Before we can assess the work of Kleisthenes we must first learn which demes constituted each of the thirty trittyes. Normally the geographical position of a deme will tell us whether it belonged to the city, coastal, or inland trittys of its tribe, but sometimes we must turn to inscriptions, such as prytany lists, which group demes according to trittyes. This is true of the smaller demes which have not yet been securely located by the topographers and of those tribes in which the demes of two trittyes lie so closely together that only an official document can show to which they belong. This is the situation of Aigeis, where several of the inland and coastal demes are neighbors. To fix the exact membership of each trittys in this tribe we must rely on fourth century inscriptions, prytany lists and a roster of bouleutai published in Hesperia several years ago (S. E. G. 19, 149) 1).

These inscriptions fall into three categories. In the first there is no discrepancy between the arrangement of demes in the inscriptions and their geographical locations (as far as they are known): coastal demes form one group, city demes another, and inland demes a third. The inscriptions of this category presumably are ordered in accordance with the trittyes of Kleisthenes. In the second category the groupings of demes show minor deviations from their geographical locations, such as a coastal deme grouped with several city demes, while in the third there is no connection between a deme's location and its position in the inscription, and the layouts of the inscriptions appear to be haphazard 2). We can,

1) Hesperia 31 (1960), 31-3.
2) To the first category belong the roster of Erechtheis in S. E. G. 19, 149 (with the city trittys listed at the top of the left column, the inland trittys at the top of the right column, and the coastal trittys, Anagyrous and Lamptra, at the bottom of both columns) and the prytany lists of Pandionis I.G. IIa 1753 (cf. S. E. G. 23, 89) and Antiochis I.G. IIa 1750. To the
of course, rely on the first type and reject the third in trying to determine the composition of a trittys, but the second category presents a problem: before we can use the evidence of inscriptions of this type we must account for the deviations. Do they show a pattern or are they random aberrations?

The two lists of members of the boule which we possess for Aigeis belong to this second category, for they show clear deviations from the geographical (and presumably Kleisthenic) order. Since the three groups of demes are identical in both documents, we can rule out accidental distribution of the demes and must, therefore, either seek the basis for their arrangement in the internal organization of the boule or ascribe it to the convenience of the men responsible for the inscription, the mason and the secretary of the boule.

Many times secretaries would prepare their lists of bouleutai in some logical order, such as grouping them according to Kleisthenic trittyes, but other factors might interfere with this design. We can probably see an example of this in the treatment of the Potamos demes. In one list (S. E. G. 19, 149) Upper Potamos, Lower Potamos, and Potamos Deiradiotai are all grouped with demes from the coast; in another (I. G. II² 1742) Potamos Deiradiotai is found with coastal demes, and the other two with city demes; while in another type of document all three are probably listed with city demes 1). It would appear from this that the three demes

second category I assign (cf. Historia 15 [1966], 1-5) two lists of Aigeis, I.G. II² 1749 and S. E. G. 19, 149; four from Pandionis, I.G. II² 1740 and 1751 and S. E. G. 19, 149 and S. E. G. 23, 87; two from Leontis, I.G. II² 1742 and S. E. G. 19, 149, and one of Oineis, I.G. II² 1745. To the third belong the fragmentary bouleutai list for all the tribes, I.G. II² 1700, as well as lists for Erechtheis, Hesperia 11, 1942, 233, and Aigeis, I.G. II² 1747 (cf. A. W. Gomme, The Population of Athens in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries B.C. [1933], 57, note 1.) In addition, the roster of Akamantis in S. E. G. 19, 149 belongs to either the first or the second classification.

1) In I.G. II² 2362, which is a roster of all the demes during the period of the eleven tribes, two Potamos demes appear with the city demes (lines 35-6) and none with the coastal demes. Since the whole list of demes belonging to Leontis is not preserved, it is possible that one of the three has been listed out of order with the inland demes. On the other hand, the fact that other double demes are listed on the stone with the designation χαθάρπερων or ὑπάνερπερων makes one wonder whether something has not been