated in the cult of Athena at Pallene,³⁸ and that several demes worshipped Zeus of Hekale.³⁹ In a society where the right to offer sacrifice and political power rested with a few families who claimed nobility of birth the spread of the cult might indicate an area where the family which controlled the cult was particularly important.

And yet even in the pre-Solonian period many of the Attic cults were under the control of state officials. The religious code of Solon published by Oliver in Hesperia 1935 throws some light on state religion at that time.⁴⁰ Since Solon made no change in the tribal structure, the evidence that can be drawn from the code applies as much to the earlier period as to Solon's own day. Two sacrifices are mentioned, one on the 15th of Hecatombaeon, the other on the 16th. On the first, the Βουλοβακιδῆς sacrificed on behalf of the trittys Λευκοταλνίαι and the tribe ^{Γελοῦντες} Seleontes; on the second the Βουλοβακιδῆς of the Seleontes sacrificed for his own tribe. The sacrifices were paid from tribal funds Βουλοβακιδικά. In the same inscription there is a list of the sacrifices to be made at the Eleusinian Mysteries. These are conducted by

the Eumolpidae and paid by the contributions of the mystae (μύσται).

The archon basileus seems to have had rather extensive powers over Attic cults. Since the festivals which originated in the 6th century B.C. such as the *Διονύσεια ἐκ Ὀβελίου* and the *Θαργῆλαια* were placed in charge of the eponymous archon, it is generally assumed that all cults which were in charge of the archon basileus must have come under his control earlier than the 6th century B.C.⁴¹ The little that we know about the archon basileus indicates that he had authority over many of the cults in Athens and in the country districts. He chose the *ἄνεφοροι*, the maidens who took secret objects from the Erechtheum to the temple of Aphrodite,⁴² and the priestesses of Dionysus at the Anthesteria.⁴³ He was responsible for the temenos of Neleus and Codrus.⁴⁴ It is probable that he had some authority to inflict punishment upon those who had done damage to cult property in Attica.⁴⁵ He was in charge of the cult of Heracles at Cynosarges,⁴⁶ and chose the religious officials (*ἐπιχόρυτοι*) who looked after the cult of Athena Pallenis.⁴⁷ The law of the king archon laid down regulations for the parasites of Apollo at Acharnae.⁴⁸ Further, the king archon assisted by four epimeletae was in charge of the *Διονύσεια ἐκ Ἀϊαντίδος* and the Eleusinian Mysteries.⁴⁹ The religious authority exercised by the archon basileus served to bind many of the cults of early Attica to Athens itself and was, therefore, undoubtedly a factor in the synoecism of Attica. We can perhaps see even at this early date a tendency to limit the power of the Attic γένν by bringing Attic religion under the state.

The legislation of Solon seriously affected the Attic γένν. Prior to his time the archons and phylobasileis were chosen by the Eupatridae and the qualification was undoubtedly membership in one of the noble families. Solon insisted that nine archons should be chosen by lot from forty men, selected ten from each of the four tribes.⁵⁰ Property rather than birth

now determined eligibility to the archonship. This meant that a man who did not belong to one of the noble families might be elected to the archonship and perform sacrifices for the state. The qualification demanded of the man who was to have political and religious authority was wealth rather than birth. Solon required also that the phratries should admit $\theta\iota\lambda\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\iota$, informal associations that had grown up apart from the $\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta$ as well as the $\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta$.⁵¹ There can be no doubt that many new men did obtain the archonship. In the year 581, for instance, following the tyranny of Damasias, it was decided that of the ten archons five should be Eupatridae, three farmers and two artisans.⁵²

The $\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta$, however, were powerful enough to provide considerable opposition to Peisistratus. This can be shown clearly by a study of 6th century Attic coins.⁵³ In the period before the tyranny of Peisistratus Attic coins bear the figure of a horse or of a bull. These two animals suggest the cults of Poseidon and Erechtheus. During the exile of Peisistratus the head of a bull appears on the coins. Since Lycurgus, the leader of the $\pi\epsilon\iota\sigma\iota\sigma\tau\alpha\tau\alpha\iota$, was a member of the Eteoboutadae the bull may represent his $\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta$.⁵⁴ During the regime of Peisistratus himself, however, the head of Athena and the owl appear regularly on the coins of Athens.

In his religious policy Peisistratus turned away from the cults on the acropolis which were associated with the $\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta$ and with ~~his~~^{his} political enemies. He tried to embellish the cult of Athena rather than that of Erechtheus. The temple of Athena Polias was built beside the present Parthenon.⁵⁵ The Panathenaea was reorganized. At Eleusis the telesterion was rebuilt and the city walls were lengthened.⁵⁶ At the same time, Peisistratus showed a strong interest in the Hellenic festivals at Delphi, Delos and Olympia. He built a Pythion beside the Elissus,⁵⁷ where his son dedicated an altar of which the inscription is still extant.⁵⁸ About the same time the Alcmaeonidae competed with Peisistratus for the approval of Delphi and laid the finishing

touches on the temple of Apollo there.⁵⁹ The sanctuary at Delos was purified by the tyrant and the porous temple of Apollo may have been rebuilt.⁶⁰ Near the Pythion in Athens the foundations of the Olympieion were laid probably by the sons of Peisistratus.⁶¹

It may not be entirely a coincidence that the part of Attica which felt the strongest interest in Delphi and Delos was the tetrapolis and the neighboring demes, the section of Attica from which Peisistratus received political support. We know, for instance, that the tetrapolis sent its own *θεῦροι* to Delphi and Delos. The *τύβαις* going to Delphi set out from the Pythion at Oenoe and that for Delos from the Delion at Marathon.⁶² The close ties between the tetrapolis and Delphi are reflected in a series of inscriptions of the second century B.C. set up by Delphi in honor of the tetrapolis.⁶³ One of the inscriptions speaks of *τὰν ἐπιπορευομένων ἀποστόλων οἰκτιρότατα πᾶσι τοῖς θεοῦ καὶ τῆς πόλεως*.⁶⁴ The *τύβαις* from Athens itself always included a group from the tetrapolis.⁶⁵ Two other Pythia are known in the north-eastern section of Attica, at Icaria and Myrrhinus.⁶⁶ The little deme of Prasiae had close connections with Delos. This was the home of the Erysichthonidae, whose eponymous hero Erysichthon is said to have founded the temple of Apollo at Delos.⁶⁷

Peisistratus seems to have regarded Theseus as his mythical counterpart in his work of unifying Attica. Kjellburg in an interesting article has shown that Pandion and Aegeus the grandfather and father of Theseus were introduced into Attic tradition at a late date.⁶⁸ Pandion, the Attic king who sought refuge in Megara, belongs to a period when Athens and Megara were neighbors and therefore must be later than the annexation of Eleusis.⁶⁹ His four sons Aegeus, Nisus, Lycus and Pallas also are late. Aegeus had his heroon at the foot of the acropolis. Nisus is the eponymous hero of Pallene and reflects the victory of Peisistratus in 546. And yet we must assume that the myths of Pandion and Aegeus were firmly established by 508, since at that time they became the eponymous heroes of two Attic

tribes. The legends may be dated to the time of the Peisistratidae in Athens.

Gruppe worked out the parallels between the myths of Theseus and the life of Peisistratus.⁷⁰ The victory of Theseus over the three sons of Pandion represents Peisistratus' victory at Pallene. The exile of the two sons of Theseus, Demophon and Akamas, driven out by Mnestheus, corresponds to the exile of the Peisistratidae. Similarly Theseus' sojourn in the underworld may reflect the period of Peisistratus' own exile. Significantly the Panathenaea was said to have been founded by Erichthonius and refounded by Theseus.⁷¹ Most of the festivals of Theseus seem to belong to a later period than Peisistratus. The Synoekia, however, which symbolized the union of Attic towns was older than Peisistratus,⁷² and we know that there was a Theseum in Peisistratus' own day.⁷³

The cult of Theseus, which Peisistratus adopted, was at home in the north-eastern section of Attica. The oldest legends of Theseus, the story of the Marathon bull and of the rape of Helen were located in the Marathon tetrapolis and the neighboring demes. The Helen who was carried off by Theseus was, according to one tradition, the daughter of Nemesis of Rhamnous.⁷⁴ When Theseus took refuge in Aphidna, the people of Deceleia led the Spartans into the town.⁷⁵ The citizens of Aphidna betrayed Theseus and received the Spartans.⁷⁶ Further, Oenoe, one of the four cities of the tetrapolis, was the place where Androgeos died,⁷⁷ and the deme Perithoadae had as its eponymous hero the companion of Theseus. We are told that Hekale prayed to Zeus for Theseus when he went into battle. In requital for her hospitality honor was paid to her.⁷⁸

The cults of Heracles and Ion which were popular in the sixth century B.C. were likewise at home in the Marathon district. Xouthus, the father of Ion, is said to have colonized the tetrapolis⁷⁹ and he is mentioned in the fasti of the tetrapolis.⁸⁰ Here, according to Pausanias, Heracles was first worshipped,⁸¹ and here the story of his victory over the Marathon bull

arose.⁸² There were, however, important shrines of Heracles around Athens itself. The heroa of Heracles at Cynosarges, Melite, and Elaeus (Ἐλαιὸν) and at Cholargus (Χολογαῖοι) are all probably early.⁸³

It is important to notice that mythologically Theseus, Ion and Heracles were not connected with the Attic γένος. Families such as the Eteoboutadae and the Bouzygae traced their genealogies to Erechtheus. Others such as the Medontidae, Alcmaeonidae and Paeonidae went back to Neleus.⁸⁴ The γένος were certainly not responsible for the interest which was shown in the heroes during the sixth century B.C.

An example of the manner in which mythology was used to support sixth century political aspirations is found in the cult of Ajax. Plutarch speaks of Philaeus the eponymous hero of the Philadae and of Eurysakes as the two sons of Ajax.⁸⁵ Since Peisistratus was one of the Philadae the connection of Philaeus with the hero may reflect the tyrant's claim to the conquest of Salamis. If Ajax himself had political significance, we can understand why his cult was placed in the hands of the Salaminioi perhaps in 508 B.C. as Nilsson suggests.⁸⁶ The Salaminioi were a non-Athenian group who had no part in the political aspirations of Athenian noble families. A long list of deities came under the Salaminioi, including Pandrosus and Aglaurus. One would have expected that these two deities, the children of Cecrops, would have been in the hands of the Eteoboutadae. Since the Ἐπειοὶ took their oaths at the sanctuary of Aglaurus, we can assume that the cult was important in the early days of Athens.⁸⁷ The transfer of the cult of Aglaurus and Pandrosus to the Salaminioi may have taken place and if so it struck a blow at the prestige of the Eteoboutadae. On the other hand, if the cult of Ajax had been involved in the politics of Peisistratus, it became, when it was handed over to the Salaminioi comparatively innocuous.

The important place which the cult of Brauronian Artemis had in the 6th and 5th centuries may have been due to Peisistratus. Brauron was the home

of the Philaetae, the γένος to which Peisistratus belonged. Every five years, in expiation for the slaying of a tame bear of Artemis, Athenian maidens between five and ten years of age, dressed in saffron garments, took part in a procession to Brauron.⁸⁸ The original bear cult was overlaid with stories drawn from the Trojan cycle. According to Euripides' "Iphigeneia among the Taurians" the worship of Artemis was brought to Halae (Araphenides) and Brauron by Orestes and Iphigeneia when they fled from the Taurians. We know from Hesychius that the books of the Iliad were recited at the Brauronia. Since Peisistratus was responsible for having the Iliad recited at the Panathenaic festival, he may have had some part in having it recited at Brauron also. In the 5th century there was a sanctuary of Brauronian Artemis on the acropolis. We do not know whether the cult was there as early as the 6th century or not, although the material remains do not exclude the possibility.⁸⁹ On the acropolis too the Trojan connections were emphasized. Pausanias describes the Trojan horse in the sanctuary of Artemis. It contained Mnæstheus, Theseus and two sons of Theseus.⁹⁰

It is generally assumed that the cult of Dionysus Eleuthereus was brought to Athens during the 6th century and perhaps during the regime of Peisistratus.⁹¹ The history of Attic tragedy and the fact that the festival of Ἀρτεμῖς καὶ Διονύσου was in charge of the eponymous archon rather than of the archon basileus make this date probable.⁹² The cults of Brauronian Artemis and of Dionysus of Eleutherae are examples of the manner in which political ties between Athens and the Attic demes were cemented by religion.

In the history of Attic religion the period of Peisistratus' tyranny is not without significance. Peisistratus turned his attention away from the older cults associated with the γένος and became interested particularly in the cults of north-eastern Attica.

Aristotle⁹³ and Herodotus⁹⁴ speak of a threefold party division of

Attica in the time of Peisistratus. Lysurgus who belonged to the Eteoboutadae led the *pediakoi*; the Alcmaeonidae were at the head of the *paralioi* and Peisistratus himself drew his followers from the *diakrioi*. This division of Attica is probably described in a passage of Strabo which refers to the partition of Attica among the three sons of Pandion, Lycus, Nisus and Pallas.⁹⁵

This passage reads as follows: εἴτα Λύκῳ τὸν ἀντιπαιδευρὸν κῆπον
 εὐβοίας ἕμεναι. Νίῳ δὲ τὸν ὀρεοῦτον ἐξαιρῆναι χεῖρον ἐκίμωνος
 ἀκτῆς. τῆς δὲ γὰρ τὸ πρὸς νότον ὁ ἄλλος οὗτος καὶ γίγαντας
 ἐκτρέψων εἰδήσε Πάλλας

The kingdoms of Lycus and Pallas may

be roughly marked out if we assume that Lycus is the eponymous hero of the Lycomidae in Phlya and that Pallas is the hero of Pallene. Strabo goes on

to quote Philochorus in regard to the kingdom of Nisus: Φιλόχορος μὲν
 οὖν ἵπὸ Ἰόλου μέχρι τοῦ Ἰουβίου Σιγκείν αὐτὸν φασὶ τὸν
 ἀρχαῖον, Ἄνδρων δὲ ἀρχαῖον Ἐλευσίνας καὶ τοῦ θροναίου πεδίου.

In general Lycus received the north-eastern portion of Attica, Pallas the south-eastern and Nisus the district which extends from Megara to Athens and the Thriasian plain.

We have much more evidence for the geographical districts of the three party divisions in the time of Peisistratus. The location of the *pediakoi* can be determined by Wade-Gery's restoration of a tritty's inscription of the tribe Oineis. Since the city and coastal trittyes of the tribe are known, this tritty must be the inland one, to which Acharnae belonged.

Wade-Gery restored the name of the tritty as *pedieon* and assigned it to the plain below ^CApharnae.⁹⁶ It is probable that the *pedieis* region of 6th century Attica was the plain which lay between Farnes on the north, Hymettus on the east and Megara on the west.

The *paralia* from which the Alcmaeonidae drew their following included the south-eastern part of Attica. Thucydides spoke of the Peloponnesians as advancing from the plain into the *paralia* as far as Laurium.⁹⁷ We can

assume from the passage in Strabo which assigned the district to Pallas that it included Pallene. Strabo gave as the eastern boundary of the kingdom of Nisus the Pythion or Eleusis and the Thriasian plain. If we identify the kingdom of Nisus with the pedieis and the kingdom of Pallas with the paralia, we can assume that the western boundary of the *Παραλία* lay just east of Eleusis and the Thriasian plain.

The *Σιδκρία* (Aristotle or *Ἑπακρία* Herodotus) from which Peisistratus received support lay in the north-eastern section of Attica. Some evidence on its location can be provided by the trittys *Ἑπακρία* which formed part of the tribe Antiochis. An inscription which speaks of sacrifices offered by Plotheia at the temple of the trittys *Ἑπακρία* gives us direct evidence that Plotheia belonged to this trittys.⁹⁸ Stephanus of Byzantium on the authority of Philochorus states that Semachidae also formed part of this trittys.⁹⁹ The position of Semachidae is not known. Milchhöfer placed it near the tetrapolis.¹⁰⁰ An inscription mentions a *Ἐπακρία* near Laurium.¹⁰¹ There may, however, have been several sanctuaries of the hero. A fragment published in *Anecdota Bekker* refers to the *Ἑπακρία* as a district (*χωρὰ*) near the tetrapolis.¹⁰² This location agrees with the list of Attic towns under Cecrops given in Strabo where the order is *τετραπόλις, Ἑπακρία, Ἀκκελεία*.¹⁰³

We must remember, however, that the name *επακρία* as it is used by later writers refers to the trittys and may or may not have corresponded to the *Σιδκρία* of Peisistratus. There is slight evidence that the latter extended as far as Brauron. Hesychius wrote; *Αἰακρικῆς καὶ αἰ χωρὰ Σιδκρία ἢ ἰπὸ Πύργου εἰς Βραυρωνίους*. The emendation *Βραυρωνία* suggested by Schmidt in his edition of Hesychius seems probable. A sentence in a lexicographer refers to *Σιδκρία* as *τοῦτος Ἀττικῆς ἰπὸ Βραυρωνία*.¹⁰⁴ It may be assumed that the region *Σιδκρία* lay in the north-eastern part of Attica and may have extended as far as Brauron.

The reforms of Cleisthenes broke up the party divisions of Peisistratus' time. Cleisthenes divided the country into thirty parts which he called trittyes and distributed the demes among them. Ten trittyes belonged to the city, ten to the paralia and ten to the mesogaea.¹⁰⁵ Three trittyes formed a tribe, one from the city, one from the paralia and a third from the mesogaea. In this way two neighboring demes might belong to the trittyes of two different tribes. The problem of deciding how the distribution of the demes affected the party divisions of the time of Peisistratus depends for its solution on identifying the sites of the ancient demes.

Two important studies of Attic demes made by Milchhöfer and Löper late in the 19th century laid the foundation of our knowledge of the location of the demes.¹⁰⁶ Milchhöfer's distribution depended primarily on a list of demes in Strabo.¹⁰⁷ Löper challenged many of Milchhöfer's attributions on the ground that Strabo's list was not limited to coastal demes alone, as Milchhöfer believed, but included a few inland demes as well. Working on this principle, Löper was able to show that the trittyes corresponded to definite geographical areas. This can be seen particularly in the north-eastern coast of Attica where we find from north to south the following tribes: Aiantis, Aigeis, Pandionis and Akamantis. In every case the inland trittys was directly behind the coastal trittys. The tribes along the south-eastern coast of Attica between Athens and Sunium, however, have their coastal trittys separated from the inland trittys. These tribes are the Kekropis, Erechtheis, Antiochis and Leontis. The Kekropis had its coastal trittys in the district around Halai Aixonides but its inland trittys included Athmone and Phlya. The Erechtheis possessed Anagyros and Lamptra on the coast as well as Kephisia further inland. The Antiochis included Aigilia and ~~Am~~Amphlystus on the coast and had Pallene as its inland trittys. Similarly the Leontis was divided between Sunium and Paeonidae.

To what extent were the prominent families of 6th and 5th century Attica

affected by the distribution? Since the home of the Alcmaeonidae was in the city demes Alopeke and Agryle,¹⁰⁸ we can assume that their main influence would be on the tribes Antiochis and Erechtheis to which these demes belonged. This would mean that of the old *παρὰ δὲ* the country between Aixone and Anaphlystus would be included in their tribes but that Kephisia and Pallene which lay outside or on the edge of the *παρὰ δὲ* would be included as well. Miltiades and Cimon lived in Lakiadae, which belonged to the city trittys of the tribe Oineis. This tribe is, therefore, the one which is most likely to have been influenced by the conservative Philaadae. The coastal and inland trittyes of this tribe included the eastern half of the Thriasian plain. The western half of the plain formed part of the Hippothontis, a tribe which included Peiraeus as part of the city trittys and Sunium. According to Aristotle, Miltiades was supported by the nobles.¹⁰⁹ From the distribution of the tribes it is clear that these were the nobles of the Thriasian plain.

The new constitution of Cleisthenes based on tribes, trittyes and demes robbed the phratries and *γένη* of their political significance. The tribes and perhaps also the trittyes had their own religious organization.¹¹⁰ The eponymous heroes of the ten tribes were chosen by Delphi. Each tribe elected three epimeletae for a year¹¹¹ and each had its own *ἱερόν* at Athens.¹¹² The priest of the tribe was probably chosen by lot.¹¹³ Under the earlier constitution those who belonged to the noble families looked after the sacrifices for the tribes, phratries and *γένη*; under Cleisthenes the tribal sacrifices were made by officials probably chosen by lot. The change is significant of the whole religious development of 6th and 5th century Attica.

In the course of the 5th century the *γένη* continued to conduct traditional sacrifices but state officials either elected or chosen by lot assumed authority over the administration of the cults. The sacrifices offered to the gods were paid for in large measure by public funds. Schlaefer has shown that at least four Attic cults were supported by taxation.¹¹⁴ Even

when this was not the case, the state provided the victims and arranged for the distribution of the skins after the sacrifice.¹¹⁵ The capital expenditure required for building new temples or repairing old was provided almost entirely by the state. At the same time the wealth of the sanctuaries constituted in large measure the wealth of the community. During the building program on the acropolis, and in the course of the Peloponnesian War Athens borrowed heavily from Athena as well as from the smaller sanctuaries of Attica. Consequently during the 5th century a large number of religious posts were created. Ten *ἱεργαστοί* chosen by lot looked after the major festivals, the Panathenaea, the Eleusinia, the Heracleia and the theoriae to Delos and Brauron.¹¹⁶ Four epimeletae with the archon basileus supervised the Mysteries at Eleusis and the *Ἀποβάσει ἐν Ἀίαντι*.¹¹⁷ Epistatae were elected for specific tasks such as the building of a temple.¹¹⁸ The treasurers of Athena were appointed to look after the money of the goddess; the treasurers of the other gods superintended the repayment of money which the state had borrowed from the sanctuaries of the minor deities.¹¹⁹

Three inscriptions can be used to illustrate the nature of the state control of Athenian religion. The first is dated before the middle of the 5th century B.C. and comes from Eleusis.¹²⁰ It determined the duration of the sacred treaty during the celebration of the Mysteries, the fee to be charged to the mystae and gave instructions that the sacred money of Eleusis should be kept in Athens. A second inscription of the Athenian *Booths* was concerned with the appointment of a priestess of Athena Nike.¹²¹ The priestess was to receive 50 drachmas a year and the legs and skins of the victims. A decree from the middle of the 4th century B.C. dealt with a dispute about the boundaries of the Eleusinion at Athens.¹²² Ten men, five from the *Booths*, were to be chosen to decide the question in the presence of the king, the hierophant, the daedouch, the kerykes and the Eumolpidae, and any other Athenian who wished to be present. In other words an important question

involving a state cult was to be decided by ordinary citizens representing the Athenian people.

The cults in the Attic demes were likewise managed by magistrates. In a few cases local γέροντες survived.¹²³ Sacrifices were frequently made by the demarchs,¹²⁴ by ἱεροποιῶντες elected by lot,¹²⁵ or by special officials such as the κερδάρχαι of Athmone.¹²⁶ Since the wealth of the god was the wealth of the community the officials reported on the finances of the cult to the local βουλῆ.¹²⁷ The demes were integrated into the religious life of Athens in so far as they offered sacrifices at the Diipoleia, Panathenaea and Synoikia in Athens.¹²⁸

In this paper I have pointed out that radical changes took place in the political and religious structure of Attic society during the 6th century B.C. At the beginning of the century political power was in the hands of the Eupatridae; religious authority under the γέροντες. Both groups based their right to exercise control on birth. The power of the noble families was challenged by Solon who insisted that a man who had property regardless of his family could be made archon and consequently perform the religious duties which belonged to that office. The Attic γέροντες provided the chief opposition to the tyranny of Peisistratus. Consequently, Peisistratus gave Athena rather than Erechtheus the first place on the acropolis and supported cults which had affinity with those of the north-eastern section of Attica from which his political power was drawn. The heroes of the tetrapolis, Theseus and Heracles, came into greater prominence and a new interest was shown in the festivals at Delphi, Delos and Olympia. With Delphi and Delos the tetrapolis seems to have had close ties. In the time of Peisistratus Attica was divided by three political parties which corresponded roughly to geographical areas. By the reforms of Cleisthenes these political divisions were brought to an end and the phratries and γέροντες sank into insignificance. The γέροντες performed the religious rites of the older cults

but the financial and administrative powers of Attic religion were in the hands of elected Athenian officials.

1. On the *ye'vn* and *θιδκοι* see W. S. Ferguson, "The Attic Orgeones", Harv. Theol. Rev. 37 (1941) 61 ff; W. S. Ferguson, "Orgeonika", Hesp. Suppl. 8 (1949) 130-163; H. T. Wade-Gery, "Eupatridae, Archons and Areopagus", C. R. 25 (1931) 7-11.
2. For a discussion of the phratries and trittyes see W. S. Ferguson, "The Athenian Law Code and the Old Attic Trittyes", in Classical Studies presented to Edward Capps (Princeton 1936) 151-8. Ferguson p. 152 pointed out that the inscriptions IG II² 1237 and 1241 indicate that the phratries were localized in specific districts. The phratry decree IG II² 2345 shows a wider distribution.
3. Op. cit.
4. Pollux 8.111.
5. Arist. Ath. Pol. 8.2.
6. On the cults of Erechtheus and Cecrops see G. W. Elderkin, "The Cults of the Erechtheum", Hesp. 10 (1941) 113-124; G. W. Elderkin, "Studies in Early Athenian Cult", in Studies in honor of E. Capps (Princeton 1936) 106-123; L. R. Farnell, Cults of the Greek States IV (Oxford 1907) 49-52.
7. Hesiod fr. 101 (Teubner).
8. Paus. 1.26.5.
9. On the arrephoroi and the Hersephoroi see L. Deubner, Attische Feste (Berlin 1932) 9-17.
10. Dem. 19.303; Pollux 8.105 f. cf. the references to Pandrosus in the Attic drinking song published by C. M. Bowra, Greek Lyric Poetry (Oxford 1936) 429. Bowra connects the fragment with Miltiades.
11. Arist. Ath. Pol. 3.5.
12. On the site of the *Βουφυστιῶν* see O. Broneer, "Excavations on the North Slope of the Acropolis", Hesp. 2 (1933) 346; W. Judeich, Die Topographie der Athen ² (Munich 1931) 286; Α. Δ. Κερμαιοπούλου, "Ἐπὶ τῇ ἀκροπόλει τῆς Ἀθηνῶν", Ἀρχ. Δελτ. (1929) 13-101 (1929) 73-101; O. Kern, "Demeter Chloë", A. M. 18 (1893) 192-198.

13. Polyaeus, Strat. 1.5. An inscription published by B. D. Meritt, "Greek Inscriptions", Hesp. 9 (1940) 86-96 = S.E.G. III 108 states that the γένος Βουβύγιοι sent two men to Delphi to consult ἐντὶ τοῦ Βουβύγιοι καὶ ἱερέως Διὸς ἐν Πάλλησιω] cf. I.S. 11² 3177 ἱερέως τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ ἐπὶ Πάλλησιου καὶ Βουβύγιος and I.S. 11² 5055 Βουβύγιος ἱερέως Διὸς ἐν Πάλλησιω
14. See I. Toepffer, Attische Genealogie (Berlin 1889) 113 ff; L. Deubner, op. cit. 19 f. cf. I.G. I² 80 = S.E.G. X 28.
15. See Elderkin op. cit. Hesp. 10 (1941) 113 ff. According to the scholiast on Aristoph. Clouds 985 the ox at the Diipoleis was slain by the Θαλαυρίδαι. Elderkin connects the sacrifice with the slaying of Erechtheus by Zeus. Mommsen, Feste der Stadt Athen (Leipzig 1898) 519 believed that the Θαλαυρίδαι were associated with the Kerykes. Since the axe with which the ox was slain was judged in the Prytaneum, the court where cases in which the perpetrator of the crime was unknown were tried, it is not improbable that the Θαλαυρίδαι were connected with this. See Toepffer, op. cit. 149-160; Deubner, op. cit. 161 f. 166 f. 169 f.
16. Toepffer, op. cit. 160 ff.
17. Arrian, Anab. 3.16.8 cf. Dion. Hal. Deinarch. 11.
18. On the connection between the εἰνεῖσαι and the κήρυκες see G. Colin, Le culte d'Apollon Pythien (Paris 1905) 61.
19. On these Eleusinia see M. P. Nilsson, "Die Eleusinischen Kulte der Attischen Deme und das neue Sakralgesetz aus Paiania", Eranos (1944) 70-76.
20. Dem. 59.72 ἀλλὰ κατισόνητος θεογένων κοίρωνίδην. The Oxford text note on the word κοίρωνίδην reads as follows, κοίρωνίδην Voemel, Kirchner: κοθωκίδην codd.; Dem. 59.84 κἄτοι μοι θεογένων ἔρχιᾶ Steph. Byz. ἔρχιᾶ. σημός τῆς ἑστικῆς τῆς Αἰγυπτῶς θουῶς, ἀπὸ ἔρχιου τοῦ ξενιέαντος ἀνάστησαν
21. Paus. 1.37.2.
22. Paus. 1.1.4.

24. K. Koupouviώτης, *Ἐλευσινιακά* (Ἀθήναι 1932) 173-189
25. O. Rubensohn, review of Koupouviώτης op. cit. in Gn 9 (1933) 428-432.
26. Hymn to Demeter line 234.
27. I.G. II² 1672 line 106. *Εἰς Διουσίαν τὰ ἐμπεπραγμένα ἐπισημασθεῖς εἰς βουσίαν.*
28. W. S. Ferguson, "The Athenian Phratries", C.P. 5 (1910) 273.
29. I.G. II² 661 (283/2 B.C.). In the inscription only two ἐπισημασθέντες are named. In the earlier period four ἐπισημασθέντες were elected (Ath. Pol. 57).
30. I.G. I² 313 line 146.
31. A sum is credited to the Mysteries at Agrae by the treasurers of the other gods in 429/8 (I.G. I² 310). This inscription is published by J. Johnson, "A Revision of I.G. I² 310", A.J.A. 35 (1931) 31-43 who argues that the stone covers the accounts of several years. W. S. Ferguson, The Treasurers of Athena (Harvard 1932) 97 suggests that the inventory is of one year with various subdivisions. Face A on which reference to the Mother at Agrae occurs is according to Ferguson the inventory of the ὀπισημασθέντος. See also A. B. West, "The Two Callias Decrees", A.J.A. 38 (1934) note 5. In I.G. I² 324 line 91 (426/5 - 423/2) another loan from the Mysteries at Agrae is recorded.
32. I.G. II² 1672 line 182. *ἐπισημασθέντες ἐπισημασθέντες εἰς Διουσίαν βούσαν*
33. I.G. II² 1672 line 204. *εἰς χύτρον δημοσίου ἱεροῦ.*
34. I.G. II² 1178. *Ἰκαρίων -- καὶ ὁ ἄλλος ὁ Ἰκαρίων.*
35. According to Herodotus the tyrannicides were Γελοῦργοι (Hdt. 5.57).
Plut. Συμποσιακῶν προβλήματα 1.10.3 states that Harmodius was from Aphidna.
36. Bekker, Anecdota I p. 274. *Κυρῆσι γένος ἱερῶν Ἀθήνων.*
See S. Solders, Die äusserstädtischen Kulte und die Einigung Attikas (Lund 1931) 86.
37. Paus. 1.31.2.
38. See R. Schlaefler, "The Cult of Athena Pallenis", H.S.C.P. 54 (1943) 35-67.
39. Plut. Thes. 14 *ἔθουσαν γὰρ Ἐκείνην οἱ περὶ δημοσίου*
βουλομένης Ἐκείνην Αἴη καὶ τὴν Ἐκείνην ἐτίμων.

40. J. Oliver, "Greek Inscriptions", Hesp. 4 (1935) 1-32; W. S. Ferguson, "The Athenian Law Code and the Old Attic Trittyes", in Studies presented to E. Capps (Princeton 1936) 144-158. For further bibliography see S.E.G. X 348.

41. Arist. Ath. Pol. 3.3; 56.4. See R. Schlaefler, op. cit. p. 43.

42. Suidas s.v. ἐπιώχλητο. κατόλεξεν. ἐξεδέξατο. ἐστὶ δὲ Ἀττικὸν ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐπιώχλητο ἀρχάγοις.

43. Et. M. γερᾶραι παρ' Ἀθηναίοις γυναικες τινες ἱερᾶι, εἰς ὃν βασιλεὺς καθίστασθαι ἰσαριθμούς τῶν βασιλέων Διονύσου. εἰ δὲ γερᾶραι τὸν βεῖν cf. Hesp. γερᾶραι... αἱ τῆ Διονύσου τῆ ἐν δῆμοις τὰ ἱερᾶ ἐπιτελοῦσθαι τῆ ἀριθμῆ.

44. I.G. I² 94 = S.E.G. X 103.

45. I.G. II² 1362. This inscription is a proclamation of the priest of Apollo Eritheseus. The priest announces that if he finds a slave doing damage to the temple of Apollo he will have him whipped, and will give his name to the archon basileus; if the violator, however, is a free man the priest will fine him fifty drachmas and report him to the archon basileus.

46. S.E.G. III 18 (420 B.C.) = X. I. Κορυσίου, Ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἡρακλείου τοῦ Κουρολόγου, Arch. Δελτ. 8 (1923) 96ff.

47. See R. Schlaefler, op. cit.

48. Athen. 6.234 F.

49. Arist. Ath. Pol. 57.

50. In Ath. Pol. 8.1. Aristotle states that ten archons were elected from each of the four tribes and that from these nine archons were chosen by lot. According to Ath. Pol. 22 and Politics 1274a 2 and 1281b 32 the archons were elected. On the question see K. Freeman, The Work and Life of Solon (Cardiff 1926) 77.

51. Philochorus fr. 94 in I. Muller, F.H.G. I (Paris 1874) περὶ δὲ τῶν ἀρχόντων γέγραφε καὶ Φιλόχορος τοὺς δὲ ἀρχόντας ἐπὶ ἀνάγκης δέχεσθαι καὶ τοὺς ἀρχόντας καὶ τοὺς ἀρχόντας οὐκ ἐπιτελοῦσθαι καλοῦμεν

On this passage see W. S. Ferguson, op. cit. C.P. 5 (1910) 257-284.

52. Arist. Ath. Pol. 13.2.
53. C. T. Seltman, Athens, its History and Coinage before the Persian Invasion (Cambridge 1927) 26.
54. Arist. Politics 1305a. Prominent also among the enemies of Peisistratus were Miltiades and Cimon both members of the γένος of the Philaetae. Miltiades, the founder of the Chersonnese, left Athens all the more gladly we are told, because he was angry with the tyranny of Peisistratus. (Hdt. 6.35). Harmodius and Aristogeiton who murdered Hipparchus the son of Peisistratus were members of the γένος of the Περικεῖται (See above note 35).
55. See T. Wiegand, Die archaische Poros-Architektur der Akropolis zu Athen (Leipzig 1904) 126.
56. On the rebuilding of Eleusis under Peisistratus see K. Kuruniotes, "Das Eleusinische Heiligtum von den Anfängen bis zur vorperikleischen Zeit", Arch. f. Relig. 32 (1935) 52-78.
57. Hesych. Περικεῖται ἡ κοσμήσι τῶν ἐν Πυθίῳ κτλ cf. Suidas and Photius Πύθιον ἱερὸν Ἀπόλλωνος Ἀθηνῶν ὑπὸ Περικεῖται γέγονός
58. I. Kirchner, Imagines Inscriptionum Atticorum (Berlin 1948) no 12 = S.E.G. X 318.
59. Hdt. 2.180 cf. 1.50; Paus. 10.5.13. T. Homolle, "Monuments figurés de Delphes", B.C.H. 26 (1902) 597-627 argues that the work done by the Alcmaeonidae was carried out after 513. See also Fouilles de Delphes II, Terrasse du temple (Paris 1927) 110.
60. On the purification of Delos see Hdt. 1.64. On the old porous temple of Apollo see Delos, Les temples d'Apollon (Paris 1931) 213.
61. Since the temple was never finished it has been conjectured that it was begun not long before 511/510. Arist. Polit. 1313b καὶ εὖ ὀλιγαίρου
ἢ οἶκος ὄρασις ὑπὸ τῶν Περικεῖται; Vitruv. I praef. 15.

Peisistrato aedem Iovi Olympio facienti cf. Thuc. 2.15; Paus. 1.18.8.

See G. Welter, "Das Olympieion in Athen", A.M. 47 (1922) 61-71.

62. Schol. (Laurent) Soph. Oed. Kol. 1047 ὅταν δὲ ἐναεῖα γένηται
παραδεδομένα ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς τότε ὀποστέλλουσιν τὴν θεωρίαν
οἱ ἐκ τοῦ γένους -- εἰ δὲ εἰς Δῆλον ὀποστέλλοιτο ἢ θεωρίαν
κοτὰ τὰ παραδεδομένα οὕτως ὁ μάρτυς εἰς τὸ ἐν Μαραθῶνι
Δῆλιον καὶ ἔστιν ἱεροσκοπία τῆς μὲν εἰς Ἀελθεύς θεωρίας
ἐν τῇ ἐν Οἰνόνῃ πυθίῳ. τῆς δὲ εἰς Δῆλον ἐν τῇ
ἐν Μαραθῶνι Δηλίῳ. See A. Boethius, Die Pythais (Uppsala 1918).

63. Fouilles de Delphes III² 18-20.

64. Ibid III² 18.

65. Ibid III² 7,8,10,13.

66. Icaria I.G. II² 4976. On Myrrhinus see E. Vanderpool, "Inscriptions
from Attica", Hesp. 19 (1950) 25-6. There were also Pythia at Cholargus
(I.G. II² 184) and at Eleusis (Paus. 1.37.7).

67. Syncell. Chronogr. p. 153 τὸ δὲ ἐν Δηλίῳ ἱερὸν Ἀπόλλωνος
Ἀνδριῶν ὑπὸ Ἐρυσίχθους υἱοῦ Κέκροπος ἰδρῦνθον cf. Paus. 1.18.5.

68. E. Kjellberg, Zur Entwicklung der attischen Theseussage (Uppsala 1922).

69. The annexation of Eleusis probably took place near the end of the 7th
century B.C. The hymn to Demeter, for instance, belongs to a period when
Eleusis was independent of Athens. It has been dated by various scholars
to the 7th and 6th centuries B.C. G. E. Mylonas, The Hymn to Demeter and
her sanctuary at Eleusis (St. Louis 1942), the last scholar to discuss the
question, does not commit himself to a definite date. An incident told in
the first book of Herodotus (1.30.5) may indicate that Eleusis joined Athens
late in the 7th century. In an apocryphal conversation described by Herodotus,
Croesus asked Solon whom he considered the happiest man. Solon answered that
in his opinion Tellus of Athens was the happiest and he mentioned incidentally
that Tellus died fighting against Eleusis.

70. O. Gruppe, Griechische Mythologie V² I (Munich 1906) 596.
71. Schol. Plat. Parm. 127^a ἰ τῶν παραθηναίων ἑορτῆ καὶ
 οὐ ἀγῶν ἔτερον ἀλλ' ἑνὸς ὑπὸ Ἐπιχθονίου -- ὅστερον
 δεῖ εἶναι θεοῦ συνδυάγοντος τοῦ θεοῦ εἰς ἑορτῆν.
72. The sacrifices to be made at the Synoekia are mentioned in the law
 code of Solon. See above note 40.
73. Arist. Ath. Pol. 15.4.
74. Callimachus, Hymn to Artemis 232 and the scholiast on this line (Paus.
 1.33.7). See S. Wede, "Aphidna in Nordattika", A.M. 21 (1896) 387.
Wede
75. Hdt. 9.73.
76. Plut. Thes. 33 cf. Paus. 5.19.2; Hdt. 9.73. See Preller-Robert,
Griechische Mythologie II⁴ p. 676 and Solders, op. cit. p. 104.
77. Diod. 4.60.5.
78. Plut. Thes. 14.
79. Strabo C 383.
80. I.G. I² 190.
81. Paus. 1.15.4; 32.4.
82. Paus. 1.27.10; 2.25.
83. See R.E. suppl. 3 s.v. Herakles. R. Schlaefer, "The Attic Association
 of the Mesogeioi", C.P. 39 (1944) 22-27 suggests on the basis of I.G. II² 1245
 and 1247 that the Herakleion of the Mesogeioi was near the Acharnian gate.
84. Medontidae, Hellanicus F.Gr.H. IV F 125; Alcmaeonidae, Paus. 2.18.8
 cf. Hdt. 5.62 and 6.125 where the family is represented as autochthonous;
 Paeonidae, Paus. 2.18.8 cf. Hdt. 5.65.
85. Plut. Sol. 10.
86. N. Nilsson, "The new Inscription of the Salaminioi", A.J.P. 59 (1938)
 385-393. See also W. S. Ferguson, "The Salaminioi and the Heptaphylae
 and Sunium", Hesp. 7 (1938) 1-74.
87. See above note 10.

88. For the ancient references to this cult see Farnell, op. cit. II 564-566.
89. G. P. Stevens, "The Periclean Entrance Court", Hesp. 5 (1936) 468 writes as follows: "If we could have gazed upon the sanctuary (i.e. of Brauronian Artemis) just after the sack of the acropolis by the Persians, we would probably have seen somewhere within the precinct the ruins of an archaic temple of Artemis, facing east, no traces of which exist to-day."
90. Paus. 1.23.4.
91. On this cult see L. Deubner, op. cit. pp. 138 ff; Picard-Cambridge, The Theatre of Dionysus in Athens (Oxford 1946).
92. See above page 4.
93. Arist. Ath. Pol. 13.
94. Hdt. 1.59.
95. Strabo C 392.
96. H. T. Wade-Gery, "Horos", in Melanges Gustave Glotz II (Paris 1932) 877-887. For a discussion of the three parties under Peisistratus see also F. Cornelius, Die Tyrannis in Athen (Munich 1929) 17-21.
97. Thuc. 2.55. On the paralia see Ath. Pol. 21.4; Hdt. 1.59; Aristoph. Wasps 1223; Strabo C 392.
98. I.G. II² 1172, 28 ff.
99. Steph. Byz. s.v. Σημαχίσι. Οιδόχοπος δὲ τῶν ἐπακρίων
ἔστι τὸν Σημῶν
100. A. Milchhöfer, "Untersuchungen über die Demenordnung des Kleisthenes", Sitz.-Ber. Akad. Berlin (1892).
101. I.G. II² 1582, 53. ἡ ὁδοὶ ἡ ἐξω τοῦ Πρυτανεῖος ἐπὶ
Ἀκρόπολιος ἔρουσθαι καὶ τὸ Σημαχίσιον
102. Anecdota, Bekker I 259 ἐπακρία ὄνομα χώρα Πλευσίου
τοῦ Πρυτανεῖος κλειμένης.
103. Strabo C 397.

104. Anecdota, Bekker I p. 242 s.v. *δίακρια*.
105. Arist. Ath. Pol. 21.
106. See Milchhöfer, op. cit. and R. Löper, "Die Trittyen und Demen Attikas", A.M. 17 (1892) 319-433. See also the map of Attic demes in A. W. Gomme, The Population of Athens in the 5th and 4th Centuries B.C. (Oxford 1933).
107. Strabo C 398-9.
108. See I. Kirchner, Prosopographia Attika II (Berlin 1903) s.v. *Μεγακλῆς* and *Λεωβύτις*.
109. Arist. Ath. Pol. 28.2.
110. On the trittyes see the sacrifice offered by Plotheia in I.G. II² 1172, 28 ff.
111. I.G. II² 1151, 1152; B.D. Meritt, "Greek Inscriptions", Hesp. 5 (1936) p. 402 no. 10 lines 168-9; I.G. II² 1165 lines 19 and 32 cf. 1164.
112. The Eurysakeion, the heroon of the tribe Aiantis was situated on the north-west section of the Kolonos Agoraios. See T. L. Shear, "The Campaign of 1936", Hesp. 6 (1937) 348-9 and B. D. Meritt, "Greek Inscriptions", Hesp. 7 (1938) 94-6. The heroon of Aigeus was at the foot of the acropolis (Paus. 1.22.5; Plut. Thes. 12.3). The Cecropion (I.G. II² 1141), the heroon of Pandion (I.G. II² 1138, 1140, 1144, 1148, 1157 cf. 1152) and of Erechtheus were all on the acropolis. The Hippothontion also may have been near the acropolis (I.G. II² 1163 cf. 1149). See W. Judeich, Die Topographie von Athen² (Munich 1931).
113. I.G. II² 1146. τὸν ἱερὸν τὸν ἐκὶ Λαχόρυα cf. 1140.
114. R. Schlaefer, "Notes on Athenian Public Cults", H.S.C.P. 51 (1940) 233-260.
115. See the regulations regarding sacrifices in the fasti of Paeania S.E.G. X 38 and in the fasti of Marathon I.G. I² 90 = S.E.G. X 102.
116. Arist. Ath. Pol. 54.7.
117. See above note 49.
118. I.G. I² 88.

119. See Meritt, Wade-Gery, McGregor, The Athenian Tribute Lists (Harvard 1939) D 1 and D 2 and the bibliography ad cit. pages 208-9; Wade-Gery and Meritt, "The Decrees of Kallias", Hesp. 16 (1947) 279-286.
120. I.G. I² 6.
121. I.G. I² 24.
122. I.G. II² 204.
123. See above page 4.
124. I.G. II² 1172, 1173, 1178, 1194 cf. 1204.
125. I.G. II² 1199.
126. I.G. II² 1203.
127. See the inscription from Ἄλκι Αἰθωνίας published by K. Kourouliotis,
 τὸ ἱερὸν τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος τοῦ Ζωστήρος. Ἀρχ. Δελτ. II (1927-8) 40
 ἱεροῦς γένόμενος τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος Ζωστήρος -- μετὰ τῶν
 αἰρεθέντων ἐκ τῶν δημοτῶν -- καὶ λόγους τῆς ἐπιμελείας
 ἐδωκεν τοῖς δημοτοῖσι.
128. I.G. I² 188.