Preface

The particularism of ancient Greek civilization is a timeworn—and unimpeachable—motif of many a general account of the subject. Hardly a "nation" in any meaningful sense of that term, Greece before the rise of the imperial hegemonies remained an assortment of so many autonomous city-states. But the admonition, however salutary, may not have gone far enough. It is a matter of historical record that many states evolved out of, or were by deliberate act synoecized from, a plurality of pre-existing settlements. How can it be assumed that the same people who continually resisted the combination of states into a "nation" readily permitted the absorption of these settlements by a monolithic central government? It cannot be assumed. The principal underlying premise of the present work is the persistence of the local community. But particularism within the state itself might, and certainly did, jeopardize its stability. The solution was, I shall argue, the creation of a new set of artificial local communities—a public social organization—which might neutralize, if it could not obliterate, the effects of the lingering lines of division. The avowed, and more visible, purpose of the new communities was to provide the apparatus for the administration of the state's business—and that they did. But this public administrative role is inseparable from, and arguably secondary to, the concurrent functioning of these same bodies as self-sustaining independent associations.

The subject is not a new one. The standard handbook accounts of Gilbert and of Busolt-Swoboda and the pertinent articles in the *Real-encyclopädie* contain information and references concerning the organizations of numerous cities, but in many cases these accounts, often sketchy to begin with, have been rendered obsolete by subsequent epigraphic discoveries. The earliest modern monographic treatment, E. Szanto's *Die griechischen Phylen,* isolated for particular scrutiny the one unit, the phyle, the distribution of which might justify the assumption of an inheritance from prehistoric times. Szanto's attempt to recover the original nature of the phyle, as well as similar speculative work by Meyer, Beloch, and others, had the effect of focussing scholars' attention on the beginnings, rather than on the actual attested operation, of the organizations. Were the phylai remnants of ancient kinship groups? Or did they descend ultimately from some early division of society by occupational affiliation, as certain ancient writers thought? Or did they grow out of a division of conquered territory following the descent of the Greeks into Greece? And so on. In recent years, however, Roussel's review of this literature has resulted in the valuable, though largely negative, conclusion that the contemporary documen-

tation for the phylai fails, on the whole, to validate any of these theories. Thanks to Roussel, we are now at liberty to direct our efforts towards a positive evaluation of that documentation. Roussel himself has made a start, but often his discussions of individual states are deeply embedded within the context of his destructive critique of the earlier scholarship; there are also many omissions, not only of individual sources, but also, on occasion, of entire states. My primary objective, accordingly, has been to assemble and analyze, on a state-by-state basis, the positive and explicit record for public organization preserved in contemporary sources. Only on this basis will it be possible to advance our understanding of the actual operation of the ancient Greek city-state.

On any accounting, this is a large undertaking, and in order to realize my objective, certain restrictions and concessions have proved necessary. The first is geographical. Although my principal interest has been in the Greek Homeland—that is, in the region to which these public organizations are native, I have extended the study to the areas of Greek colonization and, as well, to areas, principally the interior of Asia Minor, where elements of the native organizations are found in the context of a general Hellenization of public institutions. Nonetheless, I have not, following Szanto's example, included Syria, Arabia, or Egypt on the grounds that only some of the vocabulary, but little of the substance, of the Greek models was actually transmitted to these regions—a process already observable in fairly advanced form among the organizations of Asia Minor. Nor has it been possible, within the region so limited, to investigate every relevant or potentially relevant body of evidence. Theoretically, every public act of a state so organized might be conditioned, directly or indirectly, by the operation of its administrative units; if territorially partitioned, all its lands and structures belonged to one unit or the other; and the careers of its citizens could, ideally, be viewed in the light of their respective affiliations. The subject is endlessly ramifying. Necessity, therefore, has dictated the summary treatment or outright exclusion of matters not directly bearing upon the structure, disposition, or functioning of the organizations, viz. the physical record, particularly occupation sites certainly or possibly linked to a deme, *kome,* or other center; the cultic affinities of divine or heroic eponyms; the circumstances surrounding the creation of units in honor of kings, dynasts, etc.; the prosopographical implications of lists of citizens (or similar documents) arranged by public unit; the notoriously complex historical settings of epochal reforms at Sparta, Argos, Miletos, and elsewhere; and so on. These restrictions, and still others, will be in evidence in my treatment of Athens. So abundant is the documentation that only a skeletal outline, supported by minimal citation of documentary sources, has been fea-

sible. Yet, without Athens, the study would not only have been deprived of its best understood individual case. It is the Kleisthenic organization which, again and again, provides the crucial insight into the deeper purpose of what I have called the "public social organization."

With these limitations in mind, I have subtitled my work *A Documentary Study.* Throughout, with the exception of Athens, it has been my goal to cite, or otherwise account for, all contemporary documentation of public organization. References to the secondary literature are far from exhaustive, though I have done my best to include all more recent discussions dealing directly with the subject. In the case of Athens, again, economy has prevented the citation of much pertinent—and valuable—scholarship; but for the interested reader, fortunately, P. J. Rhodes' recent commentary on the Aristotelian *Constitution of the Athenians* provides abundant information on all relevant subjects touched on in that work.

The typescript initially submitted to the publisher was, except for the section on Athens, completed late in 1981; soon thereafter, Athens was added. Following unavoidable delays, the text was revised in late 1985 and early 1986. Among other changes, recent epigraphic publications have been incorporated, but no attempt has been made to respond to studies of more comprehensive scope.

During the lengthy period of the book's production, I have incurred more than one debt of gratitude. The greatest is to Ronald Stroud. He first drew my attention to the need for a study of this kind, supervised my University of California dissertation on the organizations of the Dorian states, and, since then, has advanced the enterprise with constructive criticism, sound advice, and encouragement—not to mention the example set by his own meticulous and wide-ranging scholarship. To W. Kendrick Pritchett I am very grateful for putting at my disposal his valuable detailed notes on a later draft. Raphael Sealey's 1960 paper on regionalism in archaic Athens and the discussion of this topic in his Berkeley seminar have greatly influenced my perception of the political role of the organizations. In Athens, I benefited from contact with two authorities on the Attic demes, C. W. J. Eliot and Eugene Vanderpool. To Sterling Dow I remain grateful for scrutiny of two earlier papers dealing with particular aspects of the larger subject. Christian Habicht generously made available valuable additions and corrections on a wide range of topics. To Homer Thompson I am thankful for discussion of archaeological evidence relating to the organization of Athens. For answering questions, or supplying information, regarding regions or states outside Athens, I also thank Eugene Borza (Makedonia), Colin Edmonson (Megara), P. Herrmann (Miletos), Ch. Kritzas (Argos), Joyce M. Reynolds

(Aphrodisias), and J. R. Wiseman (Corinth); and, for illuminating discussion of a general nature, Walter Donlan and R. M. Errington. Scholarly audiences on more than one occasion responded with valuable criticism, instructive parallels, or productive questioning; in particular, I thank the American School of Classical Studies, the Department of Classics, University of Cincinnati, and the Department of History, University of Pittsburgh. At all stages, I have been aided and supported by my wife, Marilyn, and, more recently, by our children—each in their own way.

Institutional support, finally, is also gratefully acknowledged. Two years' study in Greece was funded by a Fulbright Fellowship (1973-1974) and by the Eugene Vanderpool Fellowship of the American School of Classical Studies, Athens (1974-1975). Research during the summer of 1978 was facilitated by a University of Pittsburgh Third Term Research Grant, Type I. Full time work during the winter term of 1979 was made possible by an American Council of Learned Societies Fellowship for Recent Recipients of the Ph.D.

Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
February 27, 1986