

Maria Niku

# THE OFFICIAL STATUS OF THE FOREIGN RESIDENTS IN ATHENS 322–120 B.C.







THE OFFICIAL STATUS  
OF THE FOREIGN RESIDENTS  
IN ATHENS, 322–120 B.C.



PAPERS AND MONOGRAPHS OF THE FINNISH INSTITUTE AT ATHENS VOL. XII

Maria Niku

THE OFFICIAL STATUS  
OF THE FOREIGN RESIDENTS  
IN ATHENS, 322–120 B.C.

HELSINKI 2007

© Maria Niku and Suomen Ateenan-instituutin säätiö (Foundation of the Finnish Institute at Athens) 2007

ISSN 1237-2684

ISBN 978-951-98806-7-9

Printed in Finland by Rannikon Laatupaino Oy, Raahе 2007.

Cover: Grave *stele* of the Phoenician Antipatros, son of Aphrodisios, of Askalon.  
4th–3rd century B.C. EAM 1488. National Archaeological Museum, Athens.

## Contents

Acknowledgements	i
I. Introduction	1
II. The obligations of the foreigners towards the state in the Hellenistic period	13
1. Political segregation of citizens and non-citizens survives for 200 years	13
A new interpretation of <i>astoi</i> and <i>politai</i> in Athenian practices concerning access to citizenship	14
No foreigners in elective offices still in the Hellenistic age	16
Full citizen status of children of mixed marriages from 229/8 weakens political segregation	18
The division between citizen and non-citizen becomes irrelevant	20
2. The late-4th and early-3rd century: continuity of <i>metoikia</i>	21
The metic titles and terms	22
The references to <i>metoikion</i> and <i>isoteleia</i>	23
Differentiated <i>eisphora</i> payment and military service	24
The Macedonian rulers and Athenian politicians had no need to interfere in the <i>metoikia</i> system	27
3. The early-3rd century: <i>metoikia</i> survives but disturbances occur	29
<i>Isoteleia</i> in the early 3rd century	30
Disturbances of the early-3rd century – disturbances in <i>metoikia</i>	32
4. The satellite period 262/1–229/8: break in ‘normality’	38
An unconvincing hypothesis: Antigonos Gonatas abolished <i>metoikia</i> to humiliate Athens	39
The insecure evidence of the <i>isoteleia</i> cases of the 250’s	41
The μετὰ Ἀθηναίων privilege disappears – standardized <i>eisphora</i> paying and military service	44
The foreign soldiers of the satellite state period: Macedonian or Athenian mercenaries, or foreign residents in military service?	47
5. After 229/8: no longer metics but still clearly non-citizens	50
Military service still obligatory	51
The <i>epidoseis</i> and the disappearance of <i>eisphorai</i>	54
6. Changing thought-patterns in the Hellenistic period	56
II. The rights of the foreign residents from 322 to 120	59
1. The judicial status	59
2. Land ownership remains inaccessible to foreigners	63
3. Mixed marriage legitimate from the 220’s onwards as a natural result of the change in the status of the descendants	66
4. Foreigners in the sphere of public religion	70
5. Summary	80

III. State honours and privileges available to foreign residents	83
1. Metic privileges	85
Ἀτέλεια τοῦ μετοικίου/τῶν μετοικίων, a privilege for political exiles of exceptional stature	86
<i>Isoteleia</i> decrees until the later satellite state period	89
<i>Eisphora</i> and military service equality: somewhat rarer than <i>isoteleia</i> no longer in existence after 229	100
2. The naturalization of foreign residents much rarer than that of other foreigners	104
Naturalized metics/resident foreigners	105
Honorary citizenships for Hellenistic monarchs and their aides and officials	110
Regulations altered: descendants of naturalized persons made citizens by right after 229	113
3. The development of <i>enktesis</i> – foreign residents as grantees	114
Basic formulations and regulations in the Classical and Hellenistic periods	116
<i>Enktesis</i> becomes increasingly rarer in the Hellenistic period, both for foreign residents and more generally	117
<i>Enktesis</i> rarely hereditary until the end of the 3rd century. Automatically hereditary in the 2nd century?	124
<i>Enktesis</i> of land and house, or of house only	131
Ἀθήνησι and οἰκοῦντι/-σι Ἀθήνησι: not indicators of residential status	133
Specifications of maximum values for land and house appear in decrees in the 3rd century	135
4. Summary	138
IV. Conclusions	145
Appendix 1: the <i>paroikoi</i> of Rhamnous	153
Appendix 2: terminology	173
Bibliography	175
Concordance of used inscriptions	

## Acknowledgements

This study was conducted at the Department of History, at the Faculty of Humanities, University of Oulu. I spent around eight months conducting research in Athens, Greece. I am grateful to acknowledge the financial support of the following organizations: the Finnish Institute at Athens, the Finnish Cultural Foundation, the Finnish Graduate School of History and the Alfred Kordelin Foundation.

I am indebted to the following persons and institutions.

*My parents*, who have always helped and supported me in all things possible.

*The Department of History and all of its staff.* The department has been a warm and supportive studying and working environment, which has allowed me to conduct my research independently but with the knowledge that help would be available whenever required.

*The Finnish Institute at Athens and the Foundation of the Finnish Institute at Athens,* for the opportunity to conduct research in Athens, Greece, and for publishing my thesis.

*Dr. Timo Sironen*, my supervisor, for all his advice, encouragement and support, and also for the inspiration provided by his Greek lectures, without which, as an undergraduate of history, uncertain of the direction I would take, I might never have chosen the history of ancient Athens as my field of research.

*Professor Olavi K. Fält.* As head of the department for most of my stay at the University of Oulu and as professor of general history, his role in making the department what it is has not been insignificant. I am also indebted to him for his advice and comments regarding issues of historical methodology, the structure of my work and the various formalities and arrangements connected to PhD work.

*Docent Erkki Sironen*, my second supervisor, for his help in various things in Helsinki, and especially for his advice and comments regarding Greek epigraphy.

*Professor Jaakko Frösén*, for thoroughly reviewing my thesis and for his invaluable comments and suggestions for corrections and improvements on several occasions.

*Docent Martti Leiwo*, for thoroughly reviewing my thesis and for his constructive comments; also for his suggestion of limiting the scope of my study, which made it possible for me to complete my thesis earlier than I had expected, and also provided me a rich and extensive field for post-doctoral research in the form of the part of the original research plan that was left out of the study.

*Docent Leena Pietilä-Castrén*, head of the Finnish Institute during my stay in Athens, for her incisive comments regarding the section of my study I chose to present in the seminar at the Institute in the Autumn of 2003

*Vesa Vahtikari*, the current assistant of the Finnish Institute at Athens, for creating the covers for my book, and for his help in editing the manuscript for publishing.

*Maria Martzoukou*, of the Finnish Institute at Athens, for her help with the documentation required to access the libraries and for free access to the museums in Athens in 2003

*Maria Gourdouba*, of the Finnish Institute at Athens, for her help in obtaining the photograph for the cover of my thesis.

*James Boyhan*, of the University of Cambridge, for his work in proofreading my thesis, and for his friendship and support.

*My brother Mikael and his wife Mari-Elisa, and my sister Helena*, for their support and encouragement, and for providing me a base during my regular visits to conduct research at the libraries of the University of Helsinki.

*My nephews Iikka and Kuutti*, for bringing me so much joy with their existence, and through that, much needed energy and motivation for my work.

*Hannu Natri, Jukka Lausmaa and Lisa Miller*, for their friendship and support.

Maria Niku, Oulu, 25<sup>th</sup> January 2007



## I. Introduction

The temporal scope of my study is the first two hundred years of the Hellenistic period, usually defined as beginning with the death of Alexander the Great in 323 B.C. and ending in the Roman conquest of Egypt in 30 B.C.<sup>1</sup>

I have placed my starting point a year later, in 322. This is because while the Hellenistic period brought great changes to the Greek cities in general, for Athens the year 323 was not a real turning point. After the defeat at Chaironeia in 338 against Philip II and Alexander, Athens did lose independence in foreign policy but was allowed to retain full autonomy in internal affairs, the democratic constitution, the army and the navy. The year 322 on the other hand brought significant changes. With the defeat in the so-called Lamian War Athens lost its navy, one of the most significant forces in the Greek world, and was never able to recover it. On the insistence of the Macedonians, the democratic constitution was replaced by an oligarchic regime and a Macedonian garrison was placed in the city. For the next hundred years or so Athens was mostly under Macedonian control.

The chronological end point, 120 B.C., is selected for the following reasons. In the second half of the 2nd century significant changes seem to have taken place in the status differentiation of Athenian citizens and foreigners living in Athens. Approximately from the 140's, citizenship was no longer solely a reward for great services to the state, and the main criteria became instead the candidate's wealth and his own desire to acquire citizenship.<sup>2</sup> At the latest by the 120's the sons of wealthy foreign families were admitted to the *ephebeia* institution.<sup>3</sup> It appears that these foreign *epheboi* acquired full citizen status at the completion of the training. I contest that these developments represent significant changes in the status of foreigners in Athens and thus provide a clear-cut end point for my research. On the other hand, excluding grave inscriptions and some ephebic decrees and decrees of private associations, foreign residents are not seen in epigraphical sources after the 120's, and therefore studying them in the last century B.C. would be extremely difficult. The chronological span is extensive, two hundred years. However, it is justified. Firstly, there has been no specialized research into the foreign residents of Athens in the Hellenistic period. Secondly, the nature of the sources permits the establishment of patterns of development but not in most cases ones that easily fit neat chronological categories. If the latter was possible, a shorter time span would have been a logical choice. Thirdly, the developments that I will examine in the official status of the foreigners are more often than not the kinds that take place gradually, over a longer period of time, not quickly, in fast succession. An example of

---

<sup>1</sup> All dates hereafter are B.C. I will not mention the date of an individual inscription every time it is encountered. The datings can be found in the concordance of used inscriptions. 'Athens' is used to refer to the *polis* of Athens, consisting of the city centre and the territory, unless otherwise specified. This is a justified usage for two reasons. Firstly, the name appears in this sense in my primary sources, the state decrees. Secondly, although the *demoi* had a fair degree of autonomy, Athens as a *polis* was an administrative whole, with common laws and under the authority of the assembly.

<sup>2</sup> Osborne 1981–1983, IV, 146.

<sup>3</sup> The formerly compulsory *ephebeia* training was made optional and shortened from two years to one year in 307. As a result it became a tradition of the wealthy elite, an education institution coaching the sons of important families for administrative career. Habicht 1995, 27–29, 141–142, 235 ff.

this is a particular privilege going out of use due to conditions and circumstances over time rather than through abolition by an actual decision of the assembly.

The history of Athens in the Classical period (480–323) has been and continues to be a much researched subject. There exists considerable research on the foreign residents, metics, in this period. The Hellenistic period, on the other hand, has received much less attention. Nevertheless it is an important subject: although the political and economic importance of Athens was no longer what it had been in the preceding centuries, the *polis* became one of the greatest centres of learning in the Hellenistic world, with a vibrant cultural life.<sup>4</sup> Foreign residents have received very little attention in what research does exist on Hellenistic Athens. This is a glaring omission, since foreigners had a visible role in the life of Athens, especially in the cultural life of the *polis*. The most prominent example of this were the philosophers: the great majority of the leaders of the four major philosophic schools, as well as other philosophers who influenced in Athens in the Hellenistic period and students of the schools known by name.

Foreigners are also a highly interesting subject from the contemporary point of view. The majority of Western countries have large foreign populations of varying ethnic and cultural backgrounds, and so various legal, social, cultural and other issues connected to immigration and minorities are current and subjects of public discussion. Thus similar issues were important both today and over 2000 years ago.

In my thesis ‘official status’ means the status of Athenian foreign residents as defined by laws, decisions of the assembly and the consistently-followed administrative practices. I will divide my examination into three sections: 1) the obligations towards the state; 2) rights in the public sphere, that is, the citizens’ arena; 3) honours and privileges awarded by the city.

I am of course aware of the fact that official status was only one aspect in the life of the foreign residents of Athens, and that limiting the scope of the study in this way precludes analysis of the unofficial sides of their lives, their influence and position in the Athenian society, culture, economy and so on, and all the issues connected to these. However, this ‘unofficial status’, as it might be called, is such an extensive and varied subject that it deserves a special study on its own. My plan is indeed to concentrate on this in later research.

### *Historical background*

The defeat of Athens and its allies in Chaironeia in 338 by the Macedonians led by Philip II resulted in the loss of Athenian independence in international affairs. However, the *polis* retained full autonomy in internal issues.<sup>5</sup> For the next ca. 200 years Athens was in the sphere of influence of Macedon, its position varying between independence (287/6–262/1 and from 229/8) and the status of a satellite-state (262/1–229/8). In 168 the Romans defeated Macedonia and gained decisive power in the Greek world.<sup>6</sup> In the last century B.C. the Greek mainland became the Roman province of Achaia.

During the first hundred years of the Hellenistic period the form of constitution and government in Athens internal varied between democratic and oligarchic. The changes

<sup>4</sup> E.g. Habicht 1994, 231.

<sup>5</sup> Habicht 1995, 23–24.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* 221.

were regularly brought about by external factors. For instance in 318/7–308/7 the constitution was democratic in name but in reality Athens was ruled by one person with the support of Cassander, the son of Antipater, a former general of Alexander, who was involved in the power struggles following the latter's death.<sup>7</sup> In the periods of independence the form of government was fully democratic whereas during the time when Athens was a satellite of Macedonia it was controlled either by a royal governor or an Athenian regent and the authority of its administrative bodies was greatly restricted.<sup>8</sup> Despite the changes in international and internal politics, the central organs of the *polis* – the assembly, the council, the courts, the officials – survived.

The definition of the official status of the foreigners in Athens was originally necessitated by the gradual growth of the foreign population of the *polis*. Already during the reign of Peisistratos and his sons Hippias and Hipparchos, from the 560's to 510's, foreigners formed a significant part of the Athenian population. Officially, their existence was recognized for the first time in the period of Kleisthenes at the end of the 6th century. When Athens became the political and economic leader of the Greek world in the 5th century, foreigners began to arrive in droves, attracted by the economic opportunities. This led to the creation of *metoikia*, the official institution regulating the status of foreigners in Athens. The purpose of the system was to define the rights and obligations of a metic, a foreigner who settled in Athens, in relation to the state. At the same time, this process of definition served the purpose of distinguishing the status of foreign residents in relation to both citizens and other foreigners.<sup>9</sup> Participation in elections, offices and the meetings of the assembly and the council was a citizen's monopoly. The *metoikia* institution continued to evolve in the latter 5th and 4th century.

A foreigner who settled in Athens became *metoikos*, a metic, through registration. In the 5th century this required permanent settlement in Athens. In the 4th century registration was obligatory if the person remained in the *polis* beyond a defined, relatively short period.<sup>10</sup> A metic was required to have an Athenian citizen as a kind of a protector and representative (*prostates*).<sup>11</sup> In the registration, the metic was assigned as resident in a *demos*, local administrative unit, of his choice.<sup>12</sup>

The most important obligations of metics towards the state were payment of taxes and military service. Foreign residents were liable to pay a special metic tax, *metoikion*. It was an exceptional form of taxation in Athens: a direct tax, payable regularly and directed at the person, whereas all the taxes and tolls paid by citizens were either irregular emergency taxes (*eisphorai*) or directed at property.<sup>13</sup> Metics were also liable to pay *eisphorai*,<sup>14</sup> and wealthy foreigners were expected, in a similar manner to citizens, to dispense various kinds of obligatory services with their own resources

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.* 62–68.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.* 160–164.

<sup>9</sup> Foreigners who did not settle in Athens more or less permanently, for instance merchants and diplomats.

<sup>10</sup> Whitehead 1977, 9. Various estimates have been made of the duration of this 'defined time'. It may have been for instance a couple of months.

<sup>11</sup> Harrison 1968, 193. Whitehead 1977, 90–91. Todd 1994, 133.

<sup>12</sup> E.g. Todd 1997, 118. When a metic changed place of his residence, also his residential *demos* changed. In contrast, citizens were members of *demoi* and the *demos* membership remained unaltered throughout their life.

<sup>13</sup> Todd 1997, 113. Whitehead 1977, 76.

<sup>14</sup> Whitehead 1977, 78.

(*leitourgiai*).<sup>15</sup> A metic could perform military service either in the infantry or as a rower in the navy. The cavalry was open for citizens only. In the infantry metics, like citizens, were divided into heavy-armed *hoplitai* and light-armed auxiliary troops.<sup>16</sup> Metics usually served in their own units in the territorial troops which were maintained for home defence.<sup>17</sup>

Metics were entitled to appeal to Athenian courts. In cases of public law they were almost equal with citizens, the only difference being that metics could act only for themselves, not for the *polis* as a whole.<sup>18</sup> The official in charge of civil law cases for metics, with the exception of crimes of murder, was the *polemarchos*.<sup>19</sup> In murder cases the punishments varied according to the status of the perpetrator and the victim. If a metic was found guilty of the premeditated murder of a citizen, the penalty was death. A citizen could be punished for the premeditated murder of a metic with, at most, banishment.<sup>20</sup> Foreign residents could not own land without a special privilege.<sup>21</sup> Metics' right of participation in public cults – state and *demos* cults – was extremely limited, but besides this, their religious practices were not restricted in any way.<sup>22</sup>

Foreigners who lived in Athens might be awarded various types of privileges: the right to buy and own land (*enktesis*), equal taxation with citizens (*isoteleia*), the right to serve in the same military units with citizens and pay the same *eisphorai*, even citizenship. However, all these were solely rewards for extensive services to the state and thus rare. Generally speaking, the severity of the *metoikia* institution did not ease at any point during the Classical period. On the contrary, in the latter half of the 4th century the system was tightened even further. For instance in 346/5 the assembly passed a motion for reviewing the citizen rolls and registering those found cheating as metics. An individual could appeal to a court but failure resulted in enslavement.<sup>23</sup> When Alexander the Great died in 323 the *metoikia* institution appears to have been in full force.

### Earlier research

There is no specialised study that concentrates on the development of the official status of the foreign residents of Athens. To my knowledge, the only study that deals with any issues connected to the foreign residents of Hellenistic Athens in any great detail is M. Adak's 1999 doctoral thesis *Metöken als Wohltäter Athens. Untersuchungen zum sozialen Austausch zwischen ortsansässigen Fremden und der Bürgergemeinde in klassischer und hellenistischer Zeit (ca. 500–150 v. Chr.)*, published in 2003 in Munich. Adak examines social relations between foreign residents and Athenian citizens. He explores how the metics performed their official and public relations in relation to the citizenship. However, even though the chronological span of the study formally

<sup>15</sup> Cf. Todd 1997, 113.

<sup>16</sup> This was based on wealth. Each person was required to pay for his equipment himself, and thus the poorer persons could not afford service as *hoplitai*.

<sup>17</sup> See Whitehead 1977, 83–86.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.* 94.

<sup>19</sup> Whitehead 1977, 92. Harrison 1971, 9–10.

<sup>20</sup> Whitehead 1977, 93. Harrison 1968, 197–198.

<sup>21</sup> Whitehead 1977, 1977.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.* 86–89.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.* 162.

includes the Hellenistic period until 150, emphasis is heavily on the years 500–323, and the entire ca. 350 years is approached as a fairly unified whole.

The scarcity of specialised study on the foreign residents of Athens in the Hellenistic period is partially due to the lesser attention this period has received in general, and partially due to the scarcity of sources. Only fragments survive of the historical, social, political and economical works written in and about Athens in the Hellenistic period. Some issues such as the juridical position of foreign residents in the era cannot be researched in detail because such details are not recorded in the sources. Nevertheless the fairly extensive epigraphical data, supplemented by the literary fragments and works written elsewhere which refer to Athens, is sufficient for the specialised attention of a researcher. My work, then, is the first comprehensive study of the development of the official status of the foreign residents of Athens in the Hellenistic period. As I noted in the introductory section, it is by no means an insignificant subject of research both in regards to the Hellenistic period itself and the modern view: in the Hellenistic period foreigners had a prominent role in Athenian life. Today, issues of immigration remain actual everywhere, which makes the subject interesting from the contemporary perspective.

The metics of Classical Athens have received considerable attention from the end of the 19th century onwards. Of the more recent studies it is necessary to mention D. Whitehead's *The ideology of the Athenian metic*, published in 1977. Whitehead returned to the subject briefly in an article in 1986. There he referred briefly to the foreign residents in the Hellenistic period, but only in passing. He hypothesized about the survival of *metoikia* after the Classical period without concentrating on the issue. M. Adak's study with its more limited approach was already mentioned. Although not a study but a catalogue, M. J. Osborne's and S. G. Byrne's *The foreign residents of Athens: an annex to the Lexicon of Greek personal names: Athens*, published in 1996, is important as a tool provides a fairly comprehensive listing of the names of foreign residents in sources published up to that time. Metics are usually referred to in varying degrees in specialised and more general studies dealing with Classical Athens. As examples, one may mention M.I. Finley's several books on the society and economy of Athens and the ancient world, R. K. Sinclair's *Democracy and participation in Athens* from 1988 and E. Cohen's *The Athenian Nation* from 2000; and among the research of specific areas the essential work on the laws of Athens, A. R. W. Harrison's *The Law of Athens* (two volumes, 1968 and 1971).

In regards to research on Hellenistic Athens, a valuable new addition provided in 2003 by O. Palagia and S. V. Tracy's edited volume, *The Macedonians in Athens 322–229 B.C.* This collection of articles had its origins in a conference held in Athens in 2001, and examines the impact of the Macedonians on Athens from different viewpoints. The most extensive and significant body of research of Hellenistic Athens is that of Ch. Habicht, also a contributor in the above collection, from the 1970's to the 1990's. Especially worthy of mention are the monographs *Untersuchungen zur politischen Geschichte Athens im 3. Jahrhundert v. Chr.* (1979), *Studien zur Geschichte Athens in hellenistischer Zeit* (1982) and *Athen. Die Geschichte der Stadt in hellenistischer Zeit* (1995). Further, very useful for my research is the result of work of the Finnish team of researchers led by professor J. Frösén, published in 1997, *Early Hellenistic Athens. Symptoms of a Change* (Papers and Monographs of the Finnish

Institute at Athens, vol. VI). The articles in the publication examine various social, economical and cultural aspects in Athens in the early stages of the Hellenistic period, for instance private wealth in public sphere (M. Hakkarainen) and the private associations (M. Leiwo). Finally, W.S. Ferguson's *Hellenistic Athens* from 1911 must be mentioned, because although it is in many places outdated, it is still a valuable body of research.

There are plenty of studies on issues that are relevant to my work. Among the research on foreigners in the Greek world, of particular relevance for me is the work of Ph. Gauthier: *Symbola. Les étrangers et la justice dans les cités grecques* (1972) and his articles 'Citoyens et étrangers dans les inscriptions hellénistiques' (1978–1979) and *Metèques, périèques et paroikoi: Bilan et points d'interrogation* (1988). Another important work in this area is F. Papazoglou's *LAOI et PAROIKOI. Recherches sur la structure de la société hellénistique*, from 1997, which also involves the *paroikoi* known from Athens. Issues of citizenship, naturalization, civic status and mixed marriages are all essential in view of the official status of foreign residents specifically because of the existence of different civic statues with different rights and obligations in Athens and the ever essential citizen/non-citizen division. It is not surprising that these issues have received much attention in the research pertaining to ancient Athens. The essential study on naturalization is M. J. Osborne's comprehensive and authoritative *Naturalization in Athens* (1981–1983), which comprises both the surviving naturalization decrees and cases of naturalization known from other sources. D. Ogden concentrated on the concept of bastardy in his 1996 study *Greek bastardy in the Classical and Hellenistic period*. C. Vatin examined issues of marriage in 1970 in *Recherches sur le mariage et la condition de la femme mariée à l'époque hellénistique*. There are several articles on Perikles' citizenship law. It is sufficient to mention one of the, K. R. Walters' 'Perikles' citizenship law' (*Classical Antiquity* 1983).

Finally, since my primary sources are epigraphical, specialised studies in this field are important for my research. A. S. Henry's *Honours and privileges in Athenian decrees* (1983) is significant to the subject of the third part of my study, state honours and privileges. However, Henry concentrates on the formulae and pays little attention to the contents of the honorary decrees, the motivation clauses and the identities of the honorands. J. Pečírka's *The formula for the grant of enktesis in Attic inscriptions* (1966) is a similar case.

### *The research problems*

'Foreign resident' in the context of my study indicates a particular civic status, i.e. *metoikos* as long as the *metoikia* system survived.

My examination of the official status of the foreign residents of Athens is divided into three sections. Firstly, there are the obligations towards the state: primarily liability to pay taxes and perform military service. The second section concentrates on the rights that were connected to the public sphere of the life of the *polis*. This was essentially the citizens' arena, and therefore it was necessary to define what non-citizens were allowed and not allowed to do in this space. The central themes here are land ownership, juridical issues, public cults and mixed marriages. The third part of my examination is state honours and privileges, that is to say various types of commendations awarded by the assembly by honorary decrees, in return for services rendered to the state. These

could either have primarily an honorary nature or be tangible advantages, exemptions from the regular obligations or additional privileges to those normally enjoyed by representatives of the particular civic status. In this context it is necessary to note that certain private bodies could vote on and award minor honours such as crowns. An example is the private (religious) associations which flourished in Athens from the 4th century onwards. However, since these were indeed decisions of private bodies, the honours bestowed by the decrees will not be included in the examination.

The primary research question throughout my entire study will be the following: was the official status in the Hellenistic period based on contemporary regulations and official practices or merely traditions deriving from the Classical period? Thus, comparison of the state of things in the late Classical period and the changes and developments noticeable in the Hellenistic period is essential. How long did the *metoikia* system survive? What was the status of foreign residents like after the institution's disappearance? Was it a matter of *metoikia* being replaced with a different, equally comprehensive system, or was it simply the disappearance of the old system?

First in line are the foundations of the status of the *metoikos*/foreign resident: the political differentiation of citizens and non-citizens, the (official) terminology related to foreign residents, the procedure through which a foreigner arriving in Athens became a foreign resident (registration). Did political differentiation remain intact? Did the (official) terminology remain the same, or was there any specific terminology in existence in the Hellenistic period? These questions are important. The citizen/non-citizen division was essential in the world of the *polis* and the basis of all classification of civic statuses. The rights and obligations of foreigners living in Athens could only be defined if this division was properly specified.

From the foundations of the official status of the foreign residents I will move on to examine their economic obligations, namely their liability to taxation. The analysis will concentrate on three issues: two types of taxes/tolls, *metoikion* (metic tax) and *eisphorai*, and types of compulsory services called *leitourgiai*. There were other taxes in Athens, but references to other forms of taxation are scarce in the sources, and thus a systematic study of them is immensely difficult. My primary aim is, firstly, to specify, whether the foreigners' tax liability survived in the Hellenistic period in general, and secondly, whether and for how long the mentioned taxes and compulsory services survived: how the foreign residents' obligations developed regarding them and whether new kinds of taxes and obligatory services were introduced at any point. It is essential to contemplate not only the regulations regarding the economic obligations but also the practical arrangements.

Following the economic obligations is the military service obligation, with partially the same questions: were the foreign residents still compelled to perform military service still in the Hellenistic period? If yes, what changes took place? How did the roles of infantry, cavalry and navy develop, on one hand from the late Classical period to the Hellenistic period, on the other, during the Hellenistic era? Since foreign residents served in different military units to citizens in the Classical period, the survival or disappearance of this differentiation is a major point of interest. The conquered's freedom in military matters is the first thing a conqueror seeks to restrict, and thus the effect of Macedonian control on foreign residents' military service is of special concern.

The official rights of foreign residents were not necessarily integrated in the *metoikia* system but were nevertheless an essential part of their official status. They were to do with the foreigner's position in the public sphere, that is to say, the arena of citizenship. Public cults were state and *demos* cults in which only citizens had full right of participation. Since the foreigners of Athens could not be equal in comparison with citizens, it was necessary to define how exactly their position differed from that of the citizens in this sphere. Land ownership was a citizens' monopoly in Athens and everywhere in the Greek world. Mixed marriage was discouraged in the 5th century. It was formally illegalised by making the pretence of legal Athenian marriage a punishable offence. The intention was to make it difficult for a non-citizen to become part of the citizenry, in other words to enhance the strength of the citizenship laws: the law of Perikles (451/0) as well as the laws of the 4th century which defined that a child could obtain full citizen rights only if both his parents were Athenian, *astoi*. Since this was usually an impossibility in mixed marriages, the offspring of such marriages could not become citizens. Finally, defining the juridical rights of foreign residents was essential simply due to the important role of foreigners in Athens, especially for the economy of the *polis*. Guaranteeing the foreigners' access to the courts in the case of mistreatment was most likely (partly) designed to encourage them to stay in Athens for the benefit of the economy of the *polis*. The underlying basic division in the official rights was the one between citizens and non-citizens. For the basic functioning of the society it was unthinkable to leave such an important part of the population completely without rights. At the same time, foreigners could not be given the same rights as citizens. Again, it was also a matter of advantages: using these to encourage foreigners to remain in Athens and establish roots there. Due to the essential citizen/non-citizen division it is important to examine the changes and developments in the relations between citizens and foreign residents in the sphere of the official rights.

Regarding the state honours and privileges I will primarily concentrate on privileges that had a practical bearing on the status of foreign residents, i.e. the kinds of privileges that altered the grantee's official status in practice, providing either additional rights or exemptions from the normal obligations. Firstly, there are the specific metic privileges, only available to metics: *isoteleia* (tax equality with citizens), exemption from *metoikion*, and *eisphora* payment and military service equality with citizens. Being metic-specific, these privileges of course have a direct bearing on the subject of my research, and it is essential to study their survival and the changes that took place in the regulations and formulations, and the reasons for which they were awarded. The metic privileges are important in themselves but also for the study of the official obligations of foreign residents because they reflect changes in the obligations. Secondly, naturalization is essential because of the citizen/non-citizen division of the *polis* society. Thirdly, *enktesis* because of the fact that land was the most important source of income and wealth throughout antiquity, and the Greeks universally restricted ownership of land property to citizens. It is crucial to note that since citizenship and *enktesis* were general privileges, theoretically available to any foreigner whose benefactions were extensive enough, the changes in the laws, regulations, formulations and practices did not concern foreign residents alone but rather they were one group among many potential grantees. Nevertheless, *enktesis* and citizenship are important in this context, since foreign residents were actively involved in the life of society. Additionally,



though, it is necessary to consider whether the identity of foreign residents – as persons resident in Athens, not as representatives of a particular civic status – could have influence in the individual cases of in the individual cases of the awarding of citizenship or *enktesis*.

The reasons behind changes and developments in the rights and obligations of the foreign residents must be examined with a sufficiently broad approach. There are prevailing political (international and internal), economic, social and other conditions and circumstances but also ideological and other psycho-social issues. Among these are the importance of land in antiquity, specifically the citizen monopoly in land ownership, and the influence of these factors in people's thinking. There is the traditional tendency of the Athenians to assert themselves as the indigenous residents of Attica, reflected in a common myth, which is referred to by Pindar as early as in the 470's.<sup>24</sup> Another possible factor is the influence of Macedonian control in the form of the presence in Attica of foreigners who were beyond the reach of Athenian laws (primarily Macedonian troops). This kind of a presence helped create a new situation, and could be thought to have gradually influenced thinking so that the strict division into and specification of different classes with different rights and obligations was no longer considered necessary.

Finally, a notion about terminology. Studies written in the English-speaking world commonly use the term 'legislation' when dealing with issues like the themes in my study. However, I will try to avoid the term altogether. This is because the term may lead the reader to think of legislation in the modern sense, in the sense of collections of laws that authorities can refer to for the definite form of a law in problems of administration. This kind of thing did not exist in Athens. There were laws – the laws of Solon, the law of Perikles and so on – but law codes were not introduced until the Roman period. The Athenian system functioned on assembly enactments, established traditions and official practices. This is perhaps reflected in the dual meaning of the word *nomos*: 'a positive enactment, law, ordinance' but also 'usage, custom, convention.' I will use mostly use terms such as 'law', 'official practices' and 'regulations'.

### *Sources and methodological issues*

My primary sources are epigraphical, the inscriptions discovered in Attica. Although important in the Classical period, their role is emphasized when examining the Hellenistic period. This is because contemporary literary sources written in Athens have survived only in fragments or have not been preserved at all, whereas there is a wealth of epigraphical material. The most important types of inscriptions regarding the official status of foreign residents are the state decrees, especially honorary decrees awarding different types of honours and privileges to individuals or groups of people. I will use the honorary decrees in two ways: firstly, I will approach them as sources that reflect changes in the obligations of foreign residents (for example, the presence/disappearance of *isoteleia* implying the survival/disappearance of *metoikion*); secondly, I will examine the honorary decrees as themselves, as sources for the different honours and privileges available to foreign residents. Other state decrees are useful as well. The presence of

---

<sup>24</sup> Pi. O. 13.1–3.

foreigners in ephebic decrees reveals aspects of their access to the *ephebeia* institution. *Epidosis* decrees praising contributors collectively provide evidence of the survival of *epidoseis*. Apart from state decrees, some types of decrees of private groups are useable in studying the official status, in particular the honorary decrees of soldiers stationed in fortresses around Attica for their superiors. These reveal aspects of the prevailing military organisation. The great majority of individual foreign residents are known from inscriptions in grave *stelai*. In the majority of cases the only information provided is the deceased's name, which limits the usefulness of grave inscriptions to my research. Exceptions are grave inscriptions which feature an honorary title such as *isoteles* along with the deceased's name or a marriage of an Athenian to a foreigner. The former indicate that *isoteleia* was more common than the *isoteleia* decrees proper imply, the latter naturally provide evidence of mixed marriages.

Since I regularly compare the situation in the late Classical period to circumstances in the Hellenistic period, the literary sources of the 4th century are included in my research. Especially important are Aristotle (in particular, *Constitution of the Athenians*) and the speeches of Demosthenes and other orators. In the Hellenistic period, literary sources supplement epigraphical sources. Only fragments survive of the contemporary Athenian historical writings and other works, but these sometimes provide useful information. On the other hand, there are several authors who were influential later, or elsewhere, but who wrote about Athens or regularly referred to it. Thus for instance Polybius' histories, Pausanias' travel descriptions, Plutarch's biographies of Phokion and Demetrios Poliorketes, and Diogenes Laertius' biographies of eminent philosophers (the majority of whom were foreigners who were influential in Athens) will be consulted. Finally, lexicographers such as Hesychius, Pollux and Suda offer scattered but often important details about aspects of the official status of foreign residents as well as biographical details of different persons.

Due to the fact that my primary sources are epigraphical, my research method is predominantly philological. Full usage of inscriptions requires not only examination of the contents (what is said, what information provided) but also linguistic study (how things are expressed). For instance, it is important to differentiate whether a particular term appearing in an honorary decree has a special significance or is used in a more general sense. An example is the verb *λειτουργέω*, sometimes appearing in decrees. In Athens, *leitourgiai* were public compulsory services that individuals were expected to finance at their own expense. However, the verb also means 'to minister (as a priest)', 'to officiate'. Another example is the extremely fragmentary honorary decree for a Hermaios who was resident in Athens. Because the prescript of the decree has not been preserved, the document is dated broadly to the beginning of the 3rd century. Hermaios' services were of a financial and military nature and took place in different periods. These different periods are distinguished with verbs in different tempuses: what Hermaios did, has done and continues to do. The tempuses are important, and I will in fact suggest a new interpretation of the chronological context basing my hypothesis on the interpretation of the motivation clauses and the verbs tempuses. Generally speaking, inscriptions, and especially state decrees, require a somewhat different approach to literary sources: they are official documents that employ official, administrative language. Even though the grantee's benefactions are presented in the motivation clauses, they are listed rather than related in historical narrative. Unlike in the speeches

of the orators or in the travel accounts of Pausanias, there is no “author” whose background, ideologies, personal motives and so on are reflected in the language used.

Along with the prevailing philological methods, I will where possible approach the specific subject of study from a psychological-sociological point of view, that is to say, I will consider also ideologies and other ways of thinking that rise from the constructs and features of the society. To name some examples of this, the influence of ideological aspects on the different features of the official status of the foreign residents is visible in the fact that metics in the Classical period were required to pay a special tax, and the punishment for its avoidance was slavery. Since Athenian citizens were not required to pay the tax and could not be enslaved in any circumstance, there is also a strong ideological motivation in the stress on the foreign residents’ inferior status here.



## II. The obligations of the foreign residents towards the state in the Hellenistic period

The first main chapter of my study concentrates on the development of the obligations of the foreign residents of Athens towards the state, their tax paying and military service obligations, in the first approximately 200 years of the Hellenistic period. What kind of political, economic, cultural and social factors influenced the development? Were the obligations of the foreign residents in the Hellenistic period based on contemporary official practices or practices and traditions deriving from the Classical period? The obligations could be called the core of the *metoikia* institution, since it was through registration as *metoikos* that an individual became liable to pay taxes and perform military service. Prominent changes in the obligations reflect significant changes in the official status of the foreign residents. Thus, the question is: what does the development of the obligations reveal about the evolution of the *metoikia* institution in the Hellenistic period, in particular about its survival or disappearance?

My approach is partly chronological, partly systematic. The examination is divided broadly speaking into chronological phases, and the reasons for the definition of these phases will become evident in the text. Within these phases I will examine the different aspects of the obligations of foreign residents systematically.

To begin, it is necessary to discuss the foundations of the definition of the official status of foreign residents, the citizen/non-citizen division of the Athenian free population and the political segregation of citizens and non-citizens. As I already noted in the introduction, it was from this basis that the further definitions of the different civic statuses of the Athenian *polis* society sprung.

### 1. Political segregation of citizens and non-citizens survives for 200 years

The obvious basis of the definition of the official status of the foreign residents of Athens was the division of the free residents of the *polis* into citizens and non-citizens, and the restriction of political rights to the former. To quote Aristotle:

A citizen pure and simple is defined by nothing else so much as by the right to participate in judicial functions and in office.<sup>1</sup>

However, since there were a large number of residents in Athens who were free but did not have any of the above-mentioned rights and who, furthermore, had a significant influence in the life of the *polis*, it was necessary to define their rights and obligations. Since politics was the sphere of citizens, allowing foreigners to *phylai*, *demoi* and *phratriai* and to participate in politics would in practice have meant the eradication of all differences between citizens and non-citizens. That is why it is important to examine the evolution of the political status of foreign residents in the Hellenistic period.

---

<sup>1</sup> Arist. *Pol.* 1275a22–24: πολίτης δ' ἀπλῶς οὐδενὶ τῶν ἄλλων ὀρίζεται μᾶλλον ἢ τῷ μετέχειν κρίσεως καὶ ἀρχῆς. Transl. H. Rackham (Loeb).

## A new interpretation of *astoi* and *politai* in Athenian practices concerning access to citizenship

Our knowledge of Athenian laws, or practices, regarding citizenship – enactments defining who was entitled to be a citizen with full rights – comes from Aristotle:

And in the third year after him [Lysikrates], in the year of Antidotos [451/0], owing to the great number of *politai*, they learned from Perikles' words that a person would not be allowed to take part in the *polis* if he was not born of *astoi* on both sides.<sup>2</sup>

The nature of the *politeia* is now as follows. In the *politeia* take part those who are born of *astoi* on both sides,<sup>3</sup> and they are registered as members of the *demoi* when they have reached the age of eighteen.<sup>3</sup>

The terms used in the first excerpt, *astos* and *polites*, have traditionally been translated identically, meaning 'citizen', and thus the conclusion has been that in order for a child to be a citizen with full rights both of his parents were required to be Athenian citizens. The information supplied by Aristotle regarding the law of Perikles was cited much later by Plutarch and Aelian. The former uses the term 'Athenian': both parents were required to be Athenian for the child to be Athenian.<sup>4</sup> The latter mentions the law in two places and in the former of these places uses Aristotle's *astos/politeia* terminology, in the latter terms 'Athenian' and *astos*.<sup>5</sup>

Some years ago E. Cohen introduced a new interpretation of *astoi* and *politai* in his work *The Athenian Nation*. Referring to a large number of sources he concluded that *astoi* and *politai* were not identical in meaning. Instead, *astos* would have meant a local person in a geographical sense, distinguished from *polites*, which had the political meaning referring to a person who was entitled to take part in *politeia*. Thus, the Athenian citizenry would not have been as limited and closed a descent group as has been traditionally assumed but would have incorporated various kinds of persons who were not descended from citizens, but were considered 'local'.<sup>6</sup> If accepted, Cohen's arguments would signify a new, significant approach in the research of Athenian politics, law and administration. It would also be significant for my subject, the foreign residents of Athens, since the citizen/non-citizen division was the basis of the definition of their official status. Cohen has two points which would appear valid theoretically: 1) The excerpts of Aristotle deal with aspects of law, and it is to be expected that the language used in such context was definite. Therefore the two terms were not summarily used but specifically chosen because they meant different things. 2) There is not a single instance where the word *astos* replaces *polites* in an official, political

<sup>2</sup> Arist. *Ath.* 26.3: καὶ τρίτῳ μετὰ τοῦτον ἐπὶ Ἀντιδότου διὰ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν πολιτῶν Περικλέους εἰπόντος ἔγνωσαν μὴ μετέχειν τῆς πόλεως ὅς ἂν μὴ ἐξ ἀμφοῖν ἀστοῖν ᾦ γεγονώς. My translation.

<sup>3</sup> Arist. *Ath.* 42.1: Ἐχει δ' ἡ νῦν κατάστασις τῆς πολιτείας τόνδε τὸν τρόπον. μετέχουσιν μὲν τῆς πολιτείας οἱ ἐξ ἀμφοτέρων γεγονότες ἀστῶν, ἐγγράφονται δ' εἰς τοὺς δημότας ὀκτωκαίδεκα ἔτη γεγονότες. My translation.

<sup>4</sup> Plu. *Per.* 37.3: ἀκμάζων ὁ Περικλῆς ἐν τῇ πολιτείᾳ πρὸ πάντων πολλῶν χρόνων, καὶ παῖδας ἔχων, ὥσπερ εἴρηται, γνησίους, νόμον ἔγραψε μόνους Ἀθηναίους εἶναι τοὺς ἐκ δυνεῖν Ἀθηναίων γεγονότας.

<sup>5</sup> Ael. *VH.* 6.10: Περικλῆς στρατηγῶν Ἀθηναίους νόμον ἔγραψεν, εἰ μὴ τύχη τις ἐξ ἀμφοῖν ὑπάρχων ἀστῶν, τούτῳ μετεῖναι τῆς πολιτείας; 13.24: καὶ Περικλῆς ἔγραψε μὴ εἶναι Ἀθηναῖον, ὅς μὴ ἐξ ἀμφοῖν γέγονεν ἀστοῖν.

<sup>6</sup> See Cohen 2000, 50 ff.

context. However, otherwise Cohen's arguments have glaring omissions and shortcomings and are actually an incorrect interpretation of sources.

In seeking to define the significance of *astos* Cohen refers, firstly, to source references that contrast *astoi* and *xenoi* (foreigners) and points out the lack of instances where *politai* and *xenoi* are contrasted. Secondly he points out examples that seem to include *metoikoi* in *astoi*. Thirdly, according to him, there are sources where *metoikoi* are differentiated from *xenoi*.

The problem in E. Cohen's first point is that practically all the sources he cites have a non-political, unofficial context. They talk about 'locals' and 'outsiders' in the sense of merely addressing the presence of those who lived locally and those who were just visiting Attica (for instance Th. 4.90.1 and 4.94.1), or of emphasizing the difference between the two because of personal motivations (for instance various speeches of Demosthenes). These kinds of source references have a completely different context to Aristotle's descriptions of Athenian laws and they cannot be taken as evidence of what *astos* meant in the latter context.

At least one of the references which Cohen claims to represent cases where *metoikoi* are included in *astoi* is translated incorrectly by him. In *Vect.* 2.2 Xenophon says the following:

ἐπιμέλεια γε μὴν ἢδ' ἂν ἄρκεῖν μοι δοκεῖ, εἰ ἀφέλοιμεν μὲν ὅσα μηδὲν ὠφελοῦντα τὴν πόλιν ἀτιμίας δοκεῖ τοῖς μετοίκους παρέχειν, ἀφέλοιμεν δὲ καὶ τὸ συστρατεύεσθαι ὁπλίτας μετοίκους τοῖς ἀστοῖς.<sup>7</sup>

In Cohen's opinion the last five words mean that the metics, *metoikoi hoplitai*, are subsumed in the *astoi*<sup>8</sup> but in fact the correct translation differentiates *metoikoi hoplitai* and *astoi* as two different groups.

Cohen's third point, the examples where *metoikoi* are differentiated from *xenoi*, is accurate but only in one sense. In these examples (like Aesch. 1.195) *metoikoi* are indeed differentiated from *xenoi* but the point is differentiating the former as a specific civic status from the latter who were outside the authority of Athenian laws, not contrasting 'insiders' and 'outsiders' in the same sense as in the source references that contrast *astoi* and *xenoi*.

The fact that the sources used by E. Cohen are not really valid for determining the significance of *astos* in Aristotle also undermines his argument that the two terms, *astos* and *polites*, were specifically used for their different meanings. In the end he is not able to give a precise definition of who in Athens were *astoi* and who were not. For metics, he says that 'some but far from all' metics were considered *astoi*, mentioning the specific example of a metic *astos* the famous banker Pasion, a former slave who was subsequently naturalized. But Pasion was certainly an exception. He might have been accepted as a 'local' in a social sense, but would not have been an *astos* in the sense that he was not eligible for citizenship due to his background as a slave. Pasion's naturalization had nothing to do with him being an *astos*. Rather he was naturalized

<sup>7</sup> 'It seems to me sufficient care presently, if we took away such (duties) that are not useful to the state and seem to put disgrace on *metoikoi*, and thus took away also the fighting of *metoikoi hoplitai* with *astoi*.' (= the military service of *metoikoi*). My translation.

<sup>8</sup> Cohen 2000, 57.

because he was a banker who generously provided public services from his own wealth.<sup>9</sup>

It is necessary to point out that even if *astos* did have a different meaning than *polites* in Perikles' time – this would have been logical since the purpose of the law of Perikles was to limit the size of the citizenry – it is not at all certain that the two terms were still being used with equal consistency in the latter half of the 4th century. Circumstances by this time were so different that it is entirely possible that the two terms had begun to be used inconsistently and summarily, often as synonyms. However, if E. Cohen's basic argument was accepted, I feel that the Athenians would have had a specific definition for *astos* in the context of the practices and regulations concerning access to citizenship. Since the scrutiny of future *politai* was the responsibility of *demos* members, they would have needed some kind of commonly accepted, established guidelines. In my opinion a specific definition would be found in the sources. In speech 57 of the Demosthenic corpus Eubulides' right to citizenship is questioned: his father is claimed to have been a *xenos*, not an *astos*, because, for one thing, he spoke with a foreign accent. Eubulides defends himself by saying that nevertheless his father was Athenian, *astos*. He was captured abroad and sold as a slave and thus was forced to spend a long time away from Athens. Caution must be taken due to the rhetoric, but couldn't this not be taken to imply that an *astos* was someone who was born in Athens? If so, a child was eligible for citizenship with full rights if both his parents were born in Athens. These requirements would have in practice excluded the children of most metics from citizenship. While they themselves might have been born in Athens, more often than not at least one of their parents would not have been. Thus, even if Cohen's basic argument was accepted, it would not change my study in any significant way.

### No foreigners in elective offices still in the Hellenistic age

There are thousands of epigraphic documents from the chronological limits of my study, 322–120, displaying persons in various kinds of official capacity. These have been published in *corpora* and monographs such as *IG*, *SEG* and *Agora* vols. XV and XVI, as well as periodicals like *Hesperia*. Honorary and other state inscriptions name the eponymous *archon* (in the dating), the prytany secretary, the spokesman, the person who made the motion and so on. Honorary decrees for citizens give detailed accounts of the careers of these persons, involving various offices and magistracies of different kinds. There are numerous *prytaneia* decrees which include the list of the members of the particular *prytaneia*. Soldiers stationed in garrisons honour the *strategos* in charge of the particular defence zone. In private dedications, a person is seen dedicating something while serving in one office or another. The list goes on. But all the documents have one thing in common: there is not a single instance where the named holder of an office elected by lot or through some other regular system of election is identifiable as foreigner – denominated with *ethnikon* rather than *demotikon*. Neither is there a single case where a foreigner would appear in other political functions that were monopolized by citizens, such as participating in assembly or court sessions.

---

<sup>9</sup> [D.] 59.2.



Considering both the wealth of epigraphic documents and the number of foreigners who lived in Athens more or less permanently, this lack of foreigners in any official function is very unlikely to have been a coincidence. The latest figures of the number of foreign residents come from the census of Demetrios (10 000 – compared to that of citizens, 21 000),<sup>10</sup> but Athens seemed to have a relatively high number of non-citizen residents throughout the Hellenistic period. Since there is such a wealth of documents which feature some office holder or assembly participant, there should be at least some cases where such a person is a foreigner, if foreigners gained access to these functions at some point.

There are, however, some cases where a foreigner appears in some kind of a public role. But were these actually elective offices? If they were, could they be seen as a sign of the weakening of the political segregation of citizens and non-citizens?

At first glance the instructors of *epheboi* would seem to be an exception to the rule that disallowed foreigners from holding elective offices. A foreigner is featured among the instructors in three honorary inscriptions for *epheboi*, their commander and instructors. The first of these inscriptions is from the late Classical period, 332/1. The decree lists two teachers (*didaskalos*), one of whom is a foreigner, Agathanor of Syracuse.<sup>11</sup> The second inscription is dated to 266/5 and includes as instructor of archery (*toxotes*) the Cretan Sondros.<sup>12</sup> The latest of the three documents originates from 127/6 and features Nikon of Berytos as training master (*paidotribes*) and Sotades of Soloi as instructor in hoplite weapons (*hoplomachos*).<sup>13</sup>

It seems, however, that the ephebic instructors were not a part of the category of public offices in the sense that they were not chosen by lot or other regular methods of filling offices. The *epheboi* had different instructors for different types of weapons. Thus it is likely that the instructors were chosen on the basis of their qualifications. The surviving honorary decrees of *epheboi* span quite evenly from the 4th century to the Roman period. The scarcity of foreign instructors is perhaps made explicable by the fact that it was less likely to find a foreigner than a citizen with the required qualifications for the task in question. One reason for this might have been the fact that foreigners were not themselves allowed in the ephebic training, where youths received training in the use of weapons and other military skills. On the other hand, a citizen was certainly preferred to instruct the boys, if a choice could be made between a citizen and a foreigner. The conclusion is confirmed by the fact that the earliest inscription featuring a foreigner among the instructors is from the late Classical period. In the Classical period foreigners were definitely not allowed to hold elective offices. Also, nowhere in the numerous ephebic decrees is it stated that the teachers were elected to their task. The only mention of election concerns the *kosmetes*, the commander of the ephebic corps, who is praised in the decrees for performing his duties with merit having been elected as *kosmetes*.<sup>14</sup>

<sup>10</sup> Ath. 6.272c.

<sup>11</sup> SEG XLI 107, ll. 10–11: Ἀγαθάνορα Συρακόσιον.

<sup>12</sup> IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 665+SEG XXXVIII 78, ll. 28–29. The editor of IG II/III<sup>2</sup>, J. Kirchner, dated the decree to 282/1, taking the *archon* of the decree Nikias of Otryne as Nikias II, eponymous *archon* in 282/1. Later Nikias of Otryne was placed to 266/5. E.g. Pritchett, Meritt 1940, xix. Osborne 1985, 277–278.

<sup>13</sup> SEG XV 104, ll. 39, 137–138, 270–273, 275–278.

<sup>14</sup> E.g. SEG XV 104, ll. 81–82: Ἀπολλώνιος Σο[νν]ιεύς χειροτον[θ]είς κοσμητῆς. The accent on the last syllable of the last word is as restored in the edition.

## Full citizen status of children of mixed marriages 229/8 weakens political segregation

In his study on naturalization in Athens M. J. Osborne noted that from ca. 229/8 onwards naturalization decrees no longer specified that the descendants of the naturalized citizens should also be citizens. This stipulation had been standard since the 380's and until 229, had been necessary to ensure citizenship to the children of foreign mothers, that is to say the wives that the naturalized men had brought with them from their home states, because a husband's naturalization did not affect the status of his wife.<sup>15</sup> In turn, D. Ogden took the omission of the stipulation about the descendants as a sign of other changes which meant that the children of Athenian citizen men and foreign women were henceforth automatically citizens with full rights.<sup>16</sup> I believe both scholars' conclusions are correct: I can see no other way of explaining the development in the naturalization decrees. The numerous cases of mixed marriages featured in grave inscriptions as well as the cases of the citizen offspring of mixed marriages, where the mother was a foreigner, noted by C. Vatin and Ogden,<sup>17</sup> support the arguments. The instances of a citizen offspring of mixed marriage, according to these scholars are as follows:

1) *IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 9975* (mid-2nd century): Μεθύλλιον Θεστίου Μυριναία, Ἡγεμάχου Λευκονοέως γυνή

*IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 2332* (183/2), l. 38: Ἡγέμαχος Λευκον[οεύ]ς

*IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 6720* (2nd/1st century): Ἀνδρέας Ἡγεμάχου Λευκονοεύς

Here, Hegemachos from the *demos* of Leukonoion, who also appears in a list of participants in *epidosis* (2332), was married to Methyllion from the city of Myrine. They had a son called Andreas.

2) *IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 9968* (2nd century): Κασταλία Δημητρίου Μιτυληναία, Ἑρμαγόρου Στειριέως γυνή

*IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 1011* (106/5), ll. 121–123: τὸν γραμματέα Καλλίαδην Ἑρμαγόρου Στειριέα (see also l. 29)

This case presents us with the marriage of Hermagoros from the *demos* of Steiria and Kastalia from the city of Mytilene (9968), which produced a son, Kalliades, who was secretary of *epheboi* in the last decade of the 2nd century (1011).

3) *IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 8581* (2nd century): Ἀρχιάνασσα Νικάνδρου Ἡρακλεῶτις, Λευκίππου Φρεαρρίου γυνή

*IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 7726* (2nd century): Νίκανδρος Λευκίππου Φρεάρριος

*IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 7721* (1st century): Ἀρχιάνασσα Νικάνδρου Φρεαρρίου θυγάτηρ, Ἀντιγόνου Κυδαθηναίως γυνή

Both Vatin and Ogden interpret these three inscriptions incorrectly. They conclude that Archianassa, daughter of Nikandros from the *demos* of Phrearrhoi (7721), was the daughter of the earlier Archianassa of Herakleia and Leukippos of the *demos* Phrearrhoi (8581). This obviously cannot be the case, since the later Archianassa's father is

<sup>15</sup> Osborne 1981–1983, IV, 152–153.

<sup>16</sup> Ogden 1996, 82.

<sup>17</sup> Vatin 1970, 125–126. Ogden 1996, 81–82.

Nikandros, not Leukippos. It seems that Vatin accidentally took Nikandros, the father of the earlier Archianassa, as her husband, and Ogden copied Vatin's suggestions, despite printing the correct English translation in a footnote. The argument about the citizen offspring of a mixed marriage itself is, however, valid in this case, if we take Nikandros, son of Leukippos, of Phrearrhoi in 7726 to be the offspring of the marriage of 8581, and the later Archianassa in 7721 as the daughter of this Nikandros. J. Kirchner notes the connection between the three inscriptions as well, but did not venture to make conclusions about the exact nature of the relationship between the persons.

If E. Cohen's new interpretation of the meaning of *astos* and *polites* in Aristotle was accepted, it would bring a difference of shade to M.J. Osborne's and D. Ogden's conclusions but would not change the content in any significant measure: whether or not *astos* was identical with *polites*, the issue is the status of the descendants, whether or not they qualified as full citizens. The wives of the naturalized men, who in most cases had not lived in Athens or even visited there prior to their naturalization, would not have been *astai*, and therefore any descendants of such unions would not have qualified as full citizens. Therefore the stipulation about the descendants was necessary: This would have of course applied to naturalized men who had been residents of Athens prior to their naturalization, at least if they had married prior to their arrival at Athens. Ogden addresses the issue of mixed marriages in this context. I will address the issue in detail later, but some points need to be made in this context. The evidence of the source, [D.] 59, speaks of the cohabitation of an *astos/aste* and a foreigner. Since usually *astos* has been taken to be identical in meaning with *polites*, the content of the speech has usually been taken to mean that marriage of citizens and foreigners was either forbidden or illegal. Thus Ogden also talks of marriages of citizens and foreigners. As will be seen later, the validity of the speech as a source is questionable, but whether it is valid or not and whatever is its correct interpretation, this is actually insignificant in this context: the issue is the status of the descendants of mixed marriages, and whether *astos* was identical in meaning with *polites* or not, it is still the fact the descendants could not be citizens with full rights.

What changes after 229/8 is indeed the status of the descendants as D. Ogden correctly concludes. If one accepts E. Cohen's interpretation of the meaning of *astos*, this would mean that either the foreign spouses were now accepted as *astoi/astai* or that the requirement of *astos* parentage on both sides had been abandoned and the offspring could be citizens with full rights even if only one of their parents was *astos*.

One must of course be careful in making conclusions about the connections between names appearing in short inscriptions like those in grave *stelai*, but the dating as well as the names and *demotika* of the persons involved in the three cases described above fit perfectly to the observation that they were indeed cases of citizen offspring of mixed marriages. Now, if the children of mixed marriages were automatically full citizens from 229/8 onward, this represents a remarkable weakening of the political segregation of citizens and non-citizens. It did not affect the foreign party in a mixed marriage: in all the known cases the woman is the foreign spouse. Even Athenian women did not have political rights in Athens, and the foreign wife remained a foreigner whatever the status of her husband. However, the change made it easier for the (male) offspring of mixed marriage to integrate into the citizenry and obtain political rights.

### The division between citizen and non-citizen becomes irrelevant

The change in naturalization regulations after 229/8 was significant in the weakening of the political segregation of citizens and non-citizens in the sense that the children born of mixed marriages were henceforth automatically citizens with full rights. The next major change took place sometime before 120. This development seems to have rendered the citizen/non-citizen division irrelevant even if it did not officially abolish that division.

By 120 the sons of wealthy foreign families gained admittance to the *ephebeia*, through which they apparently became full citizens.<sup>18</sup> From about this date the *ephebe* lists in the honorary decrees for *epheboi* include people of foreign origin. The earliest decree including foreign names is dated to 122/1. It contains 14 foreign *epheboi* from various places: Rome, Pergamon, Temnos, Salamis (of Cyprus), Miletos, Seleukeia, Karystos, Thebes, Odessos and Eretria.<sup>19</sup> Thereafter foreign names appear in *ephebic* lists regularly.

The change in *ephebeia* seems to have coincided with a change in the regulations regarding naturalization. In the place of services performed to the state, the person's own desire to gain citizenship, and his wealth, became the main qualifications for the granting of citizenship.<sup>20</sup>

These two changes did not mean that all foreigners were henceforth to be automatically citizens. This can be seen from private grave stones for centuries after this. Just as before, we find Athenian citizens with the traditional *demotikon* and foreigners with *ethnikon* instead of *demotikon*. However, the development did mean that wealth had replaced citizenship as the primary determining factor of an individual's status. The citizen/non-citizen division survived officially: only Athenian citizens were allowed to be members of *demoi*, *phylai* and *phratriai*, and could be elected as magistrates. But since anyone with enough wealth and the desire to become a citizen could become one, being an Athenian citizen did not have the significance it originally had.

The developments affecting the political segregation of citizens and non-citizens that I have described were not the only changes that took place in the Hellenistic period in the political sphere. For instance, the constitution of Athens changed several times. However, this primarily affected citizens. The developments that I have described changed the political status of the foreigners living in Athens in making it significantly easier for people of non-Athenian origin to integrate into the *polis* not only socially but also politically. I will now move on to examine the development of the other aspects of the official status of the foreign residents of Athens, their obligations towards the state and their rights in the public sphere. Did these develop analogously with their political position?

<sup>18</sup> Osborne 1981–1983, IV, 144.

<sup>19</sup> IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 1006+SEG XXXVIII 114 (122/1). It is interesting to note that in the decree the foreign *epheboi* were not listed under *phylai* like the Athenian ones, but under the title *xenoi* at the end of the list. There was probably a practical reason for this: the honorary decrees for *epheboi* were passed before the end of the training, thus before the *epheboi* became citizens with full rights. Athenian sons were enrolled into *phylai* and *demoi* after birth and thus could be listed under *phylai*. The same could not, of course, apply to the foreign youths.

<sup>20</sup> Osborne 1981–1983, IV, 144.

## 2. The late-4th and early-3rd century: continuity of *metoikia*

The existence in Classical Athens of a system that defined and regulated the status of a *metoikos* and the rights and obligations connected to that status is confirmed by the fact that the term *metoikia* appears in the sources of the era precisely in this sense.<sup>21</sup> Some of the laws concerning the foreign residents applied to foreigners in general, not only to those who lived in Athens, others concerned foreign residents as well as citizens. But it is clear that there was a unified system that applied to every foreign resident settling permanently in Athens or staying there beyond a certain time limit. This system also defined their obligations and rights in a different way to both citizens and non-resident foreigners.

In short, a foreigner who settled in Athens became *metoikos*, a metic, through registration. In the 5th century this presupposed permanent settlement. In the 4th century registration was required if the person in question remained beyond a regulated, relatively short time.<sup>22</sup> A metic had to have an Athenian citizen as a kind of protector and representative (*prostates*).<sup>23</sup> In the registration the metic was inscribed as resident in the *demos* of his choice.<sup>24</sup> Foreign residents paid a special metic tax, *metoikion*.<sup>25</sup> Besides this, metics like citizens had to pay *eisphorai*, emergency taxes,<sup>26</sup> and wealthy foreigners were required to participate in the costs of various public projects on their own account (*leitourgiai*).<sup>27</sup> Like citizens, they were liable to military service, which could be performed in the infantry or as a rower in the fleet.<sup>28</sup> The background of the obligations of the foreign residents of Athens is likely to have been the idea that residency in Athens was already a privilege in itself. Since the citizens had obligations of various kinds, it was natural that the foreigners were expected on their part to work for the good of the *polis* in return for this privilege. The Athenians had a strong tendency to assert themselves as the original, autochthonous residents of Athens. This ideological view has an obvious connection to the idea that for non-autochthonous people coming to Athens the simple fact of residency there was a privilege.

Metics were entitled to appeal to the law courts of Athens. The common view holds that the marriages of citizens and foreigners were discouraged in the 5th century, and formally illegalised by the mid-4th century.<sup>29</sup> The right of participation in public cults (those of the state or *demoi*) was very limited, but outside of these the state did not restrict or limit religious life.<sup>30</sup> Metics could not own land unless they received a special privilege (*enktesis*). They might also gain other privileges such as equal taxation with citizens (*isoteleia*), the right to serve in the same military units as citizens, pay *eisphorai*

<sup>21</sup> Lys. 6.49. Appears also in the general sense of settlement or residence in a foreign city in A. Eu. 1018 and Pl. Lg. 850c. See also Liddell-Scott 1121.

<sup>22</sup> Ar. Byz. 305. Gauthier 1972, 117–118. Whitehead 1977, 9. There are various estimates on the length of this 'defined' time. It might have been, for instance, a couple of months.

<sup>23</sup> Arist. Pol. 1275.a11. Harp. π 105. Harrison 1968, 193. Gauthier 1972, 126–134. Whitehead 1977, 90–91. Todd 1994, 133.

<sup>24</sup> E.g. Todd 1997, 118.

<sup>25</sup> Harp. μ 27. Poll. 3.55. Suid. μ 819. See also Gauthier 1972, 122. Whitehead 1977, 76. Todd 1997, 113.

<sup>26</sup> Gauthier 1972, 122. Whitehead 1977, 78.

<sup>27</sup> Todd 1997, 113.

<sup>28</sup> Whitehead 1977, 83–86.

<sup>29</sup> MacDowell 1978, 87. Rhodes 1981, 332. Carey 1992, 3–4. Kapparis 1999, 27. Hamel 2003, x–xi.

<sup>30</sup> Whitehead 1977, 86–89.

equally with citizens, even the right to citizenship. Generally speaking the *metoikia* system did not become more lenient at any point in the Classical period. When Alexander the Great died *metoikia* seems to have been in full force.<sup>31</sup>

As will be seen later, the sources indicate that in the last two decades of the 4th century the system regulating the official status of the foreigners living in Athens remained intact. The same conclusion is reached by an examination of the general events in Athens at this time: it seems that neither the Macedonians who controlled Athens externally nor the Athenian politicians of this epoch had the motivation to interfere in the functioning of the system.

### The metic titles and terms

The official denomination of the Athenian metic was the οἰκῶν/οἰκοῦσα ἐν -formula<sup>32</sup> plus the name of residential *demos*. This indicated that the metic was registered as resident. Citizens were members of *demoi*, and membership was for life even if they lived in the area of another *demos*. Thus their names always have *demotikon* (*demos* of membership) along with the first name and *patronymikon* (father's name). The metic formula was always an individual denomination. It was never used collectively and in the plural. It is not used in literary sources, but only in official documents: the assembly decrees. It does not always appear in the latter case either: for instance in the honorary decrees of individual metics the recipient is indicated with first name, *patronymikon* and *ethnikon* (city of origin). However, the metic formula appears often enough in the official context to allow us to verify that it indeed was the official denomination of metics. This is compatible with the information provided by lexicographers about the registration system.<sup>33</sup>

The latest datable examples of the metic formula are the so-called *phialai exeleutherikai* texts<sup>34</sup> of the 320's, which appear to be connected to manumission of slaves. The typical form in them is a formulation of two to three lines, where the name of the former master is indicated by first name, *patronymikon* and *demotikon* and that of the former slave by first name and the metic formula.<sup>35</sup>

Even though the metic formula does not appear in sources dated after 322, other references indicate that the *metoikia* system did not disappear. There are no documents at a later date which would have required the usage of the official formula. The formula would have been used in documents like the *phialai exeleutherikai* texts mentioned above. However, the survival of these documents is a lucky coincidence. The texts are a special case: lists of all the liturgists of a given year added to the previously existing institution of manumission, in which the manumission was carried out by a fictitious process of ἀποστασίον. To this was added the compulsory dedication of a *phiale*.<sup>36</sup> This *phiale* might have been either a kind of a registration fee for the manumission,<sup>37</sup> or

<sup>31</sup> This is indicated by the Aristotelian *Athenaion politeia*, written in the 320's.

<sup>32</sup> I will mostly use the expression 'metic formula'.

<sup>33</sup> Harp. μ 7. Suid. μ 820.

<sup>34</sup> Φιάλαι ἐξελευθερικά. IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 1553–1578.

<sup>35</sup> See also Todd 1997, 120–121.

<sup>36</sup> Lewis 1959, 237. *Idem* 1968, 376.

<sup>37</sup> *Idem* 1959, 237.

a way in which Lykourgos and his associates sought to strengthen public devotion and increase public finances by imposing a dedication of liturgists.<sup>38</sup>

Another term used for metics in the sources is *metoikos*. This was not official in nature, but rather a technical term indicating residency in Athens. It was normally used collectively and in the plural. This is seen for instance in the decrees which deal with refugees who were to become metics: the decrees state that the refugees are to be given the same obligations and rights as all the *metoikoi* of Athens.<sup>39</sup> The latest mention of *metoikoi* in literary sources is found in Athenaeus who tells us about the general census of Demetrios of Phaleron in the 310's. This census arrived in the figure of 21 000 for citizens and 10 000 for *metoikoi*.<sup>40</sup> The latest epigraphic reference to the word *metoikoi* is IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 554, from 307–304. The decree praises Euxenides of Phaselis for, among other things, the scrupulous payment of all the *eisphorai* that the assembly had allotted to the *metoikoi*.<sup>41</sup>

### The references to *metoikion* and *isoteleia*

Further evidence of the continuity of the *metoikia* system in the last two decades of the 4th century, in addition to the presence of metic terminology in the sources, is provided by the references to *metoikion*: apart from the information provided by lexicographers,<sup>42</sup> there is the *ἀτέλεια* τοῦ μετοικίου privilege, a common feature in honorary decrees of individual metics in the Classical period. This privilege awarded the recipient exemption from *metoikion*. The latest instance of this is IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 545 from 321/0 or the 310's, after 318/7. Exemption from the metic tax was granted to Thessalian refugees.

All metics paid a special metic tax, *metoikion*. This was an exceptional form of taxation in Athens: a direct tax, payable regularly and directed at the individual, whereas all the taxes paid by citizens were either irregular emergency taxes (*eisphorai*), or were directed at property. All the metics paid an identical, annual sum – men 12 drachmae, independent women (those without a male *kyrios*) 6 drachmae – regardless of the size of their property. The payment apparently took place in monthly installments.<sup>43</sup> As there were a large number of metics in Athens, the tax brought significant revenues to the state. The other significance was ideological: it emphasized the privileged status of citizens compared to foreign residents. The punishment for the avoidance of its payment was extremely harsh: enslavement.<sup>44</sup> A citizen could not become slave under any circumstance, a fact that had existed since Solon abolished debt bondage in 594/3.<sup>45</sup> From the contemporary point of view such a severe punishment for the mere avoidance of paying a tax may be difficult to understand. However, it should be understood in the light of the Athenians' conviction of the superior status of citizens. Metics who did not

<sup>38</sup> *Idem* 1968, 376.

<sup>39</sup> For instance IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 211 (348/7) and 237 (338/7).

<sup>40</sup> Ath. 6.272c.

<sup>41</sup> IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 554, ll. 9–12: εἰσφορὰς ἀπ[άσ]ας ὅσας ἐνήφισται ὁ δῆμος εἰ[ς]ενεγκεῖν τοὺς μετοίκους ἐ[ὐ]τάκτως [ε]ἰσενήνοχεν.

<sup>42</sup> Harp. μ 27. Poll. 3.55. Suid. μ 819

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.* Whitehead 1977, 75–76 and Todd 1997, 113–114.

<sup>44</sup> D. 25.57. Whitehead 1977, 76.

<sup>45</sup> Harrison 1971, 77. Ste. Croix 1983, 162, 282. The latter notes that the abolition meant the prohibition of both enslaving for debt and any form of debt bondage. He continues that Athens was an exception in this sense: it is virtually certain that forms of debt bondage existed in all times in the great majority of Greek cities.

pay the tax were defrauding the state treasury, and more importantly were seen as deliberately attempting to breach the status-barriers between metic and citizen.<sup>46</sup>

Although the latest direct reference to *metoikion* is from 321/0 or the 310's, and in the surviving literary sources written in or dealing with the time after 322 there are no references to the metic tax, this does not mean that the tax was no longer in existence after the 310's. The usage of the word *metoikos*, a term connected to *metoikia*, at a later date, in my view indicates the survival of *metoikion*. Since the tax was a central part of the entire *metoikia* system, it would not have been logical to abolish the tax while retaining the rest of the system.

Perhaps more reliable indirect evidence is provided by the grant of *isoteleia* to two foreigners in an inscription dated to the very end of the 4th century.<sup>47</sup> *Isoteleia* was one of the most important honours that could be given to metics for services to the state, it was a fiscal privilege that gave the recipient equal tax-paying obligations to the citizens. It guaranteed exemption from *metoikion*, perhaps from some other taxes as well.<sup>48</sup> Since *isoteleia* and exemption from the metic tax were in existence at the same time but never granted in the same decree, *isoteleia* must have been more comprehensive in nature and more significant than the mere exemption from *metoikion*. Thus the inscriptions from the very end of the century indicate that the foreign residents of Athens still paid the metic tax.

### Differentiated *eisphora* payment and military service

*Metoikion* was not the only fiscal obligation of metics: they were, like citizens, required to pay *eisphorai*, emergency taxes. Furthermore the payment of taxes was only one part of the obligations of the foreign residents of Athens, another part being military service. Payment of *eisphorai* and the performance of military service were two different kinds of obligations. However, in relation to the survival of the Classical *metoikia* system in the early Hellenistic period, it is logical to examine them under the same heading; because both the *eisphora* payment and the military service of the foreign residents were organized in a different way to the corresponding obligations of the citizens. In the Athenian honours category there was a privilege which in the same clause gave a foreign resident the right to both perform military service and pay *eisphorai* in the same way as citizens. Thus, as long as this privilege appears in honorary decrees, it is safe to say that these two obligations were organized in a different way for citizens and foreign residents. This, in turn, can be taken as a sign of the continued existence of the Classical *metoikia*, since the idea of the system was both to define specific obligations for foreign residents (such as *metoikion*) and to delineate their responsibilities in a different way in view of the obligations that concerned both citizens and foreign residents (other taxes, military service etc.).

<sup>46</sup> Whitehead 1977, 76. Todd 1997, 115. There were in Athens types of public indictment that concerned a deliberate attempt to breach the status barrier between citizen and foreigner and for which the punishment was the same as for avoiding *metoikion*: enslavement. One of these was γραφή ξενίας, masquerading as citizen. Another was γραφή ἀπροστασίου, failure to produce a *prostates*. Harrison 1971, 165.

<sup>47</sup> IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 505 (302/1).

<sup>48</sup> Whitehead 1977, 11–12.



*Eisphora payment and military service of metics in the Classical period*

*Eisphorai* were emergency taxes directed at property. At least initially they were decreed by the assembly only and their purpose was to cover military costs the city was not prepared for.<sup>49</sup> The *eisphora* system is best known in the 4th century, after the reform of 378. The assembly decided on the size of the tax sum on each occasion, and payment took place in groups called *symmoriai*. Very soon the *proeisphora* practice was introduced: the 300 richest citizens paid the entire sum beforehand and collected the money from others.<sup>50</sup> The assessment of the property – specifically land property – of the *proeispherontes* was not conducted by the state. It was rather the individual's responsibility to declare his property.<sup>51</sup> The *proeisphora* system was certainly still in existence in the 320's.<sup>52</sup> Metics seem to have been liable to pay a sixth of the tax in each case.<sup>53</sup> They paid their share according to their own *symmoriai*,<sup>54</sup> and apparently the *symmoria* as well the amount of money to be paid by each metic depended on his wealth.<sup>55</sup> The metic *symmoriai* had their own officials, who received the payments.<sup>56</sup>

In the Classical period it was the duty of each metic to perform military service in some way. Foreigners were not allowed to serve in the cavalry. Cavalry service was traditionally the business of the wealthy due to the costs and traditions involved: The aristocracy had long-established traditions in relation to the cavalry. Furthermore, the state did not provide mounts for the cavalrymen, and thus only the aristocracy could afford raising horses.<sup>57</sup> Wealthy metics could in theory have been allowed to join the cavalry. The problem was that without the *enktesis* privilege they could not own land.<sup>58</sup> The inaccessibility of cavalry to foreigners is explained precisely by the elite nature of the cavalry, the importance of the ownership of land property in antiquity and the ideals of the upper classes concerning land property and their own status. Throughout antiquity, land was the most important form of property and the principal source of income. It was considered the ideal form of wealth, and in fact in common parlance 'wealth' was essentially wealth in land from the Archaic era to Roman times. For the upper classes land ownership was the essential quality of a gentleman. If we consider the political elite, the ruling classes of all the Greek states in the Classical period were

<sup>49</sup> Hakkarainen 1997, 11.

<sup>50</sup> Thomsen 1964, 205–206. Hakkarainen 1997, 11. Although there certainly were rich metics in Athens, they could not become *proeispherontes*: wealth in connection with *proeisphorai* was defined as the amount of land property. Metics could not own land without special privilege. As to why land property was meant in the context is due to the fact that land was the most important source of income and thereby considered the ideal form of wealth throughout antiquity. Ste. Croix 1983, 78, 120–123.

<sup>51</sup> Finley 1950, 14.

<sup>52</sup> Thomsen 1964, 212.

<sup>53</sup> *Ibid.* 100. Whitehead 1977, 79.

<sup>54</sup> Thomsen 1964, 225.

<sup>55</sup> Whitehead 1977, 79–80.

<sup>56</sup> Thomsen 1964, 247. Whitehead 1977, 78.

<sup>57</sup> Carlton 1977, 192.

<sup>58</sup> Until the early classical period the size of the Athenian cavalry was ca. 300 men. The cavalrymen came from the aristocratic families in which equestrian activities had long traditions. In mid-5th century the size of the cavalry was increased to 1000 men, which forced the state to recruit also from the families that were less wealthy and did not have equestrian traditions. As a result, a system of loans for the purchase of a cavalry horse was established. However, wealth did not lose its significance: the cavalryman was expected to pay back the loan after resigning from service. The fitness of the mounts for the cavalry was examined regularly, and if a particular mount did not pass the examination, the cavalryman was expected to purchase a new one at his own expense if he intended to continue service. Bugh 1988, *passim*.

primarily landowners.<sup>59</sup> Thus it is logical to assume that the wealth of the prospective cavalrymen was defined specifically in terms of the amount of land they owned. An additional factor that restricted cavalry service to citizens may well have been the fact that it was by nature an honorific service, as Finley notes, referring to Xenophon.<sup>60</sup> Since cavalry service remained inaccessible to foreigners in the Hellenistic period too, I will not return to the subject.<sup>61</sup>

With the cavalry being unavailable to foreign residents, the alternatives for military service were the infantry and the navy. In the former the metics were divided into heavily-armed *hoplitai* and lightly-armed auxiliary troops according to the same principles as the citizens, that is to say, according to wealth: everyone had to pay for his equipments himself, so the wealthier ones became *hoplitai*, whilst the poorer ones became auxiliary soldiers. Metics served in separate units, which were part of the territorial army and mainly used for defence. In the background seems to have been the question of loyalty: metics retained the citizenship of their home city, so their willingness to put themselves in danger in military campaigns and in direct battle was doubted. In the navy metics could perform military service as rowers. The rowers were not segregated according to citizen status. In the beginning of the Classical period rowers were mainly citizens and metics, later also mercenary soldiers and slaves.<sup>62</sup> Metics could not serve in positions of command either in the infantry or the navy, because these roles were either public offices or citizen *leitourgiai* (*trierarchia*).

#### *Mentions of eisphorai and military service of metics in the Hellenistic period*

Both *eisphorai* paid by metics and participation in military action by metics are mentioned frequently enough in epigraphic sources for us to conclude about the continued existence of these obligations in the last two decades of the 4th century. The motivation clauses of honorary decrees mention the *eisphora* payment of foreign residents, praising the recipients for the scrupulous payment of *eisphorai*.<sup>63</sup> There is a reference specifically to *eisphorai* paid by metics: Euxenides of Phaselis had paid all the *eisphorai* the people (= the assembly) had allotted to metics.<sup>64</sup> In the same fashion, foreign residents are praised for performing military service with great merit.<sup>65</sup>

<sup>59</sup> Ste. Croix 1983, 78, 120–123.

<sup>60</sup> Finley 1974, 51. The reference is to X. *Vect.* 4.33.

<sup>61</sup> In the early Hellenistic period the size of the cavalry was again reduced and in the 3rd and 2nd centuries the number was between 200 and 300 men. This development emphasized the elite nature of and the significance of wealth in the context of the cavalry: the 200 or 300 men reflect more closely the number of Athenians who were both wealthy and traditionally engaged in horsemanship and cavalry service than most of the Classical cavalrymen. The Hellenistic cavalrymen indeed had more in common with the aristocratic horsemen of Archaic Athens than with those who served in the cavalry in the Classical period. (Bugh 1988, 63, 184).

<sup>62</sup> Whitehead 1977, 82–85.

<sup>63</sup> *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 505, ll. 14–17; 554, ll. 8–12.

<sup>64</sup> *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 554, ll. 8–12.

<sup>65</sup> *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 505, ll. 36–40, possibly also 30–36; 554, ll. 15–19 (the recipients of honours are praised for obedience towards the *stratego*i and *taxiarcho*i, referring to infantry service). *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 421 (before 318/17) also includes this, but the lines 10–12 are mostly restored: [τὰς στρατείας ἐστράτευσ]νται π[α]ς μετὰ τοῦ δήμου καλῶς καὶ φιλοτίμως - - - - -.

*The cases of the μετὰ Ἀθηναίων privilege*

Foreign residents could receive a privilege which granted them the right of equal *eisphora* paying and military service with citizens. Since the metics paid *eisphorai* in their own *symmoriai* and served in their own military units, this privilege probably meant that the recipient was allowed into citizen *symmoriai* and army units as well as taken to expeditions outside the borders of Attica. The privilege is expressed in the following fashion: ‘shall pay *eisphorai* and fight battles along with the Athenians.’<sup>66</sup> There are some instances of this in the last decade of the 4th century: in one decree unknown individuals are awarded this privilege, along with *isoteleia* and certain other privileges, for unknown reasons (the names of the recipients, the motivation clauses and the honours preceding the mention of *isoteleia* have not survived).<sup>67</sup> IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 505 awards this privilege among many others for various services of a financial and military nature, to Nikandros of Ilion and Polyzelos of Ephesos.<sup>68</sup> This evidence makes it clear that the differentiated *eisphora* payment and military service for citizens and foreign residents continued until the very end of the 4th century.

*The Macedonian rulers and Athenian politicians had no need to interfere in the metoikia system*

The examination of epigraphic evidence would seem to suggest that *metoikia* remained unchanged until the end of the 4th century. There is evidence of *metoikion* and other metic terms such as *metoikos* from the 310’s, and of *isoteleia* as well as differentiated *eisphora* payment and military service of foreign residents. What of the events in Athens during this time, then? Would the Macedonian rulers or Athenian politicians have had a reason to abolish *metoikia*, or would there have been something else which would have caused the same result? As far as the last two decades of the 4th century go, the answer would seem to be no. Neither the Macedonian rulers nor the Athenian politicians had a need to bring about extensive changes in the function of the system.

After the battle of Chaironeia, Philip II and Alexander the Great did not abolish Athens’ own armed forces, as is evidenced by the fact that immediately after the death of Alexander, Athens could take up arms with its allies against Macedonia (the Lamian war 323–322). The other Macedonian military leaders who controlled Athens in the late-4th century (Antipater, Cassander, Antigonos and Demetrios) did not abolish Athens’ own armed forces either, being content to ensure that these forces could not be used against them.

After the Lamian war, which ended in Greek defeat, Antipater placed a garrison in Piraeus and established in Athens an oligarchic constitution, which limited full citizen rights to persons with a minimum property of 2000 drachmae. Political leadership was assumed by wealthy conservatives.<sup>69</sup>

In 318 the oligarchic government was revoked and extreme democrats gained power with the support of Polyperchon, the regent of Macedon, who now controlled the

<sup>66</sup> εἰσφορὰς εἰσφέρειν καὶ στρατείας στρατεύεσθαι μετ’ Ἀθηναίων.

<sup>67</sup> IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 516 (end of 4th century), ll. 2–3: [τὰς] στρατι[ὰς] στρατεύεσθαι καὶ τὰς εἰσφ[ορὰς] εἰσφέρειν μετὰ Ἀθηναίων. Note: στρατι[ὰς] rather than στρατείας is found in J. Kirchner’s restoration.

<sup>68</sup> IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 505, ll. 53–55: τὰς εἰσφορὰς] αὐτοὺς εἰσφέρειν μετ’ Ἀθηναίων καὶ [τὰς στρατε]ίας στρατεύεσθαι ὅταν καὶ Ἀθηναῖοι [στρατεύων]τα[ι]. The differences seen in the formulation are variations of form. The content is the same.

<sup>69</sup> D.S. 18.18.2–7. Plu. *Phoc.* 27.5–28.4. See also Habicht 1995, 51.

city.<sup>70</sup> Antipater's son Cassander controlled Piraeus and next year managed to gain control of the city of Athens as well. The Macedonian garrison remained in Piraeus, but otherwise Cassander guaranteed Athens full autonomy in internal affairs. He placed Demetrios of Phaleron in charge of the city, who had been a member of the previous oligarchic government. The constitution remained democratic in name, but the poorest citizens were again excluded from full political rights with a qualification of 1000 drachmae minimum property for full citizenship.<sup>71</sup>

Eleven years later, in 307, Antigonos and his son Demetrios defeated Cassander's garrison in Piraeus. They ousted Demetrios of Phaleron from power, restored the democratic constitution and declared that the city and the harbour would remain free of a garrison.<sup>72</sup> The Athenians received them as liberators, but their view changed soon. Demetrios ruled on behalf of his father in Athens and proved to be despotic and arrogant. Even though there was no Macedonian garrison in the city or in Piraeus, the Athenians could not act against the wishes or interests of Antigonos and Demetrios. The situation remained the same until 301, when Cassander, Lysimachos and Seleukos defeated Antigonos and Demetrios. This ended Demetrios' rule in Athens for a time.<sup>73</sup>

Antipater and Cassander interfered in Athens' internal affairs primarily by taking military control and ensuring that the leadership was held by politicians favourable to them. In Antipater's case in 322, Diodorus states that while he placed a garrison in Munychia, the Athenians retained 'the city, their possessions and everything'.<sup>74</sup> According to him, in 317 Cassander kept the garrison in place but let the Athenians keep their territory, revenues, fleet and everything else.<sup>75</sup> Both Antipater and Cassander had the aim of ensuring their grip of Athens by eliminating the kind of persons who might have wished to get rid of Macedonian control. Foreigners were not a risk in this sense, because they did not have political rights and therefore could not participate in political decision-making. Antipater and Cassander would not have had a reason to interfere in the legislation concerning foreign residents.

Demetrios Poliorketes influenced Athenian internal affairs in a larger sense by simply being present in the city for long periods of time. He is known to have occasionally even interfered in the normal issues of everyday life in Athens.<sup>76</sup> Even so, Demetrios did not appear to have systematically influenced the way in which the daily administrative routine was handled.<sup>77</sup> The function of *metoikia* was precisely routine administration. Most foreigners who became residents in Athens were private individuals, and their registration as residents in *demoi* could not possibly have held

<sup>70</sup> D.S. 18.65.6. Plu. *Phoc.* 32. See also Habicht 1995, 58–59.

<sup>71</sup> D.S. 18.74. See also Habicht 1995, 62.

<sup>72</sup> D.S. 20.45–46. Plu. *Demetr.* 8.1–10.1. See also Habicht 1995, 74–76.

<sup>73</sup> For Demetrios's stay at Athens, see Plu. *Demetr.* 8 ff. See also Habicht 1995, 76–88.

<sup>74</sup> D.S. 18.18.4.

<sup>75</sup> D.S. 18.74.

<sup>76</sup> The son of a prominent family is said to have used the King's favor so that he would write a letter to the officials of the city and order them to annul a large fine the boy's father owed. The assembly passed a decision, which forbade everyone sentenced of a crime from presenting a letter from the King in their trial. Demetrios became furious, had the decision revoked and the perpetrators punished. Plu. *Demetr.* 24.3–6. See also Habicht 1995, 86.

<sup>77</sup> Plutarch mentions nothing of the kind in his biography of Demetrios. Of the local history of Philochoros there are fragments, which deal with the rule of Demetrios in Athens. These do not mention anything like this either.

interest for Demetrios. A political enemy of the King seeking refuge in Athens would have been a different matter, but the Athenians could not risk receiving a person like that in any case. As a regular, annual tax, also for instance *metoikion* was a matter of routine administration.

Thus in the last two decades of the 4th century none of the international powers seems to have had the need to make large changes in *metoikia*. The same would seem to apply for the Athenian politicians of the time. The leading politicians of the short-lived oligarchy and the rule of Demetrios of Phaleron were wealthy conservatives. These politicians had grown up in an independent Athens. Their compliance with Macedonian rule was down to political realism, not due to either to their being keen supporters of Macedonia nor because they wanted to abolish the central institutions of independent Athens. This also applies to the democrats who gained power with the help of Antigonos and Demetrios Poliorketes, even if from a slightly different standpoint: for them it was natural to look to the nearest possible example, the democratic regime of independent Athens, which had in fact created *metoikia*.

For all the citizens of Athens it was self-evident that they should be in a privileged position in relation to the non-citizens. This was a feature of the Greek *polis* system and had nothing to do with how democratic or undemocratic the administration was, or what kind of political views the politicians in power had at any given time. Thus at the end of the 4th century neither the conservative supporters of oligarchy nor the democrats would have had reason to oppose a system which defined in great detail the rights and obligations of the foreigners who lived in Athens. The metic tax is central in this respect, because one of its purposes was that it emphasized the underprivileged position of the foreign residents in relation to the citizens.<sup>78</sup>

### 3. The early 3rd century: *metoikia* survives but disturbances occur

It can be said with relative certainty that *metoikia* survived unaltered until the end of the 4th century. There is evidence of the payment of *metoikion*, the use of metic terms such as *metoikos*, of differentiated *eisphora* payment and military service for citizens and foreign residents, of *isoteleia*. The examination of events in Athens during this period reveals that neither the Macedonians who controlled Athens, nor the Athenian politicians themselves would have had a need to abolish the system. The situation is less clear when we come to the 3rd century. There are no direct indications of *metoikion*. Neither do we have contemporary grants of the right of equal *eisphora* payment and military service.<sup>79</sup> IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 660 b (285/4) grants privileges to Tenians who live in Athens and already have the right of equal *eisphora* payment and military service,<sup>80</sup> but

<sup>78</sup> Todd 1997, 113–115. Whitehead 1977, 75–77.

<sup>79</sup> The honorary decrees of the era may have contained the privilege which granted foreign residents equal *eisphora* payment and military service with citizens, but unfortunately the inscriptions are fragmentary. Thus the decree for Hermaios, IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 715, might have included the granting of this privilege, but this part has not survived. IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 670, from 280/79, for a Thibron, is even more fragmentary.

<sup>80</sup> The decree is restored in the lines which contain the reference to the privilege. The correctness of Kirchner's restoration on the part of *eisphorai* is a matter of debate. On the other hand, all scholars accept the restoration on the part of *strateias*.

this is a reaffirmation of a grant originally made in the last decade of the 4th century (660 a). The word *metoikos* does not appear in the sources.

However, there are enough indications in the sources to lead to the conclusion that by the 280's the *metoikia* system was still in existence, at least in its main forms. Sources refer to both *eisphorai* paid and military service performed by foreign residents. More importantly, we have two examples of *isoteleia* from the early 3rd century. It is very unlikely that the privilege would already have become a mere shell, an honorary title lacking practical content. And since the metic tax was a central part of the system, emphasizing the lower status of the foreign residents in comparison with the citizens, abolishing the system yet retaining the tax would have made no sense.

### *Isoteleia* in the early 3rd century

The lack of direct references to *metoikion* naturally makes it difficult to determine if the metic tax survived in the early 3rd century. However, the instances of *isoteleia* known from the era support the view that it did indeed survive. The question that needs to be resolved is whether the *isoteleia* privilege was still the same in content, i.e. involving exemption from *metoikion*, or had been somehow changed.

The latest indisputable grants of *isoteleia* are from the early 3rd century.<sup>81</sup> The decree consisting of IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 768+802, from the mid-3rd century,<sup>82</sup> possibly included *isoteleia*, but this section is entirely restored and therefore questionable. *Isoteleia*, as well as the other privileges of the Classical era available to foreign residents, explicitly involved the idea that the recipient gained practical advantage. If this practical content had disappeared after the end of the 4th century, would the mere 'empty cell' have been retained among the different honours?

We know for sure that the *isoteleia* of the Classical period included exemption from the metic tax. Its other content is a matter of debate. What is certainly known is that *isoteleia* did not include exemption from the other two important forms of Athenian taxation, *eisphorai* and *leitourgiai*.<sup>83</sup> According to D. Whitehead, the *isoteleia* privilege of the Classical period also covered market taxes called *xenika*, paid by foreigners only, and possibly also some other taxes, of which nothing is known.<sup>84</sup> He seems to base his assumption on the fact that *xenika* appear to have been the only taxes apart from *metoikion* that were paid only by foreigners.<sup>85</sup> *Xenika* are known only from two references in Demosthenes. The first of these states that foreigners (*xenoi*) were not allowed to practice business in the Agora.<sup>86</sup> In the second section Demosthenes refers to taxes called *xenika*, the payment of which apparently made the practising of business in

<sup>81</sup> Whitehead 1986, 152.

<sup>82</sup> A new edition, with new restorations, is available in Tracy 2003b, 137–141. The inscription has been dated variously to the 250's and 230's depending on the date given to the archon of the decree, Antimachos. The arguments for a mid-3rd century dating are more convincing. For the latest examination of the dating question, see Tracy 2003b, 146–147. I will address the debate on the dating of the decree in more detail in the context of state honours and privileges, see p. 95 below.

<sup>83</sup> Whitehead 1977, 12. For the *eisphorai* this is confirmed by the fact that the foreigners often received in the Classical period the privilege which gave them equal *eisphora* paying duties with the citizens and *isoteleia* in the same decree: e.g. IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 287 (ca. mid-4th century), ll. 3–7.

<sup>84</sup> Whitehead 1977, 12.

<sup>85</sup> *Ibid.* 77.

<sup>86</sup> [D.] 57.31.

the Agora possible.<sup>87</sup> We know nothing of the details of the taxes,<sup>88</sup> but it is logical to assume that only those who intended to practice business in the Agora had to pay them. If *xenika* had automatically belonged to the obligations of all the foreign residents of Athens, they would also have been automatically allowed to practice business in the Agora. Demosthenes would not have needed to mention the denial and the taxes annulling this separately.

Thus *isoteleia* in practice included two types of taxes: a tax obligatory to all resident foreigners of Athens, payable regularly, and taxes paid by some individuals only. If *metoikion* had been left outside the sphere of *isoteleia*, the rest of the privilege would probably have remained as it was. However, it is unlikely that this would have been considered a significant enough reason for retaining *isoteleia* among the honours. It was one of the most important privileges a foreigner could receive in Athens. Important privileges were granted only as a reward for important services performed to the state. This principle survived all the way until the 2nd century. The purpose of privileges was also to encourage individuals to perform services that the state needed: the idea was to offer advantages that the wealthy, the only ones capable of performing services of any significance, found worth pursuing. Since the services were financed by the wealthy individuals themselves, exemption from some smallish taxes would hardly have been a big enough stimulus for public benevolence. Unlike *metoikion*, the market taxes apparently were fairly unimportant in emphasizing the status differences between citizens and non-citizens. Avoidance of the payment of *metoikion* was punished with slavery.<sup>89</sup> The only result of the avoidance of the market taxes would have been that the person in question was not allowed to practice his business in the Agora. The market taxes of course had some significance for foreign businessmen since the Agora was the centre of business life in the city and thus important for successful trade. However, for wealthy businessmen – the most likely candidates for *isoteleia* – these taxes would have been an insignificant financial burden. As for the other taxes possibly included in *isoteleia*, they must not have been very significant, since they are not mentioned in any surviving records from the Classical period.

There is no reason to assume that *isoteleia* was ever extended to cover any other taxes. All other taxes were paid by both citizens and foreigners, so from the point of view of the state there was no need to ‘liberate’ foreigners from them. On the other hand there is no sign of the adoption of any new type of tax that would have been necessary to add to *isoteleia*. Thus it seems clear that the most important content of the Classical era *isoteleia*, exemption from the metic tax, was intact in the early 3rd century. The resident foreigners of Athens still paid a special tax. Whether this was still called *metoikion* or not, we can assume that it survived unchanged in its practical details over the turn of the century. The period in question is short, and Athenian administration did not go through any significant changes or breaks.

---

<sup>87</sup> [D.] 57.34.

<sup>88</sup> Whitehead 1977, 77–78.

<sup>89</sup> D. 25.57. D.L. 4.14. See also Whitehead 1977, 76.

*IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 660: confirmation of the survival of isoteleia and metoikion after 287/6*

Strong evidence for the survival of *isoteleia* and thus of *metoikion* after 287/6 is provided by *IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 660*, a grant of *isoteleia* and other privileges to Tenians living in Athens. The inscription consists of two parts dated to two different periods. In the first part, dated to the second half of the 4th century (the *archon* dating has not survived), honours are granted to Tenian ambassadors, and *isoteleia* and other privileges to those Tenians living in Athens who fulfilled certain conditions: they were required to have formerly gained the right to own a house and equal military service and *eisphora* payment obligations with the citizens. The second part, dated to 285/4 (the *archon* dating having survived) would seem to be a confirmation of the privileges and honours awarded in the earlier decree (J. Kirchner's edition):

(after mid-4th century) ll. 5–9: [... εἶναι δὲ καὶ] ἰσοτέλει[αν Τηνίων τοῖς οἰκοῦσιν] Ἀθήνησ[ιν, καὶ οἰκίων ἔγκτησιν στρ]ατε[υομένοις καὶ τελοῦσιν τὰς εἰσφοράς μετ' Ἀθηναίων]<sup>90</sup>

(285/4) ll. 30: περὶ ὧν, ὥσπερ ὁ πρεσβευτῆς τ[ῶν Τηνίων αἰτεῖ ... ll. 37–38: εἶναι δ' αὐτοῖς κυρίαν τὴν δεδομένην ἰσοτέλει]αν ... l. 39: στρατευομένοις καὶ τε[λοῦσι τὰς εἰσφοράς μετ' Ἀθηναίων]<sup>91</sup>

Unfortunately, again, the crucial part which includes the *isoteleia* grant in the section of the inscription dated to 285/4 has been almost completely restored. But since the two sections are in the same *stele*, and the context of the entire inscription makes it clear that the later section is to do with a Tenian ambassador seeking – and being granted – confirmation of the honours awarded in the earlier section, the restoration of *isoteleia* can fairly certainly be concluded. Furthermore, scholars who have examined the inscription (for example Pečirka, Henry) do not question this part of the restoration. Thus, in my opinion *IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 660* can be accepted as an indication of the survival of *isoteleia*, and therefore *metoikion*, in the 280's.

### Disturbances of the early 3rd century – disturbances in *metoikia*

The evidence of *isoteleia* cases seems to indicate that *metoikia* survived at least until the 280's. Athens regained her freedom in 287, after the successful storming of the Macedonian garrison on the Mouseion hill. The city's independence was confirmed in a formal peace treaty, though at least in the beginning the important port town of Piraeus as well as the fortresses of Athens remained in Macedonian hands.<sup>92</sup> The new

<sup>90</sup> '... is granted *isoteleia* to those Tenians living in Athens, who have the right to own a house and fight and pay *eisphorai* with the Athenians'.

<sup>91</sup> 'of which, like the Tenian ambassador requested'; 'they shall have the (formerly) granted ordinary *isoteleia*'; 'to those who fight and pay *eisphorai* with the Athenians.'

<sup>92</sup> The storming of the Mouseion hill: Paus. 1.26.1–2. Osborne 1981–1983, I, D78, copy A (*IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 666*), ll. 9–15 (for Strombichos). Shear 1978, 2–4 (for Kallias). *Ibid.* 15. Osborne 1981–1983, II, 164. Habicht 1995, 102. Peace treaty: Plu. *Demetr.* 46.1–2; *Pyrrh.* 12.4–5. Shear 1978, 22–24, 74–76. Habicht 1995, 101–103. The situation with the fortifications: *IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 657*, ll. 35–36. Shear 1978, 79. Habicht 1979, 96. *Idem* 1995, 101–103. Pausanias relates the achievements of Olympiodoros in 1.26.3, and mentions the returning of Piraeus to Athens' control as being among these. This event has most commonly been dated to 281/0. However, the question of the recovery of Piraeus and the interpretation of Pausanias' excerpt has been the subject of debate for over a hundred years. For description of the available evidence and the debate, see Habicht 1979, 96–102.



government of the independent Athens was firmly democratic. This being the situation, it is hard to see why the Athenians would have wanted to make extensive changes to *metoikia*. Holding on to administrative practices deriving from the independent times of the Classical period would have been understandable as a way of emphasizing self-esteem. Furthermore, with time and resources being devoted to the reorganisation of defence, securing the grain supply and the restoration of international contacts, altering the *metoikion* would not have assumed great importance, since the system had functioned well enough before. Additionally, the foreign residents formed a large proportion of the population of Athens, and a yearly tax paid by all of them brought important income to the state.<sup>93</sup> In the first years immediately after the liberation of the city large sums of money and grain were needed quickly.<sup>94</sup> Under this scenario a tax paid annually in monthly instalments was not very useful. However, later, when conditions had become somewhat normalized, it would have been an important addition to the state treasury.

Yet even if the regulations of a system survive in theory, the existing conditions and circumstances in any given time affect how it functions in practice. In Athens, the first quarter of the 3rd century was a time of disturbances, including several changes of government, civil strife, a siege of the city, and the geographical as well as political division of the *polis*. These influenced the life of the *polis* greatly, and therefore by necessity also affected the functioning of the *metoikia* system. The disturbances more than likely hindered the full operation of the system for varying lengths of time. For instance, the metic tax could not be collected regularly or the military service of foreigners organised in a regular fashion in one time or another. These hindrances of the practical functioning of *metoikia* did not eradicate the system at once but they undermined its foundations, contributing to the conditions which eventually led this to occur.

#### *Lachares' regime*

Demetrios Poliorketes' defeat in 301 at Ipsos ended his control of Athens for a time. The political changes that took place between this date and the liberation of 287 are far more difficult to decipher than those of the last two decades of the 4th century. This is because whereas for the latter we have the clear accounts of Polybius and Plutarch, for the former the evidence consists of inscriptions<sup>95</sup> and fragments from literary sources such as *P.Oxy.* XVII 2082,<sup>96</sup> both of which require extensive interpretation. This period included Lachares' tyranny and Demetrios Poliorketes regaining Athens under his control.

<sup>93</sup> In the census of Demetrios of Phaleron the number of metics was 10 000, which according to most scholars included only male metics. With every metic paying 12 drachmae annually, the total sum paid by 10 000 metics would have amounted to 120 000 drachmae, 20 talents. There are no figures available for later periods but I have not found any indication of an event or development that would have caused the foreign population of Athens to rapidly twindle in the few decades that had passed since the census.

<sup>94</sup> Indeed, Athens received donations from Hellenistic monarchs: Spartokos, King of Bosphoros (*IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 653, 285/4) and Audoleon, King of Paiania (Osborne 1981–1983, I, D75, 285/4).

<sup>95</sup> *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 682 (for Phaidros of Sphettos), interpretations of the decrees of the *archon* year of Nikias ὕστερος (*SEG* XXXV 84; *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 645; Meritt 1942, 281, no. 54; all three 296/5).

<sup>96</sup> *FGH* Hist 257a.

It seems that shortly before or after 299/8 there was an acute famine in Athens. The authorities were unable to provide food for the population, which enabled Lachares, a popular demagogue and commander of mercenary forces, to rise to power. This event took place in the spring of 300 at the earliest, by 298/7 at the latest. Lachares appears to have retained the most important features of democracy, such as the secretary cycle of the 12 *phylai*.<sup>97</sup> This is also evidenced by the mention of the election of *strategoi* by the people in *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 682 (ll. 21–24). After some time, and before Cassander's death in the spring of 297, a group of citizens, including soldiers from the city, took over Piraeus and declared war on Lachares.<sup>98</sup> In the spring of 295 Demetrios Poliorketes overtook the fortresses of Eleusis and Rhamnous and began besieging the city. This led to the worst famine in the history of the city, and Lachares was forced to surrender. The downfall of Lachares was marked with the definition of the *archon* Nikias as ὕστερος ('later'), indicating a change of government and the re-election of Nikias as *archon* eponymous.<sup>99</sup>

Although there is no actual evidence in the sources, the events that led to Lachares' rise to power and the circumstances of his reign must have been extremely disruptive to the life of the *polis*. One factor is the famines which occurred in 299/8 and in 295. It is not known how long the famine of 299/8 lasted, but it is evident that it was long enough to make normal life in the city cease. The authorities could not feed the population, which apparently caused unrest and actual fighting, and enabled Lachares to seize power. This implies that, until Lachares' rise to power, the normal life in the *polis* – or at least in the city – was severely disrupted. From some point of time before the spring of 297 and for ca. two years onward the *polis* was in an actual state of *stasis*, or civil war. It is of course possible that the collection of *metoikion* would have continued normally in the areas of Attica that were controlled by Lachares and his supporters. However, since Piraeus was controlled by his opponents, his administration could not have handled the collection of the metic tax from its (still) undoubtedly considerable foreign resident population.

Demetrios Poliorketes established an oligarchic government in Athens. This is evidenced by the fact that, from 294 for the next three years, the *grammateis* (secretaries), appearing regularly in inscriptions, were replaced with *anagrapheis* (registrars). The office of registrar had been typical for the oligarchic government of 321–318.<sup>100</sup> Further evidence is provided by the fact that Olympiodoros was elected eponymous *archon* for two successive years, 293/2 and 292/1. It was illegal in the democratic system for one person to hold the same office for more than one year.<sup>101</sup> Finally, Demetrios allowed the oligarchs, banished from Athens in 307, to return in 292.<sup>102</sup>

I consider many of the arguments concerning the last two decades of the 4th century to be valid here as well. Demetrios Poliorketes controlled Athens perhaps more

<sup>97</sup> Habicht 1995, 90–91.

<sup>98</sup> *FGrHist* 257a, F2–F3. Habicht 1995, 92.

<sup>99</sup> Meritt 1942, 281, no. 54. Osborne 1974, 90, no. 22. *Idem* 1981–1983, II, 144 ff. *Idem* 1985, 275–282 (on the significance of ὕστερος after the *archon* Nikias' name). Habicht 1995, 88–93.

<sup>100</sup> Habicht 1995, 97.

<sup>101</sup> *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 682, ll. 21–23. Habicht 1995, 95.

<sup>102</sup> Among these was the Corinthian orator Deinarchos. *FGrHist* 328 F, 167 (Philoch.). D.H. *Din.* 2–3. Plu. *Moralia* 850d. Habicht 1995, 97.

strictly in 295–287 than in 307–301. Unlike in 307–301, he did not reside in the city but placed in power an oligarchic government and set a garrison on the Munychia. However, I do not see any reason why he would have considered the foreign residents of Athens a threat to his control of Athens and thus he would not have needed to abolish the system regulating their official status. He had not done this in 307–301. Foreigners still did not have political rights and they could not, for instance, vote in the assembly on attempting a revolt against the King. For the same reason I do not think the changes of government in Athens would have resulted in the abolition of *metoikia*.

#### *The separation of Piraeus from the city in 287/6*

When Athens became independent in 287/6, the port town of Piraeus remained in Macedonian hands. Since it was Athens' main port, it was essential for the city's food supply and economy in general, and consequently its recovery became a primary concern for the new government. This concern is often expressed in the assembly decrees of the era.<sup>103</sup> Sometime after the liberation the Athenians made a failed attempt to capture Piraeus from the Macedonians, which resulted in the death of over 400 citizens.<sup>104</sup> The recovery of Piraeus and the dating of this event, then, have long been a matter of debate among scholars. Pausanias would seem to prove that the Athenians did win back the port town. In a passage where he relates the career of Olympiodoros, he includes the recovery of Piraeus among his greatest achievements.<sup>105</sup> This event has most commonly been dated to 281/0. However, Pausanias' story has never been uniformly accepted. Some scholars have maintained that the port remained in Macedonian hands continuously from 287/6 to the end of the Chremonidean War in 262/1 and beyond. Others have held that Athens indeed won Piraeus back in 281/0. Yet others believe that Piraeus changed hands twice.<sup>106</sup>

The fate of Piraeus, although part of the general history of Athens, is connected to my subject. As Ph. Gauthier noted, Macedonian possession of Piraeus while Athens was independent divided the *polis* geographically, politically and in terms of administration. The citizens of Piraeus could not function as council members or magistrates or participate in the assembly. The festivals of the city state that took place either partially or in their entirety in Piraeus, which were a part of public life and therefore of political life, could not be conducted. The influence on the economy was significant.<sup>107</sup> True, Piraeus as well as the fortresses of the countryside had been controlled by Macedonian garrisons before. Yet in those times the entire *polis* had been under Macedonian control. Temporary separations of the city and the port had taken place earlier, for instance when Piraeus seceded from Lachares in the early 290's. This time the separation was longer and thereby had more lasting effects. Depending on which side of the debate we take, it lasted a minimum of ca. six years, a maximum of ca. 30 years. Now, if the effect of such a separation on the citizenry was remarkable, it must have been equally great on the foreign residents and the *metoikia* system. In the Classical period, a significant

<sup>103</sup> See e.g. Osborne 1981–1983, I, D75, ll. 30–35; *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 657, ll. 31–38 (for the Athenian poet Philippides, 283/2); Meritt 1938, 100–109, no. 18, ll. 28–31 (for *archon* Euthios, 282/1).

<sup>104</sup> Paus. 1.29.10. Polyæn. 5.17.1. Habicht 1979, 98.

<sup>105</sup> Paus. 1.26.3.

<sup>106</sup> For the earlier studies representing different sides in the debate, see Habicht 1979, 96–97, notes 10–12.

<sup>107</sup> Gauthier 1979, 357.

portion of the metic population lived in Piraeus. Metics could not own land and therefore many of them made their living from commerce and industry. By the 280's, foreigners could still not own land so the port town must have continued to be significant for those foreign residents who made their living by trading; even if Athens was no longer the economic power it had been in the Classical period. If the foreign residents of Piraeus were now beyond the control of the Athenian government, the effect on the function of *metoikia* was large. Taxes could not be collected from the foreign residents in Piraeus, they could not be called upon to military service and so on. The longer the separation of the city and the port lasted, the more significant the effect is likely to have been.

It is not necessary to go through the entire debate from its beginning over a hundred years ago. I will instead concentrate on the latest few studies, some of which support the idea of continuous Macedonian occupation of Piraeus from 287/6 to 262/1, others propounding the idea of recovery in 281/0. The suggestion of Piraeus changing hands twice in this period seems to have been discarded by all academics in the last couple of decades.

Pausanias mentions the issue of Piraeus in a couple of short lines:

This [*the storming of the Mouseion hill*] was Olympiodoros' greatest feat, apart from his achievements in recovering Piraeus and Munychia.<sup>108</sup>

The event has most commonly been dated to 281/0 on the basis of the context of the passage of Pausanias and other evidence. Since immediately preceding this short statement Pausanias relates the events of the liberation of 287 (1.26.1–2), this other achievement of Olympiodoros must have taken place after that. The decree for Euthios, *archon* of 283/2, from the year following his archonship, promises him further honours 'when Piraeus and the city are together again.'<sup>109</sup> This proves conclusively that Athens had not yet recovered the port. Many scholars, Ph. Gauthier among them, take the expression to mean that the Athenians had actual knowledge that the recovery of Piraeus would occur in the very near future. Negotiations were underway and were about to be successfully concluded. Furthermore, since later assembly decrees do not mention the need to win back Piraeus, the Athenians must have succeeded in this objective very soon after the passing of the Euthios decree.<sup>110</sup>

In his book, published in the same year as Ph. Gauthier's article, Ch. Habicht proposed a new theory on Paus. 1.26.3. He suggested that the verb used by the author, ἀνασφῶ (in medium aorist participle), should not be translated as 'recover (to one's own control)', but with its other meaning, 'save/preserve (from the danger of becoming lost).' This second meaning, according to him, would have been in common usage in Pausanias' time. This 'saving' of Piraeus should be placed during the time of the Four Years' War at the end of the 4th century, when Cassander tried to recapture Athens. This dating, in turn, comes from the following lines of Pausanias:

<sup>108</sup> 1.26.3: Ὀλυμπιοδώρῳ δὲ τότε μὲν ἔστιν ἔργον μέγιστον χωρὶς τούτων ὧν ἔπραξε Πειραιᾶ καὶ Μουνυχίαν ἀνασφάμενος. Transl. W. H. S. Jones (Loeb).

<sup>109</sup> Meritt 1938, 100–109, no. 18, ll. 28–31: ὅταν ὁ Πειραιεύς καὶ τὸ ἄστυ ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ γένηται. Translation by Meritt.

<sup>110</sup> Gauthier 1979, 349–366, 371–374. See also Reger 1992, 372, thoroughly agreeing with Gauthier.

But when the Macedonians made a raid on Eleusis, he put the Eleusinians in order of battle and vanquished the Macedonians. Before this, when Cassander had invaded Athens, Olympiodoros sailed to Aitolia and persuaded the Aitolians to come to the rescue. And to this allied force it was chiefly due that the Athenians escaped a war with Cassander.<sup>111</sup>

In Habicht's view, these lines should be taken as explanatory, describing in reverse the circumstances whereby Piraeus was in danger of being lost, and what Olympiodoros did to repel this threat, rather than an account of completely separate events. The crucial word is δὲ (second word), which Habicht suggests should be taken as synonymous with γάρ, 'for, because.'<sup>112</sup>

Habicht's arguments are of course very attractive in relation to my thesis. Surely a significant portion of the foreign resident population of Athens being beyond the central government's control for ca. 30 years would have had a major influence in eroding the *metoikia*? About five years later U. Bultrighini examined the subject in a published article. He examined each occasion where the verb ἀνασώζω appears in Pausanias, 44 times in all, and came to the conclusion that the meaning is always 'recover', never 'save/preserve'. Furthermore, he preferred the interpretation that the two events described by Pausanias – the recovery of Piraeus and the defeat of the Macedonians in Eleusis – are separate events.<sup>113</sup> Bultrighini's conclusions on the meaning of the verb in Pausanias in general should not be used as a proof that it cannot possibly have any other meaning in 1.26.3. However, no editor of Pausanias accepts Habicht's interpretation. Thus, unless more evidence surfaces, it must necessarily remain an unconfirmed hypothesis. The evidence generally referred to by those who support the theory of the continued Macedonian occupation from 287 to 262/1 is an excerpt of Diogenes Laertius' biography of the philosopher Menedemos of Eretria. It describes a meeting in Oropos between the philosopher and Hierokles, the Macedonian commander of Piraeus, described as ἐπὶ τοῦ Πειραιῶς, 'presiding over Piraeus.' Diogenes further reports that Menedemos had been exiled from Eritrea, because he was suspected of having betrayed the city to Antigonos Gonatas.<sup>114</sup> The text makes it clear that Hierokles was commander of Piraeus at the time of the meeting. Thus the port was under Macedonian control at the time. Menedemos' exile was dated to 273 or a little later by K. J. Beloch, whose dating has been generally accepted.<sup>115</sup> However, G. Reger persuasively argues that Menedemos' exile should rather be dated to after the beginning of the Chremonidean War in 267, when Piraeus is definitely known to have been in Macedonian hands again.<sup>116</sup>

Ph. Gauthier's, U. Bultrighini's and G. Reger's arguments make the theory that Athens did indeed recover Piraeus in 281/0 seem more compelling. Thus the city and Piraeus would have been separated from each other, and the foreign resident population

<sup>111</sup> 1.26.3: ποιουμένων δὲ Μακεδόνων καταδρομῇ ἐς Ἐλευσίνα, Ἐλευσινίους συντάξας ἐνίκα τοὺς Μακεδόνας. πρότερον δὲ ἔτι τούτων ἐσβαλόντος ἐς τὴν Ἀττικὴν Κασσάνδρου πλεύσας Ὀλυμπιόδωρος ἐς Αἰτωλίαν βοηθεῖν Αἰτωλοὺς ἔπεισε, καὶ τὸ συμμαχικὸν τοῦτο ἐγένετο Ἀθηναίοις αἴτιον μάλιστα διαφυγεῖν τὸν Κασσάνδρου πόλεμον. Transl. W. H. S. Jones (Loeb).

<sup>112</sup> Habicht 1979, 104–107.

<sup>113</sup> Bultrighini 1984, 54–62. Reger 1992, 372.

<sup>114</sup> D.L. 2.127.

<sup>115</sup> Beloch 1927, 464, 608. Habicht accepts Beloch's dating: Habicht 1979, 99–100 and n. 29. For the other studies, see Reger 1992, 374, n. 45.

<sup>116</sup> Reger 1992, 373–377.

of Piraeus beyond the control of the Athenian government, for about six years. The effects of a six year separation on the function of *metoikia* would not have been as strong as those of a 30 year separation. However, those years were certainly significant enough to erode to some extent the foundations of the system.

#### 4. The satellite period 262/1–229/8: break in ‘normality’

Thus in the first couple of decades of the 3rd century there were issues which undermined the foundations of *metoikia* by hindering its full functioning for varying periods. The effects may not have been immediate and permanent but they culminated in the final outcome which was the disappearance of a unified system regulating the official status of the foreign residents of Athens.

A more marked and longer break in the normal function of the city state came with Athens’ defeat in the Chremonidean War in 262 or 261. For the next three decades, until 229/8, Athens was a satellite-state of Macedon. Macedonian troops occupied the Attic fortresses, and a garrison returned to the Mouseion hill.<sup>117</sup> Antigonos Gonatas appointed a royal governor to the leadership in Athens. The ordinary offices survived, but with a greatly restricted mandate. In the first years after the war every motion required the approval of the royal governor. The assembly convened regularly, but its authority was limited to the most routine administrative decisions.<sup>118</sup> Epigraphic evidence proves that the King interfered in the election of *strategoi*.<sup>119</sup> Athens’ own armed forces survived, but the King took them into his service and retained the right to call citizens to arms.<sup>120</sup> The Athenians were forced to fight on the side of the King whenever he went to war.<sup>121</sup> In ca. 255 the Macedonian troops were drawn from the city, and Athens regained some of its freedom in foreign affairs. In practice the King retained his political control, and the Athenians could not act against his will. Now the *polis* was juridically autonomous, but politically and especially in military issues still subjugated.<sup>122</sup> Ch. Habicht and S. V. Tracy have recently pointed out that while the fortresses of the Eleusinian district (Eleusis, Panakton, Phyle) as well as Rhamnous and Aphidna were returned to Athenian control, and the King no longer interfered in the appointment of generals, Piraeus, as well as the island of Salamis and the fortress of Sounion were kept by the Macedonians until 229/8.<sup>123</sup> Tracy furthermore lists evidence which indicates that Antigonos continued to suppress certain elements of the normal Athenian democratic constitution until his death in 239: there are some slight indications that the usual tribal rotation of council secretaries did not function at all times. Also, for the first time in Athenian history there is evidence of an individual serving thrice in the council, a clear breach of the democratic system.<sup>124</sup>

<sup>117</sup> *FGrHist* 244 F, 44 (Apollod.). Paus. 3.6.6.

<sup>118</sup> Habicht 1995, 154–156, 161. Tracy 2003a, 56–58. For this and the other issues addressed in this chapter see also *idem* 2003b, 15 ff.

<sup>119</sup> *SEG* III 122. See also Tracy 2003a, 56.

<sup>120</sup> Habicht 1982a, 13.

<sup>121</sup> *Idem* 1995, 164.

<sup>122</sup> *Ibid.* 155.

<sup>123</sup> *Idem* 2003, 53. Tracy 2003a, 59.

<sup>124</sup> Tracy 2003a, 59–60.

The effect of the satellite-state period seems to have been the ‘final straw’ in the developments leading to the disappearance of the Classical *metoikia*. Some scholars have suggested that it was actually abolished by King Antigonos. However, I believe it was rather the result of the normal functioning of the system being hindered more markedly and for a longer time than ever before. When the mandate of the administrative authorities was strictly delimited and the King took Athens’ armed forces into his own control, the Athenians could not for instance decide when, where and how foreign residents were to be required to do military service.

### An unconvincing hypothesis: Antigonos Gonatas abolished *metoikia* to humiliate Athens

D. Whitehead, too, concludes that *metoikia* survived quite far into the 3rd century. He suggests that its disappearance took place in the satellite-state period, and that Antigonos Gonatas might have abolished the system in 262/1 specifically to humiliate Athens.<sup>125</sup> The suggestion is, in theory, viable: *metoikia* was a creation of the independent Athens of the Classical era, and Athens had used the system to control the official status of its foreign residents for almost 200 years. It is clear from the strict measures Antigonos took to ensure his control of the *polis* that he wanted to make clear that he was its master both externally and internally. Theoretically, he could have seen the abolition of *metoikia* as a good way of emphasizing this point. The problem is that the foreign residents of Athens did not have political rights and therefore could not participate in the political decision making. Thus *metoikia* did not have any actual connection to how freely or restrictedly the Athenian citizens could exert their political influence, whereas the measures taken by Antigonos did have a direct connection. These measures would certainly have been humiliating enough for the citizens, so would it not have been rather pointless for Antigonos to abolish *metoikia* if his intention was to humiliate?

D. Whitehead uses the case of SEG III 122 to argue for significant changes in *isoteleia*. However, this argument is problematic as well. The inscription, dated to the period 262/1–256/5, when Athens was controlled by royal governors, is a decree of *isoteles*-soldiers stationed in Rhamnous in honour of the *strategos* of the military district, the *epimeletes* (fortress commander) and *pyloros* (gate-keeper of the fortress). The latter is entitled *isoteles* as well. Whitehead sees the inscription – following J. Pouilloux – as a sign of development which seems to have separated *isoteleia* entirely from the sphere of resident foreigners in the earlier, *polis*-orientated sense: Pouilloux says, correctly, that these *isoteleis* were mercenaries, to whom Antigonos Gonatas had obliged the Athenians to grant this privilege.<sup>126</sup> If I understand Whitehead correctly, this would have meant the disappearance of the practical content of *isoteleia*, or at least the diminishing of its significance. However, Whitehead makes overly rash conclusions based on a single case. Furthermore, in my opinion he seems to confuse the actual changing of *isoteleia* in terms of its content and regulations, with an exceptional case where *isoteleia* did not have its usual significance as a result of exceptional circumstances.

<sup>125</sup> Whitehead 1986, 153.

<sup>126</sup> Pouilloux 1954, 118–120 (no. 7).



I would see the case of *SEG* III 122 as simply one indication of how severely Antigonos treated Athens. The wording makes this obvious:

... he also saw to the judicial scrutiny of the *isoteleia*, so that the award would be as speedily as possible received by those [stationed] in Rhamnous, following the King's request.<sup>127</sup>

Antigonos had obliged – not politely asked – the Athenians to award *isoteleia* to his mercenary soldiers stationed in Rhamnous. The soldiers, in turn, honoured the *strategos* and praised him for hastening the required judicial scrutiny of the award so that the King's will would be realized as speedily as possible. It should be pointed out that in the first decade after the end of the Chremonidean War the King himself made the appointment of *strategoí* or at least heavily restricted the assembly's freedom of choice in the matter, as the inscription makes evident.<sup>128</sup>

The inscription does not prove anything about the development of *isoteleia* itself, its content (what kind of advantages were involved) or the regulations defining to whom and for what kind of merits it could be awarded. It would have been pointless for Antigonos to change the content or the other regulations of *isoteleia*. Indeed, since his purpose here (too) was to emphasize that he was in control of Athens, he needed only to adopt an important type of privilege and without touching its content order the Athenians to award it to his soldier. The Athenians themselves had little to say in the issue. This was completely against Athenian practices and traditions and as such is a positive proof of how little freedom in decision-making the citizens had. D. Whitehead is correct in one sense: in this case, *isoteleia* did not have practical content or importance for the recipients. They were mercenary soldiers in the service of the King of Macedon. Thus they were not under the authority of Athenian laws and would not have paid taxes to the Athenian state in any case. So in a sense this particular case did equate the diminishing of the importance of the privilege. Yet that is only because of who the recipients were and the circumstances under which the privilege was awarded. It does not prove a general trend. A grant of *isoteleia* to a foreigner living in Athens would have been quite a different case in practical content and importance, if we assume that the foreign residents had paid *metoikion* thus far. Whitehead could not mean to imply that the King had obliged the Athenians to grant a privilege to his mercenary soldiers, and they purposefully chose one that no longer had practical content. He himself suggests that Antigonos might have abolished *metoikia*.

D. Whitehead further defends his theory, still following J. Pouilloux, by suggesting that the *paroikoi* appearing in garrisons after 229<sup>129</sup> would have been identical troops to the soldiers in *SEG* III 122: mercenary troops, to whom Antigonos had obliged the Athenians to grant the *isoteles* status or some other special privilege of similar nature.<sup>130</sup> This kind of an assumption seems risky, because we are dealing here with two different terms. Furthermore, the *paroikos* inscriptions and *SEG* III 122 have a different context:

<sup>127</sup> Ll. 6–9: ἐπε]μελήθη δὲ καὶ τῆς δοκιμασίας ὑπὲρ τῆς ἰσοτελείας, ὅπως [ἂν ὡς τάχιστα] ἐπικυρωθε[ῖ] τοῖς ἐν Ῥαμνοῦντος ἢ δωρεὰ ἀκολούθως τῇ τοῦ [βασιλέως προ]αίρεσει.

<sup>128</sup> Ll. 2–3: ἐπει[δὴ Ἀπολλόδωρος κ]ατασταθεὶς στρατηγὸς ὑπὸ τε τοῦ βασιλέως Ἀντιγόνου καὶ [ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου]. Habicht 1982a, 52, 56–57. *Idem* 1995, 156.

<sup>129</sup> The most recent editions of the *paroikoi* documents are available in Petrakos 1999, vol. 2. There are also earlier editions of most of the inscriptions. For these, see Petrakos. See Appendix 1, pp. 153 ff. below.

<sup>130</sup> Whitehead 1986, 152.



the soldiers mentioned in *SEG* III 122 are mercenary soldiers in the service of Macedon. The *paroikos* inscriptions are dated – by Whitehead as well – after 229. At this time Athens was again independent, so the *paroikoi* were in her service. It is not likely that the Athenians would have wanted to retain a practice that was so evidently against the traditions of the *polis* and an offence to its authority. These *paroikoi* might of course have been mercenary soldiers who had come to the service of the Athenian state after 229. Both in the Classical and the Hellenistic period in Athens honours awarded during the prevalence of some particular political trends were often revoked when the conditions changed.<sup>131</sup> If the *paroikoi* had been mercenary soldiers to whom the Athenians had earlier under obligation granted the *isoteleia* status or some equivalent, they might well have wanted to revoke the granted privileges after regaining independence. This would have been in accordance with their other actions: for instance all indications to the Macedonian King and his family were removed from public prayers, state decisions and official sacrifices, and the royal bronze coinage that had been in use during the satellite-state period was re-struck with Athens' own symbols.<sup>132</sup>

In conclusion, I find it very unlikely that Antigonos would have gone so far as to actually abolish *metoikia*. With the strict measures he took to control Athens, it is obvious that he wanted to ensure his mastery over the *polis* both externally and internally. It is also likely that he indeed had the intention to humiliate the Athenians, as if to further convince them not to try to shake off the Macedonian grip. As I noted earlier,<sup>133</sup> the *metoikia* system did not have any real connection to how freely or restrictedly the citizens were able to exert their political influence. It is unlikely that abolishing the system would have been humiliating enough for the Athenians to serve Antigonos' point. The measures he had taken to restrict the citizens' political freedom were quite sufficient for the purpose.

There are some indications of the existence of *isoteleia* in the satellite-state period, which would suggest that *metoikia* was not abolished by a single measure in 262 or immediately after that. These indications are admittedly fleeting, but all the same need to be considered.

### The insecure evidence of the *isoteleia* cases of the 250's

Apart from confusing changes in the content of *isoteleia* and its practical significance in one case, I find D. Whitehead's argument on the disappearance or significant diminishing of the practical content of *isoteleia* otherwise problematic too. As far as I understand, Whitehead suggests that Antigonos abolished *metoikia* in 262/1. Thus henceforth the foreign residents would no longer have paid *metoikion*, and *isoteles* would have been just an honorary title without any real significance. But if *isoteleia* had lost its practical content, why retain it as an honorary category? If a purely honorary title was needed, there were already plenty of those in Athens. A person could be for instance given a gold or ivy wreath or, going higher, a bronze statue. *Proxenos* in itself was apparently purely an honorary title, only gaining practical significance through other privileges that were attached to its granting. In my view a preferable theory is that at least for some time after 262/1 *metoikion* survived in name and the people paying it

<sup>131</sup> Habicht 1995, *passim*.

<sup>132</sup> *Ibid.* 182.

<sup>133</sup> See p. 39 above.

could receive exemption from it. The actual realities are a different matter, and prevailing circumstances might hinder collection of the tax or render the privilege meaningless, such as in the case of the *isoteles* soldiers stationed in Rhamnous.

As I pointed out, the case of the *isoteles* soldiers is exceptional due to circumstances of the granting of the privilege. It does not prove anything about the evolution of the *isoteleia* privilege in terms of regulations and content. *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 768+802 from the 250's would seem to be a so-called normal award of *isoteleia*. Unfortunately, the word *isoteleia* is wholly restored:

δεδοῦσθαι [αὐ]τῶι καὶ ἑγγ[όνοις ἰσοτέλειαν καὶ ἐ]νκτησι[ν οἰκί]α[ς]<sup>134</sup>

Presumably, the restoration depends on considerations of space, since no part of the original word has survived. Other factors are likely to have been the placement of the grant clause in the decree, the typical content of this kind of decrees, and the usual combinations of *enktesis* with other privileges. D. Whitehead noted the necessity of caution, though other scholars have not questioned the restoration of lines 7–8 of the decree.

The honorand's name has survived partially: [...]*ίας* Ἀκροτ[...]*ου* Περγαμ[ι]νός]. Ch. Habicht restored the honorand's first name as Aischias.<sup>135</sup> S. V. Tracy suggested the same later: [*Αἰσχ*]*ίας* Ἀκροτ[ίμ]ου. According to Tracy, this Aischias was from a known Athenian family, and he or possibly his father received Pergamene citizenship. Later Aischias' native city honoured him for his contributions to safeguard it.<sup>136</sup> If Tracy's notions are accurate, *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 768+802 is a somewhat unusual case as far as the recipient is concerned. Aischias or his father had apparently lost or given up his Athenian citizenship in the process of receiving the Pergamene one. Thus, whatever his actual origins, in official terms Aischias was a foreign resident in Athens at the time of the decree and was given honours according to his status. As a foreign resident he would also have paid *metoikion*.

Albeit the person of *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 768+802 was not a usual case as a recipient, the identity of the grantee would not have affected the *isoteleia* privilege awarded to him in terms of its content. If the restoration of the word is accepted, this decree, together with the case of *isoteles* soldiers, would seem to offer some indication that the *metoikion* survived until at least the 250's. Therefore the foreign residents would still have paid the metic tax, if circumstances did not hinder its collection, and could be exempted from it.

Apart from the case of *isoteles* soldiers and the honorary decree to Aischias, there are the 12 private gravestones, from the 3rd century and later (the latest from the 1st

<sup>134</sup> *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 802, ll. 7–8: 'he and his descendants shall be granted *isoteleia* and *enktesis* of houses'.

<sup>135</sup> Habicht 1982a, 23.

<sup>136</sup> Tracy 1988, 319. See also Tracy 2003b, 140: 'Although the restoration of the name [Aisch]ias is not certain, it appears quite probable.' Tracy 1988, 319 points out numerous relatives: Aischias son of Akrotimos from the *demos* Ikarion, perhaps grandfather, councillor in 304/3 (*Agora* XV 61, l. 45); Akrotimos son of Aischias from Ikarion, proposer of a decree in ca. 240 (*IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 772, l. 8); Akrotimos of Ikarion, paymaster and contributor to the Asclepieion in 248/7 (*IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 1534B, ll. 266, 273); Akrotimos son of Aischias the Athenian, *proxenos* of the Aitolians about 238 (*IG IX*<sup>2</sup> 1, 25, l. 73). *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 772 is dated to 268/7(?) and 1534B to 'about 245' in Tracy 1988, 319. New findings have allowed the more accurate datings of ca. 240 (*archon* Diogeiton) for the former and 248/7 (*archon* Diomedon) for the latter decree. Tracy 2003b, 83, 85.

century), on which the deceased has the word *isoteles* added to his name.<sup>137</sup> These are all hereditary *isoteleia* cases and as such do not prove the existence of the actual *isoteleia* privilege at any given time. One can note that it is scarcely possible that the families of all these *isoteles* would have lived in Athens for so many generations for the original grant of *isoteleia* to have been made in the 4th century or in the first half of the 3rd century. However, the grave *stelai* of *isoteles* include only three dated to late 2nd century and/or later.<sup>138</sup> It might well be that these were rare cases where the family of the deceased had an unusually long history of living in Athens. The original granting of *isoteleia* might have taken place in the satellite-state period or earlier, and the privilege might have remained in the family for generations. As for the actual grantings of *isoteleia*, there is not a single case, certain or otherwise, later than the 250's.

It is of course possible that there were honorary decrees including the issuing of *isoteleia* after this time and those decrees were inscribed in stone, but these inscriptions have simply not been found. However, a wealth of assembly decrees from the late 3rd century and 2nd century have survived. Since honorary decrees to foreign residents were usually inscribed and set up in public, and since *isoteleia* was a common privilege awarded for services to the state, the surviving epigraphic sources should include at least some *isoteleia* decrees. I would cautiously suggest that the privilege fell out of use at some point after 229/8. This, in turn, would indicate that foreign residents were no longer required to pay the metic tax.

What would have been the reason for the disappearance of the metic tax, then? I would suggest that the answer lies in the conditions during the satellite-state period. The whole of Athens was under a united regime and conditions were relatively stable, so in theory there were no hindrances to the collection of an annual tax. But it is evident that Macedonian control affected the function of other aspects of *metoikia*. Military service of either citizens or foreign residents could not function regularly the way it did when the Athenian authorities could control it themselves, because the King reserved the right to call people into arms. Since military service was the other major obligation of resident foreigners along with tax payment, it is possible that the Athenian authorities neglected to control the foreigners' tax obligations as well, being unable to see to the functioning of the entire *metoikia*. Another, perhaps more likely possibility is that the metic tax was abolished because the status differences of citizens and foreigners had diminished to such a degree in other respects by the liberation of 229/8 that the Athenians no longer considered it necessary to maintain a tax which emphasized the differences. There is evidence of this kind of a development. For example, the lack of the specification in naturalization decrees after 229/8 that the descendants of the naturalized citizens shall also be citizens. Another is the disappearance of the μετὰ Ἀθηναίων privilege from honorary decrees for individual foreign residents. Thus the disappearance of the privilege seems to indicate that the payment of *eisphorai* and the military service of citizens and foreign residents became standardized. Concerning *eisphorai* there is other evidence to support this conclusion.

<sup>137</sup> IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 7862, 7863, 7866, 7867, 7871–7872, 7874, 7876, 7878; Agora XVII 384, 385. In addition, Agora XVI 213, from 248/7, an *epidosis* decree with a list of donors, which includes an *isoteles* (l. 52).

<sup>138</sup> IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 7866, 7867, 7878.

The μετὰ Ἀθηναίων privilege disappears – standardized *eisphora* paying and military service

The 3rd century inscriptions still contain references to *eisphorai* paid by foreign residents, from the beginning of the 3rd century to the 220's. The latest indication is *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 835 shortly after 229/8. Here, a foreign resident called Apollas is granted various honours for the reason that he has, among other things, paid a sizeable sum of *proeisphora*. Therefore there is evidence of the foreign residents' paying *eisphorai* and performing military service at a much later date than the existence of the foreigner tax. The foreigners clearly still paid *eisphorai* when we come to the new independence of Athens. However, it appears that at some point by 229/8 a significant change in the *eisphora* practices took place. This is evidenced by the fact that the μετὰ Ἀθηναίων privilege disappears from the honorary decrees of foreign residents. Given the fact that this privilege had been a very common, even fixed part of the honorary decrees of the foreign residents in earlier times, this is unlikely to have been a coincidence.

I do not think that this development can be explained by asserting that the payment of *eisphorai* was made voluntary for either foreign residents or for both foreign residents and citizens, which in turn rendered the granting of a privilege that gave the recipient an exception from the obligation unnecessary. In addition to the *eisphorai*, there was another method of financing the exceptional costs of the state by private funds: the *epidoseis*. These were in theory voluntary donations, originally collected for special needs in wartime, when the normal methods of funding were insufficient. The earliest known *epidosis* is from the very beginning of the 4th century. In the 4th century they were mainly used to cover military expenditure and grain supply, in the 3rd and 2nd centuries their use spread for instance to the funding of large building projects.<sup>139</sup> If *eisphorai* had been made voluntary they would in practice have become identical with *epidoseis*. For the Athenian state it would not have been sensible to maintain two systems of finance that were different in name but identical in practice. On the other hand, the *eisphora* system remaining obligatory for citizens but becoming voluntary for foreigners would have been against the principles of the Greek *polis* system and concept of citizenship, the self-evident view that citizens of a *polis* were supposed to have a privileged position in relation to the non-citizens.

A more likely explanation is that the *eisphora*-paying obligations of citizens and foreign residents were standardized. It is impossible to define a precise date for this from the evidence of the available sources. *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 715 and 744 from the early 3rd century possibly included the privilege but the former is cut in the middle of the part which contained the granted honours, and in the latter no trace of this section remains. The decree for Tenians, *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 660 b, serves as an indirect indication that the μετὰ Ἀθηναίων privilege was still in existence in 285/4, even though it is a reaffirmation; it is likely that the privilege would not have been mentioned, had it not been considered valid in the present. The inscriptions where the section with the granted honours has survived do not contain the μετὰ Ἀθηναίων privilege: *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 768+802,<sup>140</sup> 835; *SEG* XXV 106 (226/5). The *eisphora* practices of the Hellenistic period are not known. An interesting detail is the fact that the decree for Apollas refers to *proeisphorai*, not

<sup>139</sup> Hakkarainen 1997, 12–13.

<sup>140</sup> The decree is heavily restored, but it is evident that there is no place for this privilege.

*eisphorai*.<sup>141</sup> If the meaning here is the same as in the Classical period, it supports the assumption of the standardization of the *eisphora* obligations for citizens and foreign residents: as far as it is known, in the Classical period *proeisphorai* were paid by a group consisting of rich citizens only. Metics were excluded from being among the *proeispherontes*, not because there were no sufficiently wealthy metics, but because of the importance of land in antiquity and the fact that land ownership was monopolized by citizens in the Greek world. Here we have a foreigner paying *proeisphorai*. Apollas would fit the pattern in terms of his wealth, indicated by the fact that he paid a sizeable sum.

I would suggest the following. When Athens was a Macedonian satellite, *eisphorai* could not be levied or at least there was no need for them. This could explain the fact that *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 768+802 does not contain the μετὰ Ἀθηναίων privilege. When Athens became free of Macedonian control, the differentiated payment of *eisphorai* of citizens and foreign residents simply was not taken up again because the general development of conditions had rendered it unnecessary. Alternatively, the *eisphora* obligations might have been standardized by the decision of the assembly. There is some evidence after 229/8 of new laws concerning the naturalization practices that seem to have brought the official statuses of citizens and foreign residents closer to each other to some degree.<sup>142</sup> The equalization of *eisphora* obligations by an official decision would have fitted in this context.

Certainly no evidence of *eisphorai* in the satellite-state period is available, whereas such evidence does exist both before and after this period. The *eisphorai* were emergency taxes collected primarily for military expenditure which the state had not prepared for, for example, military expeditions and large-scale defence projects. *Eisphorai* could be used for the securing of food supplies, but this, too, was often needed in crises specifically arising from a military threat like an impending siege. They were always decreed by the assembly according to each situation. Under the conditions of the satellite-state period the Athenian assembly did not have the authority to decide on a military-related undertaking that would have required financing with an *eisphora*: its mandate was restricted to matters of routine administration. Given the nature of *eisphorai*, Antigonos would not have allowed the Athenian authorities to freely decide on them. This applies especially to the first ca. seven years when Athens was controlled by a royal governor. Eusebius says that in ca. 255 the King gave the Athenians their freedom.<sup>143</sup> However, as seen, it was not in reality freedom but rather meant a form of Macedonian control that was not visible in the city. Macedonian troops withdrew from the city and the Athenians regained some of their autonomy in international contacts, but troops remained in the Eleusinian military district, Piraeus, Sounion and Salamis. There is also some evidence that the democratic system was not completely operational.<sup>144</sup>

It is interesting to note that while there are no *eisphorai*, there is one case of *epidosis* from the satellite-state period, more specifically from 248/7. An *epidosis*

<sup>141</sup> *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 835, l. 7: [χιλί]ας? προεισήνεγκεν δρα[χ]μὰ[ς] . . . .] ('paid *proeisphora* ...thousand (?) drachmae'). From the verb προεισφέρω, from which the substantive προεισφορά.

<sup>142</sup> See pp. 18 ff. above.

<sup>143</sup> Eus. *Chron.* 2, S. 120.

<sup>144</sup> See p. 38 above.

decree including a list of participants, it describes a situation that might have warranted levying an *eisphora* as well. The countryside of Athens was threatened, and the citizens and the other residents of Athens were asked to contribute to the 'security of the *polis*', to ensure that the crops could be collected.<sup>145</sup> The decree also provides evidence of the public activity of foreign residents: the list of contributors includes a few foreigners, among them an *isoteles* and the philosopher Lykon, the 4th leader of the Peripatetic school.<sup>146</sup> It is obvious that a large sum was needed in haste. In the 3rd century, the use of *epidoseis* had extended to civil objectives such as large building projects, whereas similar evolution had not taken place with *eisphorai*. This perhaps made *epidoseis* less connected to military affairs than *eisphorai*, which in turn probably rendered the Macedonian King more willing to allow the Athenians to use them. Allowing *epidosis* for securing the harvest was in the King's own interest, too. Severe grain shortage or famine that might have been caused by the destruction of crops, as well as the military threat formed by the attackers, were a potential threat to his control of the *polis*, and by allowing the *epidosis* he avoided having to use his own resources in the situation.

If Antigonos had obliged the Athenians to pay taxes, ordering them to levy *eisphora(i)* would have been ideal for his purposes. In this way, large sums could be collected efficiently and quickly. Furthermore, emergency taxes were an important aspect of the obligations of the citizens, and thus from the King's point of view an excellent way of demonstrating his control. However, while the Macedonian control affected the economy of Athens, for instance by bringing remarkable numbers of royal coinage into circulation,<sup>147</sup> and while the Athenians were probably obliged to provide food supply to the Macedonian troops, there is no evidence that Antigonos demanded payment of taxes in money.

In view of the above examination it seems clear that by 229/8 the *eisphora* obligations of citizens and foreign residents had become identical. Rather than being the direct result of terms imposed by Antigonos concerning *eisphorai*, this evolution occurred because of the conditions between 262 and 229. *Eisphorai* could not be, nor were levied because the Athenian authorities did not have the authority to levy them or, rather, decide on issues that would have required financing with *eisphorai*.

*Eisphorai* were only one half of the μετὰ Ἀθηναίων privilege. There is evidence for the standardization of *eisphora* payment beyond the disappearance of the privilege awarding equal *eisphora* and military service obligations to foreign residents: the statement in *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 835 that Apollas had paid *proeisphorai*, taxes waged in the Classical period on citizens only.

Similar evidence is not available for military service, but it is logical to assume that the standardization of obligations concerned both *eisphorai* and military service. Otherwise it could be assumed that the mention of *eisphorai* would have disappeared and the rest of the privilege formula remained intact. Lines 4–9 and 39 of *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 660

<sup>145</sup> *Agora* XVI 212. J. Kirchner (earlier edition *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 791) dated the inscription to ca. 232/1. Later, the *archon* of the decree, Diomedon, was placed in 244/3. Recently, the discovery of new evidence has made it necessary to move this *archon* a few years earlier. Habicht 2003, 54–55. Osborne 2003, 69–70. Tracy 2003a, 59.

<sup>146</sup> Part d, ll. 10 and 29.

<sup>147</sup> A result of the presence of Macedonian soldiers and other persons in Athens rather than by terms imposed on the city by Antigonos, forcing the Athenians to mint coinage with Macedonian symbols or denying Athens the freedom to mint her own coinage. Kroll 1993, 12–13, 36–37. Habicht 1995, 158.

offer some clues regarding the survival of a differentiated military service prior to the satellite-state period. Whether or not the lines in question actually contained a mention of *eisphorai* is a matter of debate, but the reference to military service is certain: albeit partially restored in l. 9, it is wholly preserved in l. 39. Again, although the decree is a reaffirmation, the fact that this condition for receiving further privileges is still mentioned in 285/4 would indicate that it was still considered valid. Therefore, if the privilege granting equal military service was valid in the 280s, the military service of citizens and foreign residents must still have been differentiated.

Again, the standardization of military service would have been a natural result of developments in the satellite-state period. Among the obligations of the free residents of Athens, military service was perhaps the most strongly affected by the Macedonian control, because the first goal of the foreign masters was to ensure military control of the area. Rather than abolishing Athens' own armed forces, the King reserved the right to call the citizens to arms to himself, so it most likely depended on him as to what extent foreign residents were required, for instance, to serve in the garrisons. In the Classical period metics had primarily served in the territorial army used for defence and had not been taken on expeditions abroad. Now the Athenian authorities had no control over Athens' own troops, and the Athenians could not embark on expeditions independently. In such a situation, dividing citizens and foreign residents into different units would have been impossible or at least useless. Thereafter, similarly to *eisphorai*, the standardization of military service was decided by the assembly, or alternatively differentiated military service simply was not re-established, when Athens became independent in 229/8. Despite the newly-restored independence, differentiation was no longer necessary. It seems that Athens no longer had resources for large-scale military expeditions, and so the question of whether or not foreign residents were taken on expeditions and put into pitched battles was irrelevant.

### The foreign soldiers of the satellite-state period: Macedonian or Athenian mercenaries, or foreign residents in military service?

Apart from the decree of the *isoteleis* soldiers examined earlier,<sup>148</sup> there are three military-related inscriptions providing evidence of people of foreign origin serving as soldiers along with citizens between 262/1 and 229/8. They are all similar in form: decrees of soldiers garrisoned in the fortresses of Attica honouring the *strategos* and sometimes their immediate superiors. In all three cases foreign soldiers appear together with Athenian ones. A decree of foreign στρατιῶται (simply 'soldiers') for their superiors is dated to the 240's.<sup>149</sup> In a decree of the 230's, Athenian and foreign soldiers called *kryptoi* honour their superiors.<sup>150</sup> The third inscription is a decree of soldiers stationed in Eleusis and other fortresses, from 235/4, the participants including foreigners along with citizen soldiers. The former are called first *stratiotai* and later *xenoi*.<sup>151</sup> The word *xenos* had the general meaning 'foreigner, stranger' but in military context acquired the meaning of mercenary soldier already in the Classical period.<sup>152</sup>

<sup>148</sup> See pp. 39 ff. above.

<sup>149</sup> Petrakos 1999, no. 11.

<sup>150</sup> *Ibid.* no. 20.

<sup>151</sup> *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 1299, ll. 21–22, 40, 93 ff.

<sup>152</sup> E.g. X. *Hell.* 1.1.3, 4.3.18. Aesch. 2.131, 3.87, 3.147.

Thus these foreign soldiers are easily recognizable as mercenary soldiers, and need not be examined further. The other two documents are more complicated due to their terminology.

However, these inscriptions cannot be taken directly as evidence of the military service of foreign residents, because the foreigners in question might just as well have been mercenary soldiers. Athenian citizens are always easy to recognize, because they are indicated by *demotikon*. All the free foreigners are indicated in inscriptions with *ethnikon*, whatever their precise identity might have been. Thus the *ethnikon* alone does not give a clue of whether a particular foreign soldier was in origin a resident in Athens or not. It is very likely that the mercenary soldiers appearing in the inscriptions of the period of direct Macedonian control, ca. 262–255, were in Macedonian service: after Athens' defeat in the Chremonidean War, the mercenaries employed by the state probably entered Antigonos' service.<sup>153</sup> Later, the situation became more complicated.

Petrakos 1999, no. 11 is fragmentary, but among the attested persons there are some Cretans, a Corinthian and a Klazomenian (ll. 23–26). The fact that the decree originally contained citizen names is proven by the surviving demotic, Εὐώνυμους, 'of the *demos* Euonymon' (l. 24).<sup>154</sup> The exact status of the foreign στρατιῶται is not easy to determine, because the term refers merely to profession. It does not include any implication of origin or civic status. In some cases the στρατιῶται appear to have been mercenaries.<sup>155</sup> In other documents the term is used to refer to citizen soldiers,<sup>156</sup> in others still in reference to both citizen and mercenary soldiers.<sup>157</sup> Thus the usage of the term is elastic in the military decrees of the Hellenistic period.<sup>158</sup> All the scholars who have examined the decree have considered the στρατιῶται of Petrakos 1999, no. 11, both the citizen and foreign ones, to be mercenaries.<sup>159</sup> This conclusion seems reliable. The fact that the Athenian and non-Athenian persons are listed together apparently in a summary order, and that they are not separated by different terms would indicate that these persons were all the same type of soldiers.<sup>160</sup>

The *kryptoi* inscription is especially interesting for the fact that *kryptoi* are known only from one other inscription in Hellenistic Athens. This latter is dated to 268/7, just before the Chremonidean War when Athens was still independent.<sup>161</sup> It is an honorary decree of Rhamnousians in honour of Epichares, who had served as *hipparchos* and later as *strategos*. Epichares is mentioned having placed *kryptoi* in watchtowers/lookout-posts,<sup>162</sup> for camouflage surveillance, so as to ensure the safe

<sup>153</sup> Habicht 1982a, 13.

<sup>154</sup> Petrakos 1999, no. 11 restores this person's first name as Ἀρχέστρατος.

<sup>155</sup> *Ibid.* no. 13 (end of 3rd/beginning of 2nd century), ll. 13–14: the leader of the στρατιῶται, Dionysios of Klazomenai, is clearly a mercenary. 1313 (ca. end of 3rd century), ll. 2–3: the leader is titled *xenagos*.

<sup>156</sup> *JG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 1954, l. 3 (306/5)

<sup>157</sup> *JG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 1270 (298/7), ll. 15–16; 1260, ll. 21–24; 1287, l. 4. Roussel 1930, 269–270, ll. 9–10.

<sup>158</sup> Kent 1941, 344. Pouilloux 1954, 114–115.

<sup>159</sup> Wilhelm 1892, 151. Kent 1941, 344.

<sup>160</sup> Cf. *JG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 1299, where the division of the soldiers into Athenian citizen soldiers (i.e. of the Athenian armed forces) and mercenaries in the King's service is clearly expressed: the former are indicated with the expression τεταγμένοι τῶν πολιτῶν, 'citizens stationed', the latter with the title *xenoi*. The participants are listed at the end of the decree in separate lists, the citizen soldiers first, the *xenoi* after them.

<sup>161</sup> Petrakos 1999, no. 3.

<sup>162</sup> The word used here, ἡ σκοπή (alternative form σκοπιά) means a lookout-post and watchtower but also simply a look-out or watch. Since the word is in the plural here (σκοπᾶς, acc.), the former meaning is more appropriate.



gathering of harvest (ll. 9–11). D. Knoepfler cautiously draws a connection to the *kryptoi* mentioned by Plato in *Laws*. These were young men, between 25 and 30 in age, 44 in number, selected from each tribe or sector (of the defence system). According to Plato their other title was *agronomoi*.<sup>163</sup> The task of these officials was, broadly speaking, surveillance, in regard to, for instance, agricultural and judicial functions. In short, they formed a mobile guard which at the same time functioned as an engineering corps and a detachment of scouts.<sup>164</sup> Knoepfler notes, though, that the decree for Epichares does not necessitate the conclusion that an actual Attic *krypteia* existed. Epichares might, due to the prevailing circumstances, simply have selected some men for camouflage surveillance while they were stationed in the area with the rest of their corps.<sup>165</sup> I find the latter alternative a more plausible explanation for the *kryptoi* stationed under Philotheos in the decree of the 230's. The decree includes a mention of the honorand, *strategos* Philotheos, having taken care of the watchtowers. This seems to indicate a similar surveillance task as with the *kryptoi* of 268/7 placed in watchtowers.

However, the foreign *kryptoi* of the 230's should probably be identified as mercenary soldiers rather than Athenian foreign residents.<sup>166</sup> The decree includes the following lines:

[the *stele*] is to be placed in the fortress in the same place where also earlier soldiers placed [honours] honouring him [Philotheos] while he was *strategos* over *xenoi* in the *archon* year of Lysanias.<sup>167</sup>

The 'earlier soldiers' mentioned in the decree were among the *xenoi* over whom Philotheos had been *strategos* earlier. Judging by the wording, the *kryptoi* identify themselves as similar soldiers, therefore as *xenoi* in the military sense of the word. The decree is similar to that of the Athenian and foreign στρατιῶται in the sense that the *kryptoi* are not separated with different titles according to their status and they are listed together in summary order. This seems to indicate soldiers of the same type/status.

As can be seen from the preceding discussion, all the foreign soldiers known from the satellite-state period should be identified as mercenaries rather than as Athenian foreign residents performing their obligatory military service. However, this does not necessitate the conclusion that all the mercenary soldiers were in Macedonian troops in Attica. We have seen that in ca. mid-250's Eleusis, Panakton, Phyle, Rhamnous and Aphidna were returned to Athenian possession, but Macedonian troops retained control of Piraeus, Sounion and Salamis.<sup>168</sup> As can be seen from the documents examined above, foreign mercenaries appear in the fortresses after the mid-250's. Yet at least in Rhamnous they are identified as serving the city, not the King.<sup>169</sup> This would indicate that after 255 the Athenian state was allowed to recruit mercenaries on a limited scale

<sup>163</sup> Pl. *Lg.* 763b–c.

<sup>164</sup> Knoepfler 1993, 332–333.

<sup>165</sup> *Ibid.* 335. Of earlier studies for instance Petrakos 1967, 42 also considered the task of these *kryptoi* something to do with camouflage surveillance.

<sup>166</sup> Cf. Petrakos 1999, 28.

<sup>167</sup> Petrakos 1999, no. 20, ll. 20–23: στήσαι ἐν τ[ῷ αὐ]τῷ [τοῦ φρουρίου ἐν ᾧ] τόπῳ καὶ οἱ πρότεροι στρατιῶται ἀνατεθήκασιν στεφανώσαντες αὐτὸν στρατηγήσαντα ἐπὶ τοὺς ξέν[ους ἐ]πὶ [Α]ρ[χ]ο[ν]τος.

<sup>168</sup> See p. 38 above.

<sup>169</sup> Petrakos 1999, nos. 11, 12, 13, 20 l. 22. See also Habicht 2003, 53.

for guard duties in the fortresses. This is not impossible: Antigonos might well have considered retaining control of Piraeus, Sounion and Salamis sufficient for keeping Athens in check. It is extremely unlikely that the Athenians would have been allowed to recruit mercenaries in unlimited numbers because this might have enabled them to amass a large enough troop for an armed uprising. In fact, Antigonos might actually have considered it advantageous to allow Athens to hire a small amount of mercenaries. He would have been able to concentrate his own troops in some central locations as they were no longer needed for ordinary guard duties in all parts of Attica.

The possibility that the foreign mercenary soldiers, at least those stationed in Rhamnous, were hired to serve the Athenian state does not exclude the chance that some – or indeed all – were resident in Athens when they enlisted as mercenaries. There is no actual proof of the survival of obligatory military service for the foreign residents of Athens. Finally, it is questionable as to what extent it is possible to clearly distinguish foreign residents (or Athenian citizen soldiers) in military service in Athens' own armed forces and mercenaries/soldiers in the service of Macedon, or indeed mercenary soldiers recruited by Athens itself, in this period. Although the King no longer interfered in the election of *strategoi* and returned most of the Attic fortresses to Athenian control, Athens obviously was not entirely free in military matters. One final point needs to be considered. The findings of my investigation so far seem to indicate that *metoikia* was still in existence during the satellite-state period, and even if it was not fully functioning in all its aspects, it at least had not been officially abolished. If we assume that the foreign mercenary soldiers after 255, at least in Rhamnous, were in Athens', rather than the King's, service, would their legal status have been different to that of resident foreigners? In the 4th century the system had been changed so that a foreigner who remained in Athens beyond a certain time limit was required to register as metic. If this regulation was in force in and after the mid-3rd century, wouldn't the mercenary soldiers have held exactly the same status than any foreign resident, provided they remained in service long enough? To my knowledge, the legal status of the mercenaries in Athenian service, in the Classical or any other period, has not been researched. It is unlikely that there are sufficient sources for such research to be undertaken.

## 5. After 229/8: no longer metics but still clearly non-citizens

Athens' position changed drastically in 229/8. The Athenians took the advantage of the unstable situation in Macedonia caused by problems over the succession to the throne and managed to regain their independence. This happened peacefully, through negotiations and with financial help. They persuaded Diogenes, the commander of the Macedonian troops in Athens, to hand over Piraeus and the countryside fortresses, and collected the 150 talents of silver required to pay off his troops.<sup>170</sup> Thus the whole of Athens was under the authority of a free and independent Athenian government for the first time in several decades.

Several changes had taken place in the official status of the foreign residents by 229/8. The *eisphora* payment and military-service obligations of citizens and foreign

---

<sup>170</sup> Habicht 1995, 176.

residents had become standardized. This occurred due to conditions in the previous few decades. As the Athenians could not decide on any military undertakings which required exceptional resources, *eisphorai* were not needed. Even though Athens' own armed forces were not abolished, the Athenians could not control the troops themselves. Thus upholding the differentiation in the *eisphora* and military obligations was pointless. Besides the change in these two obligations, it is likely that the foreign residents no longer paid *metoikion*, as there are no honorary decrees for individual persons including the grant of *isoteleia* from the latter 3rd century onwards. From 229/8 onwards the children born of mixed marriages were citizens with full rights, which to some extent levelled the political differentiation between citizens and non-citizens. These changes were so extensive that by 229/8 the *metoikia* system as it had been in the Classical period was no longer in existence.

With their new independence, the Athenians were now fully free to decide on their own affairs. This of course included the official status of the foreign residents. Theoretically the Athenians could have decided to fully restore *metoikia*. After all, this was the first time that the whole of Attica was united under an independent Athenian government since before the battle of Chaironeia in 338. The Athenians might have looked to the practices of the Classical times as an example and restored them in full to reflect a newly-discovered self-confidence. However, the sources would seem to indicate that *metoikia* was not restored. Nevertheless, it is equally clear that the political segregation of citizens and non-citizens did not disappear. Foreigners did not begin to be allowed as members of *phylai*, *phratriai* and *demoi*, as can be seen from the fact that the clauses concerning admittance to these survived in citizenship decrees. We do not know a single case of a non-citizen in an elective office. So, the foreign residents evidently remained non-citizens. As *metoikia* was no longer in existence, what was left of the former status of these free non-citizen residents of Athens?

### Military service still obligatory

As has been seen,<sup>171</sup> the Macedonian rulers controlled the Athenian armed forces and considerably restricted the authority of the Athenians in all military matters during the period when Athens was a satellite-state of Macedon. The result of this was that a differentiated military service between citizens and foreign residents went out of practice. In the prevailing situation, the traditional division of citizens and metics into different military units with their different functions was useless, and even impossible for the Athenian authorities to uphold. The Macedonian King, on the other hand, would hardly have considered it necessary to apply Athenian laws to his troops even when he required Athenian citizens and/or foreign residents to bear arms.

The liberation of 229/8 returned the full control of the military matters of the *polis* to the Athenian authorities. Eurykleides and Mikion chose a policy of neutrality to ensure the survival of this newly-acquired freedom.<sup>172</sup> However, for this purpose it was also essential to enhance and secure the defence system. The Athenians began a project to strengthen the walls of the city and Piraeus, as well as the fortresses of Attica.<sup>173</sup> Men

<sup>171</sup> See pp. 38 ff. above.

<sup>172</sup> Habicht 1995, 177–178. Polybius scolded this policy as quietist, opportunist and worthless: 5.106.6–8.

<sup>173</sup> Habicht 1982a, 82. *Idem* 1995, 186. The repair works were financed partly with *epidoseis* and possibly with *eisphorai*. One of the participants was Apollas, who was shortly later awarded honours for his eager

were needed as the Attic fortresses were now manned with Athenian troops. Indeed, the numerous military inscriptions that have survived show strong activity in the garrison of Rhamnous in the last decades of the 3rd century.<sup>174</sup> The Athenians would now have had the freedom to reinstate the old system of dividing the population into different army units, had they wanted to do so. However, it seems that this was not done either immediately after the liberation or even later. This was because of the prevailing realities: when during the satellite-state period dividing the population in the armed forces according to civic status had been made unnecessary or impossible due to foreign control, after the liberation lack of resources brought about a similar result. It appears that after the 220's Athens no longer had the resources for extensive military operations beyond the borders of the *polis*. As the armed forces were mainly being used to guard the city, the port and the countryside, different army units being composed of people of differing civic status was no longer important in such a limited sphere.

Since there are no sources which relate to this matter, it is impossible to know whether the disappearance of the practice of having different army units was merely something that came to be in effect or whether it was formally decreed after 229/8. It is unlikely that it would have meant that military service became voluntary for citizens and/or foreign residents. I believe that it was simply the case that both citizens and foreign residents as free residents of Athens were now expected to serve in the military. There are several military inscriptions of soldiers identified as citizen soldiers, στρατευόμενοι τῶν πολιτῶν, which indicates the continuance of obligatory military service, at least for citizens.<sup>175</sup> Why would the other residents of Athens have been freed from the obligation? This would have occurred in at least the last three decades of the 3rd century. Athens had to be able to protect her territory with her own armed forces, as it was then unable to rely on military assistance of others. The *polis* needed, and had, mercenaries, as is evident from the decrees honouring the *xenagos*, mercenary commander.<sup>176</sup> However, replacing the obligatory military service of citizens and foreign residents entirely with mercenaries would have been extremely costly, and especially problematic because Athens' resources were generally speaking limited at this time.<sup>177</sup> After 200 the burden on the *polis'* armed forces diminished as Athens entered into an alliance with Rome and could henceforth to some extent rely on the aid

---

participation in the collection of the 150 talents needed to pay off the Macedonian forces as well as in financing the repair works: *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 835.

<sup>174</sup> The inscriptions discovered in Rhamnous were compiled by B. Ch. Petrakos in his monograph *Ο δῆμος του Ραμνοῦντος. Σύνοψη των ανασκαφῶν και των ερευνῶν (1813–1998)*. II: *Οι επιγραφές*. Earlier editions exist for some of the inscriptions. See Appendix 1, pp. 205 ff. below. See also Habicht 1995, 186.

<sup>175</sup> Athenians stationed in Sounion: *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 1302 (222/1), 1308 (end of 3rd century). In Eleusis, Panakton and Phyle: 1303 (after 220/19), 1304 (215), 1305 (end of 3rd century?), 1306–1307 (ca. end of 3rd century). In Rhamnous: Petrakos 1999, nos. 19 (ca. end of 3rd century), 22 (229), 35 (222/1), 44 (after 216/5), 45 (after 229), 46 (214/13), 48 (210/9), 49 (207/6).

<sup>176</sup> *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 1313; Petrakos 1999, no. 57 (both end of 3rd century).

<sup>177</sup> The lack of soldiers, especially experienced soldiers, whether Athenian citizens or foreigners who lived in Athens, could be explained by the development of the *ephebeia* system in the Hellenistic period, namely its evolution from a two year training period obligatory to all citizen youths to a voluntary tradition of the wealthy elite. This must have had a strong effect on the availability of soldiers who had experience and skill in the use of arms and could be expected to be really useable in a situation which might require the use of weapons. For the details of the development of *ephebeia*, see p. 1, n. 3 above.

of Roman troops in protecting her territory.<sup>178</sup> Exceptional achievements in the military field were one of the primary reasons for the award of honours and privileges. The reason why such things are not mentioned in the decree for Apollas is easy to understand, because Athens regained independence in 229/8 through negotiations. Military action was not required. The organisation of defence after the liberation consisted of the repairing of the walls and the manning of the fortresses with Athenian forces. There was no occasion for great military feats.

Despite the probability that military service was still obligatory for foreign residents, the exact identification of the foreign soldiers appearing in inscriptions after 229/8 is difficult. Such is the case with *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 1958 (ca. 210), where soldiers at Eleusis honour the *strategos*. The list of participants contains over 60 names, of which slightly over 10 are foreign, the rest Athenian. Some of the foreigners are from mainland Greece, others from the Greek islands and Asia Minor. The soldiers are all called στρατιῶται and are listed together in summary order. Thus it seems similar to the two cases of the satellite-state period where Athenian and foreign soldiers are given the same title and listed together in summary order, Petrakos 1999, nos. 11 and 20. Indeed, J. H. Kent stated that both the Athenian and foreign soldiers here were possibly mercenaries.<sup>179</sup> This is possible, but these soldiers might just as well have been citizens and foreign residents in military service. Given the dating of the decree (ca. 210), they certainly served in Athens' own armed forces. In the satellite-state period Athenian citizens might well have enlisted as mercenaries in the Macedonian army as a means of making a living. Yet why would the independent Athenian state have hired its own citizens as mercenaries if the citizens could be obliged to perform military service in any case? The summary listing of Athenian and foreign soldiers could in this case be a reflection of the standardization of the military service obligations.

An interesting case with a possible connection to the question of the military service of foreign residents is the ὑπαίθροι appearing in a few military inscriptions of the late 3rd century. Only one of the documents contains individual names, which all happen to be Athenian. Thus the ethnicity or civic status of these *hypaiethroi* cannot be identified with certainty. In one instance the *hypaiethroi* would seem to have been Athenian citizens, since the term used, στρατευόμενοι,<sup>180</sup> always appears in connection with citizen soldiers in the Hellenistic era. In another document, the Athenians stationed in Eleusis, Panakton and Phyle and the *hypaiethroi* honour the *strategos*.<sup>181</sup> The third document is a decree of citizen soldiers and *hypaiethroi* stationed in Rhamnous for a *strategos*.<sup>182</sup> In these two cases the Athenian citizen soldiers and the *hypaiethroi* are clearly distinguished. The adjective ὑπαίθρος means 'under the sky, in the open air'.

<sup>178</sup> To Roman side, declaration of war on Philip V and the reasons for it: Plb. 26.16.9. Liv. 31.14.6 (citing an excerpt of Polybius, which has not been preserved); Liv. 31.15.5; 31.44, 29; 41.23.1. Romans aiding the Athenians against Macedonian forces invading Athens: Plb. 16.27.1–3. Liv. 31.16.2; 31.24.1–25.2. See also Habicht 1995, 199 ff.

<sup>179</sup> Kent 1941, 344.

<sup>180</sup> Petrakos 1999, no. 55 (2nd half of 3rd century).

<sup>181</sup> *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 1304, ll. 1–2: ἔδοξεν Ἀθηναίων τοῖς τεταγμέ[νοι]ς ἐν Ἐλευ[σί]νι καὶ Πανάκτῳ κ[αί] Φυλεῖ καὶ τοῖς ὑπαίθροις. See also ll. 41–42 and 54–65.

<sup>182</sup> Petrakos 1999, no. 49, ll. 1–2: [Ἔδοξεν] τοῖς στρατευομένοις τῶν πολιτῶν καὶ τ[οῖς] ὑπαίθροις. See also ll. 25–26.

Kent translated the substantive as ‘open-air soldiers’,<sup>183</sup> J. Frösén suggested ‘soldiers in camp’, also noting that they are encountered in Egyptian papyrus sources from the Ptolemaic period.<sup>184</sup> Thus the title *hypaiithroi* is not an indication of foreign origin, used to distinguish the foreign soldiers from the Athenian ones, but rather refers to a particular type of soldier. Concerning *hypaiithroi* in Athens specifically, J. H. Kent suggested that the term replaced the word *peripoloi*, known from the earlier history of Athens, as the expression used for border patrols: the word *hypaiithroi* is first met only after the word *peripoloi* disappeared from use after the end of the Classical period. The border patrols in the Hellenistic era were composed at least partly of mercenaries.<sup>185</sup> D. Knoepfler, in turn, said the *hypaiithroi* were all citizen soldiers who were not, unlike those ‘stationed in Rhamnous’, limited to one garrison, and cautiously proposed that perhaps the word replaced the term *kryptoi*.<sup>186</sup> One more argument might be presented in favour of considering the *hypaiithroi* as at least in part foreigners: if the *hypaiithroi* were citizen soldiers, one would expect this to be stated, despite the special title. Judging by the careful expression of citizen status in the military inscriptions, the Athenian citizen soldiers stationed in the garrisons considered this important. However, this issue cannot be resolved in any final manner since none of the few Athenian documents which involve *hypaiithroi* name individuals.

### The *epidoseis* and the disappearance of *eisphorai*

While it seems likely that the military service obligation of foreign residents survived, the other half of the old μετὰ Ἀθηναίων privilege, *eisphora* payment, appears to have disappeared soon after the standardization of the obligations. This is to be concluded from the fact that all references to *eisphorai* disappear from the sources after the 220’s.<sup>187</sup> As with the μετὰ Ἀθηναίων privilege, this is unlikely to have been a coincidence, but instead reflects a change that took place in the *eisphora* institution. In the 4th and 3rd centuries the *eisphorai* are often mentioned. While the references to *eisphorai* disappear after 220’s, there are documents that mention the *epidoseis*.<sup>188</sup>

At least originally *epidoseis* were only paid in exceptional circumstances, usually for military purposes or for grain supplies, when the normal methods of funding like *eisphorai* proved insufficient. In the 3rd and 2nd centuries their usage spread to civil purposes as well, particularly to building costs, while a similar development did not take place with *eisphorai*. In the 3rd century there still were situations where *eisphorai* were needed. After the storming of the Mouseion hill in 287 the Athenians had to take urgent action to secure the grain supply and bolster the defence system. In 229, 150 talents of

<sup>183</sup> The adjective ὑπαίθριος (or ὑπαίθριος) means ‘under the sky, in the open air’. The substantive could be translated ‘open-air soldiers’. Kent 1941, 348.

<sup>184</sup> In discussion, January 17th, 2006.

<sup>185</sup> Kent 1941, 348.

<sup>186</sup> Knoepfler 1993, 335.

<sup>187</sup> Even though there are no honorary decrees for foreign residents after the 220’s, there are such for Athenian citizens from the 2nd century, none of which mention the *eisphorai*. Since the payment of *eisphorai* was one of the major obligations of Athenian citizens, they would certainly have been mentioned in the decrees, had any *eisphorai* been levied.

<sup>188</sup> IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 2332: foreigners in ll. 45, 57, 59, 60, 72–73, 87, 97, 114–115, 131, 136, 139, 162–163, 167, 171, 177, 196, 201(?), 210, 214–215, 223, 343–344. IG II<sup>2</sup> 2334 from mid-2nd century, for the building of a theatre; one foreigner: l. 59.

money were needed to pay off the Macedonian troops and to liberate the fortresses.<sup>189</sup> Immediately after this the Athenians began a project of repairing the city and port walls and the fortresses.<sup>190</sup> In both cases *epidoseis* were needed along with *eisphorai*.<sup>191</sup> In the 2nd century Athens no longer had the ability or nor the opportunities for large-scale military undertakings.<sup>192</sup> On the other hand, special measures for enhancing the defence system or securing the grain supply were apparently not needed: the countryside of Athens was generally speaking not threatened in the wars of the 2nd century (The First and Second Macedonian War), and for military security Athens could to some extent rely on the forces of their ally Rome.<sup>193</sup> It is quite possible that *eisphorai* disappeared at some point after the 220's. When larger amounts of funds were needed mainly for building works, it seems likely that *eisphorai* became redundant. It was not necessary to extend their usage towards civil purposes since the *epidoseis* were already available, and apparently the wealthy citizens and foreigners of Athens were still willing to use their own resources for the good of the *polis*.

It is evident that the disappearance of the *eisphorai* affected the tax obligations of both citizens and foreigners, and there was no need for special measures concerning the *eisphora* payment of foreign residents. Even though this development did not concern foreigners alone, it is self-evident that the disappearance of the *eisphorai* had a significant impact on their tax obligations.

The developments that led to the disappearance of *eisphorai* had possibly begun already at some point in the 3rd century. In the changing political conditions *epidoseis* were perhaps considered a more flexible system for the state to accrue resources for special purposes. This perhaps gradually increased the importance of *epidoseis* and decreased that of *eisphorai*. In this situation it was considered sensible to standardize the *eisphora* obligations of citizens and foreigners, and finally *eisphorai* vanished entirely.

The final disappearance of *eisphorai* was probably due to conditions after the end of the 3rd century, when there was no use for *eisphorai* anymore, and other means of funding public undertakings were considered sufficient. When *eisphorai* were no longer levied, they naturally ceased to be a part of the obligations of citizens and foreign residents alike. The precise date for the disappearance of *eisphorai* cannot be determined. Possibly it took place very soon after the 220's: the defence works after the liberation of 229 are the latest instance where *eisphorai* are known to have been used.

<sup>189</sup> Habicht 1995, 177.

<sup>190</sup> *Idem* 1982a, 82.

<sup>191</sup> Of the *eisphorai* levied after 287 a possible example is IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 715 (Hermaios is praised for the paying of *eisphorai*). An instance of *epidoseis* in the same situation might be IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 744 (dated to early 3rd century). The latter inscription has survived in a very fragmentary state. The person honoured in the decree, Phayllos, in any case seems to have donated money for defence costs: τῆ[ς] [π]όλεως σω[τηρία] - - -] ..... Φάλλος μυσία[ς] - δροχμάς - ] (ll. 3–4). It cannot be the question of *eisphora* here, because the purpose of the *eisphora* is generally not explained. With the *epidoseis* the purpose is usually expressed, often precisely 'to safeguard the *polis*'. The verb has not survived, so it can only be *epidosis* or some other type of donation. The need for caution is strengthened by the fact that the section in question is for the most part a restoration of the editor. For the situation after 229 there is a more certain proof, IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 835: Apollas has paid *proeisphora* and *epidoseis*.

<sup>192</sup> For instance in 200 Athens joined Rome against Macedon, but the Athenians could not in practice wage war or even properly defend their own hinterland. Habicht 1995, 201.

<sup>193</sup> Habicht 1995, *passim*.

Neither is it possible to determine whether the *eisphora* system was abolished by an actual decree of the assembly or merely disappeared in time.

## 6. Changing thought-patterns in the Hellenistic period

So far we have discussed the actual political and other realities that led to the disappearance of *metoikia*. During the satellite-state period the conditions were such that the system could not function effectively. For instance, as military issues were controlled by the Macedonians, and the Athenians could not freely decide who should serve in the army and according to what system, the division of soldiers according to civic status was practically impossible. Similarly, in the sphere of *eisphorai*, the earlier division according to status was rendered impossible because the Athenian assembly could not decide to levy an *eisphora*. *Eisphorai* were, after all, closely connected to military issues. By the liberation of 229/8, the realities had changed considerably. From around this time, children of naturalized citizens were automatically classified citizens and consequently marriages between citizens and non-citizens were legal. The *eisphorai* as a system of financing exceptional costs seem to have disappeared entirely at some point after 229/8.

The pure realities do not, however, explain entirely satisfactorily why *metoikia* disappeared. Surely, if the Athenians had always continued to view strict status differentiation as absolutely necessary, they would have reformed *metoikia* as a fully functioning system when they were free to do so after 229. The division of citizens and foreign residents into different military units might not have been possible (or necessary) in practice, but the system of registration and the *metoikion* could have been resumed. The latter would have actually been advantageous to the *polis* since the tax would have brought resources to the state. It seems to me that the changing conditions in Athens in the Hellenistic period must have affected ways of thinking as well. By the late-3rd century the Athenians no longer found strict status differentiation to be as important as they had in the Classical period.

### *Cosmopolitanism, the catchphrase for the Hellenistic world*

The first matter to consider is cosmopolitanism, a concept which is very much the catchphrase in the general parlance concerning the Hellenistic world. It is thought of as the defining characteristic of Hellenistic culture – free movement and the interaction of people from all over the known world, in the arts and sciences and in society in general; the blending of a wide range of influences in the arts and literature, and so on. In fact, a whole new ‘cosmopolitan’ state of mind is supposed to have come into existence.

This sort of a view is certainly accurate for the great cities of the Hellenistic world such as Alexandria. Applying the train of thought to Athens, it could be assumed that cosmopolitanism is the natural explanation for the disappearance *metoikia*. Certainly, if from the end of the 4th century onwards more people from a wider area than ever before were coming to Athens, wouldn't the Athenians have adopted a more cosmopolitan state of mind and begun to think that the strict status segregation of citizens and non-citizens was an anachronism and no longer necessary? This scenario is not, however, supported by the sources. True, there do appear people in the Hellenistic period with



*ethnika* not seen in Athens earlier. Yet these mainly represent cities like Alexandria, Antiocheia and Pergamon which were not founded until the late-4th century or later, and thus there could not of course have been people from these places in Athens in earlier times. A crude comparison of the *ethnika* of persons seen in Athens in the 4th century with those in the 3rd century<sup>194</sup> reveals that the cities and regions represented by these *ethnika* are far fewer in the 3rd than in the 4th century: just under 120 versus just under 180. Pursuing the cosmopolitanism idea, one could assume that although in the 3rd century people came to Athens from fewer places, a greater percentage were from faraway lands, whereas in the 4th century the emphasis would have been on locations closer to Athens. However, the prosopographic evidence shows that such a development did not take place. This is made explicable by the fact that although Alexander's conquests and the empires of the Diadochi vastly expanded the sphere of Greek culture, the majority of the names of faraway places represented in the sources are those of the old Greek colonies which always had close connections to the Greek mainland, or otherwise areas with a long history of trade and cultural connections with the Greek *poleis*, such as Egypt and Phoenicia.

The prosopographic evidence indicates that the ethnic composition of Athens' foreign population and foreigners present in Athens at any given time did not become at all more cosmopolitan or heterogenous in the 3rd century. The fact that we in fact encounter people from significantly fewer areas is easily explained by the insecurity and instability of conditions for much of the 3rd century. After Alexander's death, and until the early-3rd century, the Diadochi struggled for the control of the areas he had conquered. In Greece itself, several generals competed for the control of the *poleis*. In this same period in Athens, conditions were unstable, with the form of the constitution and the leading politicians changing several times. It can be assumed that this sort of situation would have discouraged travelling to some extent and diminished the attractiveness of Athens.

If 'cosmopolitanism' is defined in the way described at the beginning of this chapter, then Athens was already cosmopolitan well before the Hellenistic period. Unlike most Greek *poleis* which were small and insignificant, Athens had much to offer in terms of economic and business opportunities, higher education and arts. In the 5th and 4th centuries it attracted large numbers of people from the Greek world as well as more distant lands. Generally speaking, the arrival of people was never restricted in any way.

#### *Foreigners in Athens outside the authority of Athenian laws*

Although Athens did not become more cosmopolitan in the 3rd century, foreigners should be taken into account in this context in a different way. As epigraphic and literary evidence shows, from the end of the Lamian war to the liberation of 229/8 there were significant numbers of foreigners in Athens who stayed relatively long periods but were not within the sphere of Athenian laws: Macedonian soldiers garrisoned in the

<sup>194</sup> According to M. J. Osborne and S. G. Byrne's *The Foreign residents of Athens. An annex to the lexicon of Greek personal names: Attica*. The prosopographic evidence compiled by Osborne, to great extent provided by inscriptions in private grave *stelai*, includes names well into the Imperial period. Since the evidence shows that the *metoikia* system disappeared in the course of the 3rd century, the names of later dates can be excluded in this context.

countryside fortresses, Piraeus and the city. There are a large number of indications of this in the epigraphic and literary sources. The Lamian war ended in Athenian defeat, and as part of the peace terms Antipater installed a garrison in Piraeus. During the reign of Demetrios of Phaleron, 317–307, Antipater's son Cassander allowed Athenian autonomy in internal affairs but the garrison remained in Piraeus. Antigonos Monophthalmos and Demetrios Poliorketes, who ended Demetrios of Phaleron's rule in 307, promised to keep both the city and Piraeus free of a garrison. The countryside fortresses were, however, under Macedonian control.<sup>195</sup> Demetrios Poliorketes lost control of Athens after the battle of Ipsos in 301, but regained possession in 295. At this point not only were the countryside fortresses and the Munychia garrison in Piraeus manned by Macedonian soldiers but a garrison was also placed on the Mouseion hill in the city itself.<sup>196</sup> The Mouseion garrison was overrun by the Athenians in 287.<sup>197</sup> The *polis* regained independence, though at least for a few years after this Piraeus and the countryside fortresses remained under Macedonian control.<sup>198</sup> The period of independence ended in Athenian defeat in the Chremonidean War in 262. During the satellite-state period honorary inscriptions of soldiers for their commanders offer evidence for the presence of Macedonian mercenaries in the garrisons.<sup>199</sup>

The long-time presence of foreigners beyond the control of Athenian laws was something new in comparison with earlier times, when every free person who settled in Athens or stayed beyond a certain time limit was in practice required to register as metic. The Macedonian soldiers garrisoned in the fortresses and in the city often remained in Athens for long periods but were always outside Athenian law. The Athenian authorities could not oblige them to pay taxes nor perform military service. There were foreigners outside Athenian law in the city or elsewhere in Attica almost continuously for nearly a hundred years, and for several generations. It is likely that the presence of such foreigners would have eventually become something of a commonplace, and influenced the way the Athenians viewed the status differentiation of citizens and free non-citizen residents. It is important to note that this does not mean that the Athenians would have begun to consider foreign military control commonplace and acceptable. As we have seen, they continuously struggled to free themselves from Macedonian control. But since for several generations there were foreigners present in Athens whose status could not be defined by Athenian law, it seems natural to assume that this fact would have in some way changed Athenian thinking. At the latest in the course of the satellite-state period the Athenian authorities, and the population in general, may have begun viewing the system which defined the status of every foreigner staying beyond a certain time limit as something that was no longer needed. Thus, when the Athenians could have in theory restored the old *metoikia* system after 229, they did not have the motivation nor the will to do so.

<sup>195</sup> See pp. 27–28 above.

<sup>196</sup> Plu. *Demetr.* 34. See also Habicht 1979, 6.

<sup>197</sup> Paus. 1.26.1–2. *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 666, ll. 9–15. Shear 1978, 2–4. *Ibid.* 1978, 15. Osborne 1981–1983, II, 164. Habicht 1995, 102.

<sup>198</sup> Plu. *Demetr.* 46.1–2; *Pyrrh.* 12.4–5. Shear 1978, 22–24, 74–76. Habicht 1995, 101–103. See also the discussion concerning the fate of Piraeus after 287, pp. 46 ff. above.

<sup>199</sup> Piraeus: *SEG III* 122, *isoteleis* stationed in Rhamnous. Petrakos 1999, no. 20, *kryptoi* (Athenian and foreign) stationed in Rhamnous (230's). Eleusis: Petrakos 1999, no. 11, foreign soldiers (240's). *IG II/III<sup>2</sup>* 1299, Athenian soldiers in various fortresses and foreign mercenaries stationed in Eleusis (230's).

## II. The rights of the foreign residents from 322 to 120

The *metoikia* system defined clearly the obligations of the foreigners who lived in the Athenian *polis* towards the state. This was necessary for the proper functioning of both the administration and the whole of society. Since the Athenian citizens had various obligations, it was unthinkable that the other free residents of Athens would have been exempted from these. Finally, the foreign residents provided important resources to the state: in paying taxes they brought in significant revenues and as they were required to perform military service, they provided more manpower for the armed forces and the navy. The obligations were, however, only one half of the official status of the foreign residents. The other half was their rights. Foreign residents were extremely important for the economy of the *polis* as a large percentage of them functioned in the commerce and industry. To keep foreigners coming and settling in Athens it was necessary to allow them certain rights. On the other hand, these rights could not be equal with those of citizens. Thus the rights of the foreign residents were defined by laws primarily in areas that were to do with public life and the rights of citizens; in other words, what made an Athenian citizen a citizen: judicial issues, public religion (state and *demos* cults, festivals), land ownership, issues of marriage and inheritance.

### 1. The judicial status

When we study the judicial status of the foreign residents of Athens (or the function of the Athenian judicial system in general) in the Hellenistic period, the situation regarding the sources is more problematic than in relation to any other issue concerning the foreigners. Before the year 322 there are several works by the ancient authors containing information about the function of the judicial system (for example Aristotle's *Athenaion Politeia*, the court speeches of Demosthenes and other orators, historians like Thucydides, comic poets). No such sources are available after 322. For example many philosophers who were influential in Athens wrote about the issue, but none of their works survive. There are works written in the Hellenistic period or later, dealing with Hellenistic Athens (for instance Polybius, Cicero, Philodemus, Plutarch, Gellius, Diogenes Laertius, Athenaeus). However, the authors of these works were not specifically interested in the function of the Athenian judicial system. Inscriptions do not provide much help either. The judicial system functioned in the Hellenistic period and the court sessions were entered in records. However, information of this type was generally not inscribed in stone, but archived. Thus, the judicial status of resident foreigners in the Hellenistic period can be studied only with the help of indirect references: one must use any and all references regarding the functioning of the judicial system that might have some connection to foreigners.

The latest source that sheds some light on the judicial status of Athenian resident foreigners is indeed Aristotle's *Athenaion Politeia*:

... and the murder of a slave or a metic or a foreigner is handled in the Palladion.<sup>1</sup>

To him (*polemarchos*) are brought only the private cases, which concern metics, *isoteleis* and *proxenoi*; and he is required to take these and divide them into 10 parts and appoint by lot one part to each *phyle* ... He himself handles those cases of metics, which concern acting without *prostates* or the lack of *prostates*, property and inheritance; and the other cases, which in the case of citizens are handled by the *archon*, are in the case of metics handled by the *polemarchos*.<sup>2</sup>

These two concise references are the most important sources concerning private metic cases, and all scholars refer to them. Other sources complement this information: in murder cases the punishment was different depending on the status of the victim and the defendant. If a metic was found guilty of the premeditated murder of a citizen, the punishment was death. For the premeditated murder of a metic a citizen could be punished at worst with banishment.<sup>3</sup> In public cases metics were almost equal with citizens apart from the fact that they could only speak for themselves, not for the entire *polis*.<sup>4</sup> In Athenian law there were some charges in the sphere of public cases that concerned only non-citizens: *γραφὴ ξενίας* (disguising as citizen) and *γραφὴ δωροξενίας* (charge of bribery).<sup>5</sup> Generally scholars also count the charge of the lack of *prostates* as among the public cases, and not private cases as Aristotle did. The punishment for all these three charges was slavery.<sup>6</sup>

*Athenaion politeia* was written in the 320's. Because there are no sources whatsoever from later times, it is impossible to clarify the details of the judicial status of the foreign residents of Athens in the Hellenistic period. Some kind of conclusions, or at least estimations, about the general lines of development in this issue can be made, however.

It can be said relatively safely that the judicial status of the foreigners of Athens remained in the main unchanged from the time of the writing of this work to the end of the 4th century. *Athenaion politeia* depicts the judicial system as it was at the time of its writing. As has been seen, the epigraphic and literary sources indicate that *metoikia* remained unchanged in the last two decades of the 4th century. Thus it is unlikely that the judicial status of foreign residents would have changed to any significant degree. The Macedonian generals who controlled Athens at different times (Antipater, Cassander, Antigonos Monophthalmos and Demetrios Poliorketes) seem not to have interfered in its internal administration regarding the status of foreign residents. The Athenian politicians of this period did not consider it necessary to change the traditional institutions of Athens. A kind of indication of continuity is the creation, or

<sup>1</sup> Arist. *Ath.* 57.3: ... καὶν οἰκέτην ἀποκτείνει τις ἢ μέτοικον ἢ ξένον, οἱ ἐπὶ Παλλὰδιῳ. Transl. H. Rackham (Loeb).

<sup>2</sup> Arist. *Ath.* 58.1–3: δίκαι δὲ λαγχάνονται πρὸς αὐτὸν ἴδιαι μόνον, αἱ τε τοῖς μετοίκους καὶ τοῖς ἰσοτελέσι καὶ <αἱ> τοῖς προξένοις γιγνόμεναι· καὶ δεῖ τοῦτον λαβόντα καὶ διανείμαντα δέκα μέρη τὸ λαχὼν ἑκάστη τῇ φυλῇ μέρος προσθεῖναι ... αὐτὸς δ' εἰσάγει δίκας τὰς τε τοῦ ἀποστασίου καὶ ἀπροστασίου καὶ κλήρων καὶ ἐπικλήρων τοῖς μετοίκους, καὶ ἄλλ' ὅσα τοῖς πολίταις ὁ ἄρχων, ταῦτα τοῖς μετοίκους ὁ πολέμαρχος. Transl. H. Rackham (Loeb).

<sup>3</sup> *An.Bekk.* 1.194.12–13: Φονικόν· ἐὰν μέτοικον τις ἀποκτείνει, φυγῆς μόνον κατεδικάζετο: ἐὰν μέντοι ἄσπτον, θάνατος ἢ ζημία. Harrison 1968, 197–198. Whitehead 1977, 93.

<sup>4</sup> Whitehead 1977, 94.

<sup>5</sup> Todd 1994, 134. In the latter case the foreigner was charged of having bribed the judges to declare him a citizen.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* 134.

strengthening, by Demetrios of Phaleron, of the council of the seven, *nomophylakes*, ‘guardians of the law.’<sup>7</sup> Among the tasks of these officials was the supervision of other officials to ensure that they obeyed the existing laws.<sup>8</sup> It is important to note that even if the varying political circumstances did not affect regulations concerning judicial issues, they certainly would have affected the activity of the judicial system *in practice* and at the same time also how cases concerning foreign residents were handled. The changing of government could result in the leaders of the earlier government being brought to court, as indeed happened in 318 when democrats overthrew the oligarchic constitution. The leading oligarchic politicians were brought to court and sentenced to death or exile, among them a foreigner, the Corinthian orator Deinarchos.<sup>9</sup>

References in epigraphic sources indicate that the courts were functioning throughout the Hellenistic period. In honorary decrees from the beginning of the 3rd century to the latter part of the 2nd century a common part was a request/order to the *thesmotetai* to arrange a judicial scrutiny for the recipient of the granted honours, ‘when the court(s) are filled up the next time.’<sup>10</sup> Excavations have revealed voting pebbles and lead pellets connected to the function of the courts from the 3rd century.<sup>11</sup> In 2nd century A.D. Pausanias visited Athens and described the judicial buildings he saw and their functions: the largest court in Athens is the Heliaia, charges of unpremeditated murder are brought to the Palladion, the claims of justified murder to the Delphinion, cases concerning iron and lifeless objects to the Prytaneion etc.<sup>12</sup>

There are also some references to foreigners in the judicial context. Diogenes Laertius informs us that the student and successor of Aristotle, Theophrastos (ca. 371–287) was brought to court when one Hagnonides attempted to get him sentenced for impiety.<sup>13</sup> Diogenes further mentions that the Stoic philosopher Kleanthes (263–232), who was extremely poor, was brought in front of the Areopagos council to answer the question regarding how a sturdy man like he made his living.<sup>14</sup> According to Plutarch, the Corinthian orator Deinarchos<sup>15</sup> brought charges against a friend, because while living in the friend’s house he lost his money, and his friend refused to investigate the matter.<sup>16</sup>

Finally, several *archon* lists and other lists of officials indicate that the office of *polemarchos*, the official who used to be in charge of judicial cases concerning metics, survived throughout the Hellenistic period and beyond.<sup>17</sup> The *archon* lists comprise the names of the eponymous *archon*, the *basileus*, the *polemarchos* and the six *thesmotetai* for each year, with no additional information. As such, they simply indicate that the

<sup>7</sup> Poll. 8.102.

<sup>8</sup> Habicht 1995, 64.

<sup>9</sup> D.H. *Din* 2. Plu. *Phoc.* 33.1–4; 35.2–36.4. Habicht 1995, 58–59.

<sup>10</sup> τοὺς θεσμοθέτας εἰσαγαγεῖν αὐτῷ τὴν δοκιμασίαν ὅταν πληρῶσιν τὰ δικαστήρια. For example *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 663, 801, 802, 947, 980–982; Osborne 1981–1983, I, D96, D102–D104, D107–D108, D112.

<sup>11</sup> Boegehold 1995, 42.

<sup>12</sup> Paus. 1.28.4–11.

<sup>13</sup> D.L. 5.37.

<sup>14</sup> D.L. 7.168.

<sup>15</sup> Deinarchos was born in ca. 360 and died in the beginning of the 3rd century.

<sup>16</sup> Plu. *Moralia* 850e.

<sup>17</sup> *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 1706 (list of *archontes* 229/8–213/12). After 120: *SEG* XXXII 218 (list of officials, 103/2–97/6), 1714, 1717–1719, 1721–1722 (lists of *archontes*, 1st century B.C. and early 1st century A.D.)

office of *polemarchos* was still in existence, not whether or not the duties of *polemarchos* remained the same in the Hellenistic period.

The indications of the inscriptions, the archaeological remains connected to the judicial system and the descriptions of the Imperial era together prove that the courts of Athens remained in function through the Hellenistic period and well into the Roman era. The references to Athenian foreigners in the judicial context are sporadic and partly unreliable – for example, the claim of Diogenes that Kleanthes was brought to the Areopagos council – but they prove that the foreigners living in Athens still had the right to appeal to the courts in the Hellenistic period. It would indeed have been impossible to exclude a group that constituted a relatively significant part of the population of Athens entirely from this right. In the 4th century the status differentiation of citizens and non-citizens was partially made stricter, but this kind of a development is not visible in judicial matters. Indeed, contrary development can be noticed if we look at foreign residents and non-resident foreigners in the judicial sphere. Through the introduction of the so-called mercantile laws in the mid-4th century, non-resident foreigners gained the right to appeal to Athenian courts.<sup>18</sup> As I observed earlier in my study, the Hellenistic period, especially from the last decades of the 3rd century, witnessed a clear weakening of status differentiation between citizens and foreign residents in other areas of life. It is unlikely that a contrary development would have taken place in judicial issues.

The stories of Diogenes and Plutarch do not reveal any details of the judicial status of foreign residents: were cases concerning them still handled in the same courts as at the end of the 4th century? Did the same officials take care of the judicial matters of the resident foreigners? Diogenes' claim that Kleanthes was brought to the Areopagos council to be heard is hardly reliable. The case would have been too insignificant for the Areopagos council to deal with: this was the court where the criminal cases of the most serious kind, premeditated homicides of citizens, were handled. Furthermore, judging by Diogenes' account, the issue in question was not even a crime. Possibly Diogenes merely wished to emphasize the fact that Kleanthes was poor and had to perform manual work to make a living. Most philosophers seem to have either been independently wealthy or had rich patrons, so Kleanthes' poverty was indeed exceptional.

All the important courts that existed in the Classical period, including those where cases involving foreign residents we handled, were still functioning in Pausanias' time. According to his description, their primary functions had survived. This might indicate that the functions of the different courts had remained mostly intact throughout the Hellenistic period. It is notable that Pausanias makes mention of the judicial cases handled in the Palladion only those concerning unpremeditated murder, not the murder cases of *metoikoi*. The excerpt does not give any indication as to whether Pausanias is talking about the functions of the courts in his own time (2<sup>nd</sup> century A.D.) or merely reciting earlier sources, namely Aristotle, and for some reason only partially repeating the information given by the latter. Whichever alternative is preferred, there are several possible explanations for the omission of some of the facts related by Aristotle. Pausanias' description of the courts of Athens is relatively short and general, so he

---

<sup>18</sup> See e.g. MacDowell 1978, 231–234.

might not have considered it necessary to describe in detail all the functions of the various courts. After all, his work was intended as a travel document, not an in-depth study of the legal systems of the different areas of the Greek world. The murder cases of the foreigners of Athens might have been moved at some point to the Areopagos council, where the handling of the cases concerning the premeditated murder of citizens took place, and thus only the cases concerning unpremeditated murder would have been left at the Palladion. This might have taken place after 229, when the *metoikia* system was no longer in existence. The Athenian authorities might have decided that it was unnecessary to assign criminal cases to different courts according to the civic status of the individuals concerned. Finally this sort of division might have been rendered obsolete in the late-2nd century when Athenian citizenship became insignificant in regard to the definition of an individual's status. In Pausanias' time, over 200 years later, the insignificance of this matter would have been even greater.

In the Classical era the judicial procedures concerning citizens and metics were approximately the same with the exception that different officials were responsible for the handling of their cases.<sup>19</sup> The only issue with some connection to the judicial status of the foreign residents, for which there are plenty of references in sources, is the aforementioned requirement of the honorary decrees for the *thesmotetai* to arrange scrutiny of the recipient about the honours granted. The purpose of this seems to have been to ensure the legality of the honorary decrees. The recipient of the honours was required to be present at the judicial scrutiny.<sup>20</sup> In practice this concerned only a fraction of the foreigners in Athens, because the granting of honours was always relatively rare.

The details of the judicial procedures concerning the foreigners of Athens can be clarified only when, or if, more epigraphic material is discovered and published. Generally speaking it can be said that the prevailing political conditions in Athens at any given time affected the judicial issues of foreigners at the same time as they affected the functioning of the entire judicial system. Especially during 262/1–229/8 the freedom of manoeuvre of the various administrative organs of Athens was severely restricted, so this must have also influenced the judicial system. In the periods of independence the courts were certainly more active. The status differences of the Athenian citizens and foreign residents remained clear for a very long time, but by the second half of the 2nd century it is possible to see clear signs of the diminishing of these differences. This factor might have resulted in the complete equalization of the judicial procedures of citizens and matters.

## 2. Land ownership remains inaccessible to foreigners

In the Classical Athens metics could not own land, unless they were granted a special privilege allowing this (ἐγκτησις γῆς καὶ οἰκίας). This is unambiguous,<sup>21</sup> and can be deducted simply from the fact that the privilege appears in the honorary inscriptions of

<sup>19</sup> Whitehead 1977, 92–93.

<sup>20</sup> Osborne 1981–1983, IV, 166.

<sup>21</sup> Harrison 1968, 199.

metics, as well as foreigners in general, as a common type of honour.<sup>22</sup> If the metics had been allowed to own land, this sort of a privilege would of course have been unnecessary. The reason for the prohibition is easy to understand: land was the most important source of an individual's wealth. Since so many outsiders came to Athens due to the economical opportunities it offered, especially in the 5th century, it was natural that the Athenians wanted to ensure that land ownership in Attica remained primarily in their hands.

Inherently connected to the issue of foreigners' land ownership is the *enktesis* privilege. I will examine this privilege in detail in the third section of my study. However, some points should be made here. *Enktesis* was a state privilege that could be awarded to foreigners for services and achievements that benefited the *polis*. If a foreigner had received a hereditary *enktesis* privilege, the inheritance of his land property was dictated by the general inheritance laws of Athens: land property could not be bequeathed by will if there were legal heirs.<sup>23</sup> However, A. R. W. Harrison noted that the privilege was not automatically hereditary.<sup>24</sup> This is easily deductible from the fact that in some cases the grants of *enktesis* do not include the specification that the privilege was should be given both to the recipient and his descendants.<sup>25</sup> Furthermore, foreigners could not accept a gift of land without the *enktesis* privilege and could not inherit land through a will.<sup>26</sup> Nearly all the Hellenistic honorary decrees for individual foreign residents from the last two decades of the 4th century to shortly after 229 that have survived include the *enktesis* privilege.<sup>27</sup> Although there are indications of the activity of foreign individuals who clearly lived in Athens in the 2nd century,<sup>28</sup> the latest actual honorary decrees for resident foreigners are from the 220's.<sup>29</sup> There are, however, at least two dozen decrees for foreigners who did not live in Athens. A few of these include the grant of *enktesis*, in each case coupled with *proxenia*. These are IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 862 for Dionysios (ca. 200), 884 for Heris of Byzantion (ca. 200), 907 for Lucius Hortensius (?) (ca. 170), and 948 for two Pergamenians (ca. 190). This evidently shows that the prohibition of foreigners' land ownership was not abolished after 229/8.

The changes that did take place in matters concerning foreigners' land ownership were related to the *enktesis* privilege: at least from the mid-3rd century onwards it had been possible to define a maximum monetary value for which the *enktesis* recipient was

<sup>22</sup> *Enktesis* before 323: IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 80, 83, 86, 132, 206, 285, 287, 343 (+Add. p. 659+SEG XXIV 103), 351, 360; Pečirka 1966, 350–325; SEG XXI 300. Only in a few of these can the recipient of honours be certainly identified as a metic, on the basis of the other privileges he had received and the other content of the decrees. In most cases *enktesis* is coupled with *proxenia*, and the recipient is a non-resident foreigner.

<sup>23</sup> Harrison 1968, 148, 151.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.* 238.

<sup>25</sup> Examples of this from the Classical period would seem to be IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 83, ll. 7–10 (before 387/6); 279, ll. 6–7 (342 or before 336/5); Pečirka 1966, 43–45, ll. 1–4 (350–325; heavily restored).

<sup>26</sup> Harrison 1968, 153.

<sup>27</sup> IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 505, 551 (mostly restored but plausible: Pečirka 1966, 85), 554, 802, 835.

<sup>28</sup> E.g. the decree of *epidosis*, IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 2332, presumably for a building project. The decree includes a long list of participants. Among them are some 25 foreigners, originating from instance from Antiocheia, Kyzikos and Rhodes.

<sup>29</sup> This does not indicate that no foreigners living in Athens were given honours after the 220's, merely that no such decrees have survived: it is known from a statue base that the platonic philosopher Karneades, founder of the so-called New Academy, was naturalized at some point around the middle of the 2nd century. This must have been done by decree, since that was still the procedure at the time, as indicated by surviving naturalization decrees. Cf. Osborne 1981–1983, III, 101–102.



allowed to buy houses and land.<sup>30</sup> This practice survived after 229/8 too. Thus for instance Apollas gained the right to buy a house up to the value of one talent, and land up to the value of two talents.<sup>31</sup> Various issues at different times affected the granting of *enktesis*, how often it was awarded and for what reasons. This naturally affected the prevailing realities of foreigners' land ownership: how many foreign land owners there were in Attica, how much land they owned and so on. Unfortunately, as interesting as these questions are, they cannot be researched because there is no information in the sources about these issues.

There was an exception to the rule of the prohibition of foreign land ownership, which was already visible in the second half of the 4th century and became increasingly emphasized in the Hellenistic era: foreigners could acquire and own land with the *enktesis* privilege but also indirectly, as part of a collective in which citizens also played a part. The foremost example is the private religious clubs that the state generally allowed to function without surveillance or interference. In the latter half of the 4th century clubs that had both Athenian and foreign members became more common. According to M. Leiwo, foreigners were able to own land within these clubs.<sup>32</sup> It appears that in official contexts the citizen members were marked as the actual owners of the land property.

A similar example of the foreigners' indirect land ownership is possibly the land property of the philosophical school Aristotle founded, *Peripatos*. A citizen never presided over the school. The wills of Theophrastos, the successor of Aristotle, as well as those of the two following leaders of the school, Straton and Lykon, are preserved in the work of Diogenes Laertius. Of these three wills at least that of Theophrastos makes mention of terms concerning land property. Theophrastos received some land by *enktesis* through his connection with Demetrios of Phaleron.<sup>33</sup> Aristotle did not receive *enktesis*, so in practice Theophrastos was the founder of *Peripatos* as an institution in the sense that the school now had permanent premises.<sup>34</sup> He bequeathed the school and its land to 10 of his comrades, whom he obliged to retain it as common property, for the advantage of all the members of the school.<sup>35</sup> Some of these comrades were citizens, some foreigners. Theophrastos, being a foreigner, could not bequeath the land he owned to another foreigner. Therefore it is likely that in official circumstances the land of *Peripatos* was the property of the citizens who belonged to the circle of comrades he named. The situation was probably the same with the wills of Straton and Lykon: it is possible the land property of the school was officially inherited by the descendants of the Athenian members of the circle Theophrastos named. Further evidence of property arrangements like this within the philosophic schools is provided by the will of Epicurus.<sup>36</sup> Epicurus was himself a citizen of Athens, but since most of his friends,

<sup>30</sup> E.g. *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 801; 835, ll. 26–27; 862, ll. 7–8; 948, ll. 3–4.

<sup>31</sup> *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 835, ll. 26–27.

<sup>32</sup> Leiwo 1997, 111.

<sup>33</sup> D.L. 5.39. Demetrios had studied in the school under Aristotle and seems to have put some of the Peripatetic ideals to use in his politics.

<sup>34</sup> Cf. Gottschalk 1972, 329.

<sup>35</sup> D.L. 5.52–53. Gottschalk 1972, 328, 330.

<sup>36</sup> D.L. 10.16–21.

colleagues and pupils to whom he bequeathed the school and its property were foreigners, he named two Athenians as the formal inheritors of the property.<sup>37</sup>

Indirect land ownership by foreigners was in many respects more restricted than the right to own land gained through *enktesis*, and it was dictated by different rules. When owning land as part of a certain whole, a foreigner could not be held responsible for it at least officially, and he could not decide upon its inheritance.

### 3. Mixed marriage legitimate from the 220's onwards as a natural result of the change in the status of the descendants

Land property acquired through *enktesis* could be inherited by the recipient's descendants if the original privilege included this stipulation. The matter of the inheritance of property was linked to the issue of marriage. A person's property was inherited by his closest legitimate descendants, who in the ideal case were his children. The children, in turn, were legitimate descendants if the marriage in which they were born was lawful, i.e. in accordance with the Athenian practice, a contract of betrothal (*engye* or *epidikasia*).<sup>38</sup> The specifications are well known in the case of the marriage of two Athenian citizens. It would seem that the same regulations applied if both the spouses were foreigners. A much more complicated matter is the marriage of an Athenian and a foreigner. The most important sources for marriage and the status of descendants are Aristotle and Demosthenes. Most scholars have taken it for granted that the evidence supplied by them means that the marriages of citizens and foreigners were prohibited by law, at least by Demosthenes' time. If this was so, then, it is highly interesting to study the issue of mixed marriages in the Hellenistic period: the private grave monuments of the period reveal several instances where one of the spouses is an Athenian, the other a foreigner. If marriages of citizens and foreigners were prohibited in the Classical period, surely this would mean that they became legal in the Hellenistic period?

The excerpts of Aristotle's *Athenaion politeia* traditionally considered relevant in the context of mixed marriage have been quoted earlier.<sup>39</sup> According to Aristotle, the law of Perikles (451/0) defined that in order for a child to be a citizen with full rights both of his parents were required to be *astoi*. Regarding the situation in his own time Aristotle implies that the requirement of *astos* parentage was still in force.

Concerning the effect of the Periclean law on mixed marriage, the prevailing opinion is that it did not illegalize marriages of *astoi* and foreigners formally, but the

<sup>37</sup> Leiwo, Remes 1999, *passim*.

<sup>38</sup> A woman was given in marriage with *engye* by one of her closest male relatives (father, brother, paternal grandfather). In the Classical period the standard formula contained a statement that the woman was given in marriage with a view to the birth of legitimate offspring and, normally, an additional clause about the amount of the dowry. The agreement was confirmed by a handshake and its validity secured through the presence of witnesses. In the Hellenistic period a written contract became standard practice. The marriage was, however, only valid from the day the woman moved into the man's house. If none of a woman's closest male relatives were alive, she became *epikleros*, heiress, in which case the marriage procedure was *epidikasia* (claim of inheritance and the awarding of the *epikleros* to a man). MacDowell 1978, 86, 103. Kapparis 1999, 14–15, 203–204.

<sup>39</sup> See p. 14 above.

practical result was that it did render them invalid or at least extremely unattractive through dictating that children born of these marriages were not citizens with full rights.<sup>40</sup> This is an acceptable conclusion. The most important form of property a person's descendants could inherit was land, and this was not available for the offspring of mixed marriages. The prospect of not being able to pass his land to his descendants would have greatly discouraged an Athenian landowner from considering a marriage to a woman of foreign origin. Aristotle's explanation of the law of his time does not refer to marriage any more than that of the law of Perikles, although it does describe how the specifications of the law were put into practice, i.e. the process of examination and entrance of new citizens.

However, most scholars are in agreement that such a prohibition was included in the laws sometime in the 4th century.<sup>41</sup> This conclusion is based on the speech included in the Demosthenic corpus, *In Neaeram*, which appears to quote a law text which forbids mixed marriage:

If a *xenos* shall cohabit with an *aste* in any way or manner whatsoever, he may be indicted before the Thesmothetae by anyone who chooses to do so from among the Athenians having the right to bring charges. And if he be convicted, he shall be sold, himself and his property, and the third part shall belong to the one securing his conviction. The same principle shall hold also if a *xene* shall cohabit with an *astos*, and the *astos* who cohabits with the *xene* so convicted shall be fined one thousand drachmae.<sup>42</sup>

To summarise the context of the speech: Apollodorus, Athenian citizen, accuses Neaira that she is an alien woman who has been with an Athenian, Stephanos, as if in a lawful Athenian marriage, and she and Stephanos have tried to pass Neaira's daughter as Athenian. At first glance the law quoted during the trial would indeed seem to prohibit marriages of *astoi* and foreigners. If this is true, then, the appearance of cases of mixed marriage in the Hellenistic funeral monuments would indicate a significant change: the abolition of the prohibition.

The private grave stones are in most cases dated on the basis of the style of lettering. Thus it is not possible to place them into a more specific chronological context than by century. However, if we take into account all the grave inscriptions dated to the Hellenistic period, we find over 50 cases of mixed marriage. Since this study is limited to the first two centuries of the Hellenistic period, I will mainly concentrate on the cases that are dated to the 3rd and 2nd centuries. These are 25 in number.<sup>43</sup> All are funerary *stelai* of foreign women, married to Athenian men. The inscriptions are short, all in the same form as the example of *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 9027: 'Synethea, daughter of Dionysios, of

<sup>40</sup> MacDowell 1978, 87. Rhodes 1981, 332. Ogden 1996, 62.

<sup>41</sup> MacDowell 1978, 87. Rhodes 1981, 332. Carey 1992, 3–4. Kapparis 1999, 27. Hamel 2003, x–xi.

<sup>42</sup> [D.] 59.16: Ἐὰν δὲ ξένος ἀστὴ συννοικῇ τέχνῃ ἢ μηχανῇ ἡτινιοῦν, γραφέσθω πρὸς τοὺς θεσμοθέτας Ἀθηναίων ὁ βουλόμενος οἷς ἔξεστιν. ἐὰν δὲ ἄλλῳ, πεπράσθω καὶ αὐτὸς καὶ ἡ οὐσία αὐτοῦ, καὶ τὸ τρίτον μέρος ἔστω τοῦ ἐλόγτος. ἔστω δὲ καὶ ἐὰν ἡ ξένη τῷ ἀστῶ συννοικῇ κατὰ ταυτά, καὶ ὁ συννοικῶν τῇ ξένῃ τῇ ἀλούσῃ ὀφειλέτω χιλίας δραχμᾶς. Transl. A. T. Murray (Loeb).

<sup>43</sup> 3rd century: *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 9027 (= *SEG III* 194), 9152. 3rd/2nd century: *Agora XVII* 515; *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 9662, 10097. 2nd century: *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 8092, 8377, 8581, 8693, 9054 (= *SEG III* 167), 9198, 9217, 9679, 9805 (= *SEG III* 160), 9895, 9968, 9975, 10204, 10206, 10304, 10452; *SEG III* 175, 185; *SEG XIX* 279; *Agora XVII* 566. See also *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 2332 (183/2), ll. 95–97: a husband from the deme of Myrrinouttai and his wife from Akarnania in a list of participants in an *epidosis*.

Kibyra, wife of Aischinos of the *demos* Phaleron.<sup>44</sup> Occasionally the patronymic is omitted. The word used in the inscriptions, γυνή, also has the general meaning 'woman', but here the meaning is 'wife', since it is coupled with the husband's name which is in the genitive. Despite the unspecific dating of the grave inscription, a clear chronological pattern can be seen: while in the 3rd century and 3rd/2nd century there are only five cases of mixed marriage, in the 2nd century there are 20. A similar pattern is seen in the later grave inscriptions (over 20 for 2nd/1st and 1st century), so this growth in numbers is not a coincidence. If we followed the traditional interpretation of [D.] 59.16–17, we could interpret this significant growth in the numbers of marriages of Athenian citizens and foreigners as a sign that at some point in the Hellenistic period mixed marriages were legalized. But is the traditional interpretation of *In Neaeram* correct?

One issue to consider are Apollodoros' motives. Stephanos was his political rival and his motive for bringing charges was mainly to humiliate him, thereby gaining revenge for earlier lawsuits which he had endured through Stephanos.<sup>45</sup> In 59.16 Apollodoros says that he has come forward to accuse Neaira, because he feels he has been wronged by Stephanos. The motive is evident throughout the speech. The prosecutor expresses Apollodoros' desire to reinstate the authority of the law, but in K. A. Kapparis' view this can be taken simply as a patriotic generality.<sup>46</sup> Thus, although formally the accused was Neaira and the charge was that she pretended to be lawfully married to Stephanos, Neaira was in fact used as a convenient tool by the prosecutor to get to Stephanos, since she was a foreigner and with her past as a courtesan someone who by reputation was already questionable.

Another issue is the authenticity of the law citation, which has been a matter of some debate. Some scholars have questioned its authenticity but, as K. A. Kapparis notes, the majority have come to accept it.<sup>47</sup> The historians of the last few decades have not even addressed the issue but have taken the authenticity as given. Among the more recent editors of [D.] 59 C. Carey and Kapparis presented convincing arguments for accepting the law citation. The former pointed out three details in favour of this: the restriction of the right to prosecute to citizens, the reward for the successful prosecutor and the penalty for an Athenian male married to a foreigner. These do not appear in Apollodoros' paraphrase immediately after the law text.<sup>48</sup> A forger would have had to rely on the context of the speech, and this kind of details would have naturally formed the basis for any forgery.<sup>49</sup> Kapparis considered the law text authentic on the basis of linguistic criteria, contextual evidence and analysis of the content. He noted that the citation is standard and concise forensic language and does not contain some elements provided by the context which could be expected to appear in it if it was a forgery, for example the striking word παδοποιεῖσθαι (to beget or bear children), in the orator's paraphrase.<sup>50</sup>

<sup>44</sup> Συνήθεα Διονυσίου Κιβυρᾶτις, Αἰσχίνου Φαληρέως γυνή.

<sup>45</sup> Todd 1994, 134. Kapparis 1999, 29–30.

<sup>46</sup> Kapparis 1999, 30.

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid.* 198.

<sup>48</sup> [D.] 59.17.

<sup>49</sup> Carey 1992, 92.

<sup>50</sup> Kapparis 1999, 198. Both Kapparis and Carey 1992, 93 take παδοποιεῖσθαι to refer to the impossibility of legitimate offspring in mixed marriages.

Thus, in my opinion the excerpt of [D.] 59 can be taken as evidence of the existence of a law that concerned mixed marriages. However, its interpretation requires some further thought. At first glance it would appear to have forbidden all manner of cohabitation of an *astos/aste* and a foreigner (συνοικῆν τέχνῃ ἢ μηχανῇ ἥτινιοῦν). This cannot be the case since, as many have noted, concubinage was perfectly legal in Athens, whether with a foreign, slave or citizen woman.<sup>51</sup> For instance, in 59.118 the prosecutor implies that Stephanos could claim as his defence that Neaira was living with him as a concubine, not as a lawful wife. D. M. MacDowell, K. R. Walters, C. Carey and K. A. Kapparis concluded that the verb συνοικεῖν does not mean any kind of cohabitation but can only imply lawful or at least purported marriage.<sup>52</sup> This conclusion is based on the interpretation of the verb in the sources and seems to be correct.<sup>53</sup> The phrase ‘in any way or manner whatsoever’ (τέχνῃ ἢ μηχανῇ ἥτινιοῦν) in the law text does not necessarily contradict this, for Kapparis noted, citing several examples, that it is simply a standard phrase used in legal texts aiming to eliminate any possibility of violation of the law, the oath or the treaty.<sup>54</sup> In conclusion, then, that what the law forbade or illegalised was the pretence of lawful Athenian marriage.<sup>55</sup>

*Against Neaira* represents a case of γράφῃ ξενίας, a public indictment for pretending to be a citizen.<sup>56</sup> Apollodoros attempts to establish that Stephanos treated Neaira’s two sons as his own, born from an Athenian woman, and introduced them to his *phratRIA* and *demos*, and married her daughter Phano off to an Athenian as if she was an *aste*, born of two *astoi*.<sup>57</sup> To establish this, he seeks to prove that Neaira was a *xene*, not an *aste*, for if she was not an *aste*, her children could not be *astoi* either. Neaira’s and Stephanos’ crime, then, was to try to infiltrate into the citizenry persons who had no right to be there. The main issue in the speech was the status of the offspring, and this was the aim in the law regarding mixed marriage as well. The union of an Athenian and a foreigner was not in any way illegal or forbidden, as long as they did not attempt to present it as a lawful Athenian marriage. The pretence of lawful Athenian marriage involved the charade that the foreign party was an *astos/aste*, and from this it followed that any offspring illegally gained access to citizenship.<sup>58</sup> In other words, the law emphasized and strengthened the stipulation of *astos* parentage in the citizenship law.

The significant increase in the number of mixed marriages from 3rd to 2nd century, from 5 to 20 cases, then, does serve as a kind of an indication that mixed marriages were formally legitimate from the 220’s onwards. However, this was not a formal act of legalisation but rather a natural result of the change in the status of the offspring of mixed marriages after 229/8:<sup>59</sup> from the 220’s onwards the offspring of mixed

<sup>51</sup> MacDowell 1978, 89. Walters 1983, 320–321. Carey 1992, 4. Kapparis 1999, 8–13. The latter doubts the argument that concubinage with an Athenian woman was legal, suspecting that at least it happened extremely seldomly.

<sup>52</sup> MacDowell 1978, 87. Walters 1983, 320–321. Carey 1992, 4, 92. Kapparis 1999, 203.

<sup>53</sup> [D.] 17.51; 59.14. Is. 2.4; 3.16.

<sup>54</sup> Kapparis 1999, 203–205.

<sup>55</sup> E.g. Carey 1992, 4.

<sup>56</sup> Cf. Todd 1994, 134.

<sup>57</sup> [D.] 59.72; 59.122.

<sup>58</sup> Cf. Carey 1992, 4.

<sup>59</sup> See pp. 18 ff. above.

marriages were automatically citizens with full rights, which meant that *astos* status of both parents was no longer required for full citizen rights. As a result, the need for the pretence of lawful Athenian marriage was eliminated and it ceased to be a cause for charges of γραφή ξενίας. If the children of mixed marriages were citizens with full rights from 229 onwards, the significant increase in the number of such marriages in the 2nd century grave inscriptions is logical. As the children had a citizen status, this would have enhanced the willingness of Athenian men to marry foreign women. The existence of the few cases of a marriage of a citizen man and a foreign woman from earlier in the 3rd century does not contradict this conclusion. It might be that the few mixed marriages we know from the 3rd century were in fact cases where the husband had been naturalized, the wife remaining a foreigner. As seen in the early part of this study, the specification of the citizen status of the descendants had been necessary to guarantee the citizenship of the children of foreign mothers, that is to say the wives the naturalized men had brought with them from their home cities: the wife remained a foreigner according to the law even after the husband's naturalization, so the children would not have had citizen status without the specification.<sup>60</sup>

#### 4. Foreigners in the sphere of public religion<sup>61</sup>

When studying the religious life of ancient Athens, or the ancient Greece in general, it is important to make note of an essential difference in comparison to the contemporary world: it is not possible to separate the religious from the mundane. Religion was completely intertwined in virtually every aspect of life in ancient Greece, from a person's birth to his death. There was the sphere of private religion, manifested for instance in private cult associations, often centred on the worship of an imported deity, whose function the state did not control or restrict in any way. Aside from this, there was the more official sphere of public religion, consisting of *demos* cults and the state cult. The former were local cults, practiced in a limited area of Athens. The state cult – more important for the purposes of this study – could be defined as all the cult activities which the state regulated by decrees or laws. This state regulation took many forms, varying from cult to cult, but broadly speaking could be said to have focused on two areas, the form and financing of the cults, the content of them being dictated by tradition.<sup>62</sup> The public cult functions, especially the state cult, were closely tied to politics, administration and in fact everything that comprised the Athenian citizen.<sup>63</sup> The connection between public religion and politics made it also necessary to define the rights of non-citizens in this sphere. This had to do firstly with whether or not foreigners were allowed to participate in the public cults at all. Secondly the rights of foreigners

<sup>60</sup> Osborne 1981–1983, IV, 152–153.

<sup>61</sup> A note on the word 'cult', used in this chapter: it appears that the modern English word has no direct equivalent in ancient Greek. The average Athenian did not necessarily even think in terms of cults, because religion was such an integral and natural part of life. The word 'cult' is used here for practical purposes, but needs to be defined: a complex of religious activities concentrated on one or more deities or heroes and including prayer, ritual, sacrifice and dedications. Aleshire 1994, 12.

<sup>62</sup> *Ibid. passim*.

<sup>63</sup> Pakkanen 1995, 29.

were defined in the different elements which the cults contained. The most important of these were sacrifices, processions and contests.

The cults of public religion were in most cases concentrated on indigenous divinities and they had a long history, deriving from the Archaic period or even earlier. Most of them also continued to exist long after the Hellenistic period, into late antiquity. These cults varied in size and importance, ranging from local *demos* cults to great state festivals. The abundance of religious festivals is demonstrated by the fact that around the mid-4th century there were at least 97 annual festival *leitourgiai*, in the years when the Panathenaia was held, over 118.<sup>64</sup> It is no surprise that the largest amount of evidence exists for the cult activities which had the longest traditions and visibility in the life of the *polis*: the Eleusinian Mysteries, and festivals such Panathenaia, Great Panathenaia, City Dionysia, Theseia and Eleusinia. Dozens of inscriptions carry references to these throughout the Hellenistic period: festivals mentioned as celebrated or expected in a certain year, officials in charge of the arrangements of cult proceedings or festivals, victor catalogues of festival competitions and so on. In the Hellenistic period evidence of new cult activities appear in the sources. These often had a closer connection to the prevailing political climate than the old, traditional cults. The most prominent examples are the Ptolemaia and Rhomaia festivals. The former was established in 224 in honour of Ptolemy III Euergetes. The latter, founded shortly after 200, was dedicated to the personification of Rome, and presumably related to the alliance with Rome which occurred in that year.

The first century of the Hellenistic period, until 229, was a period of instability in Athens. In international politics its position varied between complete independence and the status of a satellite-state of Macedon. Above all in the satellite-state period, 262/1–229/8, Athens' independence was severely restricted. In terms of internal affairs, Athens' constitution and leading politicians fluxuated frequently between democracy and oligarchy. Conditions were not stabilized until after the end of the 3rd century. Despite the instability, the sources show strong continuity in the practice of public religion. Short breaks did occur: in some years circumstances prevented the celebration of the large festivals. But on the whole the traditional forms of public religion continued regularly.<sup>65</sup> The continuity of cults must indeed have been important for the Athenians. The cults were a way to uphold and express Athenian identity. The changing conditions certainly created insecurity and restlessness in the life of the *polis*, so the continuity was a kind of a token of the survival of traditions in spite of social and political changes. This gave public cults an importance outside of politics as well. Thus it is very likely, as P. Pakkanen noted, that political changes affected official religion very slowly.<sup>66</sup>

It could be assumed, precisely because of the fact that the cults changed very slowly, that any significant changes in relation to the foreign residents' – or any foreigners' – right of participation did not take place either. Political segregation remained strong for a long time, and only in the latter half of the 2nd century did citizenship lose its significance in defining an individual's status. As noted, official religion was closely intertwined with politics, and participation in the latter was the distinct privilege of citizens. Very few decrees concerning the regulations of official

<sup>64</sup> Whitehead 1977, 81–82.

<sup>65</sup> Cf. Mikalson 1998, 242 ff., esp. 242–264.

<sup>66</sup> Pakkanen 1995, 29.

cult proceedings have survived. The very few exceptions are all from the Classical period. One is a law concerning the Eleusinian Mysteries.<sup>67</sup> It is extremely fragmentary, and if it ever contained regulations concerning the right of participation of foreigners, they were in the sections that are now lost. Another is the regulations concerning the annual Panathenaia, from 335/4–330/29.<sup>68</sup> The decree clarifies how the different phases of the festival are conducted but does not mention anything about the participation of foreigners. However, it appears that there really were specific regulations concerning the participation of people of different statuses. According to Aleshire, the state kept lists of those entitled to participate in processions and festivals.<sup>69</sup> Our knowledge of the metics' right of participation in official religion in the Classical period derives mainly from literary sources.

### *Cult officials*

In Classical Athens, elective offices were monopolized by citizens. This did not change in the Hellenistic period. The officials of the state cult such as priests and officials responsible for the organization of festivals, for instance the *athlotetai* of Panathenaia, were considered state officials and were usually selected by election. This is evidenced for instance by the honorary decrees for priests, which use the same term referring to elections as the decrees for officials of the state administration. Since the offices of state religion were elective offices, foreigners were naturally excluded from them.

In some cases the election of cult officials was dictated by tradition. The *demoi* had their own, local cults and officials taking care of them. Access to the priesthood of a *demos* cult required membership of the particular *demos* and *phratría*. This, again, made it impossible for a foreigner to serve in such a position. In the Mysteries of Eleusis office holding was limited even with regards to the citizenry. The Eleusinian festivities were organized by the state, and the proceedings were supervised by elected officials, but the priesthoods of the Mysteries were held by two clans, the Eumolpidae and Kerykes.<sup>70</sup>

However, there are some cases where a foreigner appears in a role of public religion, something that at first glance would seem to be a religious elective office.

A catalogue of *hieropoioi* of the Rhomaia and Ptolemaia festivals from 183/2 includes five foreigners: Mnasagoras of Alexandreia, Glaukias of Thessaly, Panaitios of Rhodes, Memnon of Sardes and Spurius of Rome.<sup>71</sup> One Aristomenes of Halikarnassos appears in a later, more fragmentary catalogue of *hieropoioi* of the Athenaea festival, dated to 157/6.<sup>72</sup> Apart from these two, there is a dedication of *hieropoioi* for Artemis, from the 3rd century, including one *isoteles* and one other foreigner.<sup>73</sup> The dedication does not reveal the function of these *hieropoioi*. All of the three festivals named in the *hieropoioi* lists were certainly within the sphere of official/public religion. Ptolemaia

<sup>67</sup> Clinton 1980, 258–288.

<sup>68</sup> IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 334+SEG XVIII 13+Agora XVI 75.

<sup>69</sup> Aleshire 1994, 14.

<sup>70</sup> Mylonas 1961, 230–231. Parke 1977, 57. Lauenstein 1987, 187. Pakkanen 1995, 31–36. The Eumolpidae were an Eleusinian family, the Kerykes Athenian.

<sup>71</sup> IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 1938, II. 8, 22, 25, 35, 40: [Μ]ναςαγόρας Ἀλεξανδ(ρεύς), [Γλ]αυκίας Θεσσαλός, Παναίτιος Ῥόδιος, [Μ]έμνων Σαρδιανός, Σπύριος Ῥωμαῖος.

<sup>72</sup> IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 1937, I. 14: [Ἀρισ]τομέν[ης Ἀλικα]ρνασσεύς.

<sup>73</sup> IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 2859: Χαβρίας ἰσοτε(λής), Παιδέας Σολεύς.



and Rhomaia were founded on the instigation of the state. The Athenaea festival named here is not the annual Panathenaia nor the Great Panathenaia but a smaller festival for Athena. These *hieropoioi* definitely had some kind of a public role, since their names were inscribed in stone. But was the position of the *hieropoioi* an elective office?

*Hieropoioi* were cult officials who took care of the offerings and who with the priests organised the festivals of the particular deity. There were several different kinds of *hieropoioi*: 1) ordinary yearly offices, 2) festival commissions appointed for particular festivals, 3) festival ambassadors and 4) caretakers of the offerings of single cult associations and religious societies.<sup>74</sup> Due to the diversity of the tasks of *hieropoioi*, they did not represent any one social group. They were selected as a collegium according to each circumstance.<sup>75</sup> The two *hieropoioi* catalogues including foreigners would seem to belong to the second group, festival commissions appointed for particular festivals. Since this was not the case for ordinary elective offices, both Athenian citizens and foreigners could serve in these festival commissions.

Another religious role resembling an office in which foreigners could participate was the position of *zakoros*. A dedication from the year 133/2 goes as follows:

To Isis and Anubis. Nikonymos, son of Antifanes, of Oinoe, former priest in the *archon* year of Xenon dedicated while Metrodoros of Kalchedon functioned as *zakoros*.<sup>76</sup>

In this case we cannot be sure whether this is a public cult or a private cult of a religious association. Private cults also had priests. What is fairly certain is that the foreign *zakoros* was a free person, not a slave, because slaves were not usually included in inscriptions. It would appear from the dedication that *zakoroi* were servants to priests. Thus it is likely that these positions would not have been elective offices.

#### *Exception to the rule: the Eleusinian Mysteries open to all*

Most of the individual cults of the state cult seem to have had some limitations concerning the foreigners' right to participate. The only exception appears to have been the Mysteries of Eleusis. Everyone who wished could participate and be initiated independent of citizenship, age or gender. Indeed would-be initiates came from all over the Greek world.<sup>77</sup> The public part of the festivities, including the procession, was open to all, but only the initiated could take part in the secret mysteries. Isocrates and the much later Libanius give the impression that in the Classical period the only limitation was that non-Greek people could not attend.<sup>78</sup> The same excerpt of Libanius seems to imply that this limitation was based on language rather than ethnicity: the initiates had to know Greek to understand what was being said and respond correctly during the course of the rituals.<sup>79</sup> The fact that all Greek people could attend naturally meant there were no limitations for metics. Most of them were of Greek origin. The freed slaves –

<sup>74</sup> Oehler 1913, 1583.

<sup>75</sup> Habicht 1982b, 174.

<sup>76</sup> SEG XXIV 225: Ἰ[σ]ίδι Ἀν[σὺ]βιδι. Νικόνυμος Ἀντιφάνου Οἰναιοῦ ἱερεὺς γενόμενος, ἐπὶ Ξένωνος ἄρχοντος ἀνέθηκεν, Ζακορεύοντος Μητροδώρου Καλχηδονίου.

<sup>77</sup> Mylonas 1961, 226. Parke 1977, 61.

<sup>78</sup> Isoc. 4.157. Lib. Decl. 13.19.

<sup>79</sup> Parke 1977, 60.

who became metics – could be of “barbarian” origin but were normally wholly Hellenized.

The only thing that changed in the right of participation of foreigners in the Hellenistic period appears to be that the Romans were given access to the Mysteries.<sup>80</sup> In the 2nd century eminent Romans who visited Athens were interested in becoming initiated. An anecdote tells that the eminent orator Lucius Licinius Crassus visited Athens as a young *quaestor* in the late-2nd century. The Mysteries had been held just two days earlier, but since Crassus wanted to be initiated, he demanded the Athenians to arrange them anew. At the end of the 4th century the Athenians had altered the rules in a similar situation to please Demetrios Poliorketes, but now they refused. The other members of the Roman embassy quietly took the young *quaestor* away from Athens.<sup>81</sup>

Allowing the Romans to participate in the Mysteries was most likely a politically-motivated decision: the Athenians had a desire to remain on good terms with a powerful ally. Thus the change is likely to have taken place at around 200 or sometime later. Athens was allied to Rome from that time onwards, and in earlier times very few Romans had visited Athens. Roman troops were present in Piraeus and occasionally gave military aid to the Athenians. Especially after the end of the third Macedonian war in 146 the Romans had decisive authority in Greece. Thus they were not only very much a different case from other, individual non-Greek persons who might come to Athens, but it was also in the Athenians’ best interests to keep a cordial relationship with the formidable power Rome represented. The Athenians indeed strived for this, as for example the establishment of the Rhomaia festival and the regular praising of the Romans in the state decrees as friends and allies indicate.<sup>82</sup>

#### *Foreigners mostly excluded from sacrifices until 120*

Sacrifice was the essential part of any cult proceedings in Athens, whether public or private. It was conducted on various occasions, both independently and in connection with other festivals and proceedings, no matter what their size. As far as public religion goes, it seems to have been regulated by state very thoroughly. Magistrates, both sacred and otherwise, were required to sacrifice on behalf of the Athenian *demos*, one of its constituent groups and so on. Often the state provided funds for sacrificial animals, and proceeds from the sale of the hides went to the city.<sup>83</sup> It is no wonder, then, that references to sacrifice are copious in the sources. These range from the description of the duties of various officials to documents like the regulations for the annual Panathenaia. The latter define the course of the sacrifice in detail: in the main sacrifice a single animal was sacrificed on the altar of Athena Nike, just inside the entrance to the Acropolis. The other animals were sacrificed on the great altar of Athena to the east of Erechtheion. Afterwards the meat was divided up outside the main city gate in the Kerameikos where the procession had started. The meat from the main sacrifice was

<sup>80</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>81</sup> Cic. *De Or.* 3.75.

<sup>82</sup> Maintaining good relations with Rome indeed proved fruitful for Athens: in 168 it recovered possession of the islands of Delos, Lemnos, Imbros and Skyros, and the territory of the destroyed city of Haliartos. Delos and Lemnos were the primary source of Athens’ prosperity in the 2nd century. Habicht 1995, 219–222.

<sup>83</sup> Aleshire 1994, 13.

divided among the populace by *demos* and allotted in proportion to the numbers from each *demos* that had participated in the procession.<sup>84</sup>

It seems that in the Classical period metics – or any foreigners – were for the most part not allowed to take part in sacrifices as far as the state cult and the big festivals were concerned.<sup>85</sup> This was the case at least with Panathenaia. The regulations only mention Athenians in connection with the sacrifice.<sup>86</sup> The exclusion of foreigners can perhaps be explained by the fact that this kind of sacrifice was in direct relation to the success of the *polis*. It was perhaps then considered a political issue, and politics, in turn, was monopolized by citizens. There were, however, some exceptions at least in Demosthenes' time. We know from the speech against Neaira that there was a law which allowed foreign women to take part in certain public sacrifices.<sup>87</sup> The prosecutor makes the accusation that Neaira's daughter Phano had performed sacrifices on behalf of the city although she was not allowed to do so, not because she was a foreigner but because she was impure, having been caught with an adulterer: Stephanos had married her off to an Athenian man, illegally presenting her as Athenian.<sup>88</sup> The rites Phano was supposed to have participated in were part of the second day of a festival called Anthesteria. This three-day festival was celebrated in the month of Anthesterion (roughly at the end of February) when trees were in full blossom and new wine had matured.<sup>89</sup>

There is no evidence of the participation of foreigners in sacrifices of the state cult (or *demos* cults) in the sources of the Hellenistic period. References to sacrifice in general are plentiful, especially concerning priests and other officials and magistrates performing sacrifices. Foreigners did not have access to elective offices, so they naturally were excluded from these. It seems reasonable to think that as far as the very old and traditional elements of the state cult were concerned, the regulations on the participation of foreigners in sacrifices did not change remarkably. The cults with long traditions were the most important for Athenian identity, so there might not have been a strong tendency to change the ways in which they were performed.

Although there are no sources to prove this, it is possible that in the case of some of the new cults established in the Hellenistic period the rules concerning participation were more lenient. I am using the Ptolemaia and Rhomaia festivals as examples. Although similar in form to the old cults they did not have long traditions and were more firmly based on the contemporary political climate. Furthermore, with the traditional cults it is likely that the state established control over them gradually,<sup>90</sup> whereas these new festivals were from the start established on the instigation of the state. Taking into consideration the fact that *metoikia* no longer seems to have been in existence and the offspring mixed marriages were citizens with full rights after 229, this sort of diminishing of status differentiation of citizens and non-citizens might have been translated in the new festivals in the sense that it was not considered necessary to limit participation in the sacrifice to citizens.

<sup>84</sup> IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 334+SEG XVIII 13+*Agora* XVI 75. Tracy 1991, 133–134.

<sup>85</sup> Whitehead 1977, 87. Mikalson 1998, 255.

<sup>86</sup> IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 334+SEG XVIII 13+*Agora* XVI 75. Whitehead 1977, 87.

<sup>87</sup> [D.] 59.85. See also the commentary for this in Kapparis 1999, 353.

<sup>88</sup> [D.] 59.73 ff.

<sup>89</sup> Kapparis 1999, 324.

<sup>90</sup> Aleshire 1994, 13–14.

The above suggestion must unfortunately remain a hypothesis. Limiting our attention strictly to what can be established on the basis of sources, the only major change in the right of participation of foreigners in sacrifices came when the sons of wealthy foreign families gained access to *ephebeia* in ca. 120. The training programme of the *epheboi* included sacrifices during various festivals and on other occasions, described in detail in the honorary decrees for *epheboi* and their commander and instructors: mentioned are, for example, sacrifice with the ephobic commander and the priest at the state hearth in the *prytaneion* for Demos, Charites and the benefactors, sacrifices in Eleusis, the Proerosia festival, Dionysia and Panathenaia.<sup>91</sup> Thus the foreign youths now shared in the rituals of some of Athens' oldest religious cults. As these had been previously restricted to citizens, the change was remarkable.<sup>92</sup> Although the foreigners are listed separately after the citizen youths, there is no sign in the description of the training programme that the foreigners could not participate in the sacrifices.

#### *Processions: a limited right of participation*

Procession was a standard part of festivals. It was included in all the large, traditional festivals mentioned so far: the open part of the Mysteries, Panathenaia and Great Panathenaia, Theseia, Eleusinia and City Dionysia. The procession took an especially spectacular form in the Great Panathenaia. The members of this procession gathered just outside the city walls at the Kerameikos, continued along the Panathenaic way through the agora to the Acropolis. The culmination was the presentation of the *peplos* to the cult statue of Athena in the Erechtheion.<sup>93</sup> At least in the 2nd century the ephobic training included participation in several processions: for instance those of the Eleusinian mysteries, the Dionysia festivals and Panathenaia are mentioned.<sup>94</sup>

What evidence there is of the participation of foreign residents in processions concerns the late Classical period. Surviving fragments of New Comedy, quoted by the lexicographers, indicate that foreigners acted as carriers of sacrificial trays (*skapherophoi*) at least in the processions of Panathenaia and City Dionysia.<sup>95</sup> Apart from this, in the Panathenaic procession the daughters of metics carried water jars. Evidently foreigners could not be given as important a role as citizens, but it does seem, as Parke noted, that an effort was made to include all ages and classes.<sup>96</sup>

#### *Participation in festival competitions*

Competitions, like sacrifices and processions, were a standard part of Athenian festivals – included in most of them, although not all. The competitions varied in scope, ranging from a singular torch race, like the one integrated in the all-night celebration of the annual Panathenaia, to the full program of the Great Panathenaia. City Dionysia had an extensive programme of dramatic contests, as did Lenaia, a winter festival. Also the Thargelia festival included drama competitions.<sup>97</sup> The competition programme of the

<sup>91</sup> IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 1006+SEG XXXVIII 114, IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 1008.

<sup>92</sup> Cf. Mikalson 1998, 255.

<sup>93</sup> Tracy 1991, 134.

<sup>94</sup> IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 1006+SEG XXXVIII 114, IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 1008 etc.

<sup>95</sup> Harp. Σ 21. Suid. σ 544. Parke 1977, 127. Whitehead 1977, 87.

<sup>96</sup> Parke 1977, 43.

<sup>97</sup> For Thargelia: Mikalson 1998, 54.

Great Panathenaia was comprised of athletic events for men, youths and boys and equestrian contests. Theseia had a similar programme. Also Eleusinia and Ptolemaia included athletic contests.<sup>98</sup>

The most important sources on the participation of foreigners in the competitions of the Great Panathenaia are the victor lists, which date roughly from the first half of the 2nd century.<sup>99</sup> The athletic events were open to all, and the lists indicate participants from all over the Hellenistic world. Some events in the equestrian competition were restricted to citizens, whereas others were open to all. The latter were a fixed and regular feature of the games, and formed the equestrian competition in all the major games. They were pan-Hellenic. All but one winner in the lists are non-Athenians, the sole exception being a naturalized Athenian (*IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 2313, l. 58). Also members of the Ptolemaic and Attalid royal families figure in the lists, though not participating themselves but rather through their representatives.<sup>100</sup> Since all the names of the non-Athenian winners are listed in identical form (first name, patronymic, ethnic), it is of course impossible to establish if any of these individuals lived in Athens. However, most likely most of them did not: the likelihood that the foreign population of Athens would have had numerous athletes and horse racers so overwhelmingly successful in the competitions is minimal. The same explains the small number of Athenian winners in the open events.

Similar victor catalogues have survived from the Theseia festival, from 161/0–109/8.<sup>101</sup> The situation regarding the participation of foreigners is very different here compared to the Panathenaic competitions. Whereas in the latter case most of the winners of the open events were foreigners, in the Theseia catalogues only a few were of foreign origin. Eumenes, son of Straton, of Kyzikos was victorious in boys' boxing (*IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 956, ll. 13–14). In the same catalogue Dionysios, son of Soson, from Kyzikos won the men's boxing (l. 15). Another list includes a Chalkidean, Dionysios, as the winner of the men's stadium race (*IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 961, ll. 50–51). In yet another, a citizen of Smyrna whose name has not survived, won the boys' wrestling.

The programme of Theseia is best clarified by the earliest of the victor catalogues, *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 956, which is also the most complete. First listed are contests that have a strong military nature and a close connection to the *ephebeia*:<sup>102</sup> skills of the war-trumpeteer, of the herald, physical fitness, the condition of arms and equipment, fitness of horses, and torch races. Competing in physical fitness and the condition of arms and equipment took place in *phylai* and military divisions. There were three torch races, for boys, youths and *epheboi*. Next in the list come athletic contests, comprised of regular games events – running races of different distances, boxing, wrestling and *pankration*. These were divided into men's and boys' category. Last listed are the equestrian events.

Although most winners in the catalogues are Athenian, a close study reveals which events were limited to citizens and which permitted the participation of foreigners as

<sup>98</sup> For the latter: the Hellenistic honorary decrees often stipulate that the honours are to be announced at festivals, among those mentioned are the athletics competitions of Ptolemaia. An example of this: *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 900 (ca. 185/4). See also one of the *paroikos* documents, Petrakos 1999, no. 151. The *paroikos* appearing in the inscription was a winner in Ptolemaia.

<sup>99</sup> *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 2313–2317. Tracy, Habicht 1991, 188–189.

<sup>100</sup> Tracy, Habicht 1991, 197–202.

<sup>101</sup> *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 956–965.

<sup>102</sup> Cf. Kyle 1987, 40 and Tracy, Habicht 1991, 199.

well. One indication could be the way the names of the Athenian winners are entered. It appears that in events from which foreigners were excluded the names of the winners are listed with first name, father's name and name of *phyle*. In events that were open to both citizens and foreigners the name of *phyle* is replaced with the *ethnikon* Ἀθηναῖος ('Athenian'). All the names are listed in this way in the military-skill events. In athletics, in the boys' category all events are divided into two groups. In one, the names appear with *phyle*. In the other, *phyle* is replaced with the *ethnikon* 'Athenian'. All the winners in the men's athletic events are entered in the list with *ethnikon*. In the equestrian competition all winners have *phyle* in their name. Thus it would seem that the military-skill and equestrian contests were open only to citizens, while in athletics foreigners could compete in the men's category and a part of the boys' category. There is other evidence for this conclusion, as well. The equestrian competition of Theseia was identical with the part of the Panathenaic equestrian events programme that was open only to citizens.<sup>103</sup> The events were mostly for *phylarchoi* and cavalymen. In military skills, a significant part of the events were competed in *phylai*. As we know, foreigners could not be members of *phylai*. There is the torch race for *epheboi*; foreigners did not gain access to *ephebeia* until ca. 120. In the boys' athletics, in events where the winners have the *ethnikon* 'Athenian', the title of the event has the additional description 'of all' (ἐκ πάντων). The two foreign winners in the boys' category appear precisely in this group.

Obviously, then, foreigners could compete in some events in the games of the Theseia festival. The scarcity of foreign winners would seem to indicate that the four we know of were ones who lived in Athens, rather than persons who had happened to travel to Athens at the time of the festival. Theseia was a local festival of Athens: it had strong ties to the (local) military and military training (*ephebeia*). Furthermore, it was dedicated to Theseus, who was the mythical King and founder of Athens. Any foreigner might have been entitled to compete in the open events, but it is likely that foreigners rarely travelled to Athens in order to compete in the Theseia games.

We also have winner lists of City Dionysia and Lenaia. The combined lists of these two festivals which still exist are somewhat fragmentary, but the surviving entries span from the early 5th century to beyond the mid-2nd century.<sup>104</sup> The fact that *demotika* or *ethnika* are not recorded makes it difficult to determine if the winners included foreigners. However, P. Ghiron-Bistagne was able to identify three victorious foreign actors at City Dionysia based upon the evidence of festival competitions elsewhere: Mynniskos of Chalkis (5th century), Philonides of Zakynthos (ca. 284) and Kephisodoros of Boiotia (ca. 253).<sup>105</sup> More assistance in determining whether foreigners could take part in the drama competitions is provided by the dedications of *choregoi* (Classical period and the first years of Hellenistic period) and *agonothetai* (Hellenistic period).<sup>106</sup> These dedications took place in the event of a choir produced by

<sup>103</sup> Tracy, Habicht 1991, 199.

<sup>104</sup> IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 2318–2323, 2325.

<sup>105</sup> Mynniskos: IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 2325, fragm. p, l. 24, and 2318, l. 584. Philonides: 2325, fragm. b' c', l. 93. Kephisodoros: 2325, fragm. m', l. Ghiron-Bistagne 1976, 336, 344, 362.

<sup>106</sup> *Choregiai* were festival *leitourgiai* which involved the person performing the *leitourgia*, *choregos*, to sponsor and produce a chorus in a festival. In the mid-4th century there were at least 95 such *choregoi*, of which 28 for City Dionysia. Demetrios of Phaleron replaced festival *leitourgiai* with the office of *agonothetes* ('contest producer'), a single, annually elected official, who was responsible for all the dramatic and choral

a particular *choregos/agonothetes* being victorious. It seems the *choregiai* were mostly performed by citizens, and foreigners did not have access to the *agonothesia* which was an elective office, so foreigners do not appear in either role in the dedications. But if we look at the dedications included in *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup>, they do prove that foreigners could participate in dramatic competitions. The choregic dedications of the Classical period are connected to City Dionysia (four) and Thargelia (three). Of the former, in three cases a foreigner appears as player of the *aulos*. One inscription also has a foreign trainer of the victorious chorus. All three Thargelia dedications have a foreign *auletes*, and one also a foreign trainer of the chorus.<sup>107</sup> The Hellenistic agonothetic dedications cannot be assigned to a particular festival, since the *agonothetes* was responsible for all drama competitions arranged during his term of office. As such, they are evidence of the participation of foreigners in drama competitions in the Hellenistic period in general. *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> has 10 inscriptions of this type including foreign names. The earliest is from 307/6, and the latest from ca. 270. Six inscriptions have both a foreign *auletes* and a trainer of a chorus, in three only the trainer and in one the *auletes* is a foreigner. One inscription figures a foreign poet who was victorious in the tragedy competitions, Phanostratos from Halikarnassos.<sup>108</sup>

H. W. Parke argued, on the basis of two lines in Aristophanes' *Acharnians*, that foreigners, metics or otherwise, were not allowed to compete in the dramatic contests of Lenaia.<sup>109</sup> However, his conclusion is based on an incomplete translation of the particular lines and an erroneous interpretation of the context. The lines of the comedy are as follows:

For we are alone here in the competitions of Lenaia, and no strangers have yet come.<sup>110</sup>

In the preceding lines the speaker, Dikaiopolis, reminds the listeners that foreigners are not present when he criticizes Athenian war policy. In the following lines (505–506) he goes on to say that neither tribute nor allies have yet arrived in Athens. H. W. Parke took lines 504–505 to mean that there were no foreigners present because they were prohibited to attend. However, he seemed to ignore the crucial word οὐπω, 'not yet', which does not fit this kind of an interpretation. As some editions point out, taken in context with the following lines, the expression should be understood as referring to the time of the year when Lenaia was celebrated and the weather conditions in that season: it was difficult to travel by sea during the winter, which is why few foreigners travelled to Athens at that time.<sup>111</sup> Lines 507–508 read:

---

competitions of the festivals arranged in the particular year. He received the necessary funds from the state, but his own financial contributions were welcomed. Mikalson 1998, 54–57.

<sup>107</sup> Dionysia; foreign *auletes*: *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 3038 (364/3), 3055–3056 (320/19); foreign *auletes* and trainer of chorus: 3052 (328/7). Thargelia; *auletes*: 3069 (344/3), 3071 (ca. mid-4th century); *auletes* and trainer of chorus: 3068 (344/3).

<sup>108</sup> Phanostratos of Halikarnassos, tragic poet: *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 3073 (307/6); *auletes* and trainer: 3078 (beginning of 3rd century), 3079 (ca. 280/79), 3080 (279/8), 3081 (280–270), 3083A (271/0); trainer: 3082 (280–270), 3083B (271/0), 3085 (beginning of the 3rd century); *auletes*: 3093 (beginning of the 3rd century).

<sup>109</sup> Parke 1977, 104–105.

<sup>110</sup> *Ar. Ach.* 504–505: αὐτοὶ γὰρ ἔσμεν οὐπὶ Ληναίῳ τ' ἁγῶν, κοῦπω ξένοι πάρεσιν. Transl. J. Henderson (Loeb).

<sup>111</sup> Starkie 1909, 106. Olson 2002, 202.

... but we are alone now winnowed; for I call metics the bran of citizens.<sup>112</sup>

The poet compares here citizens and metics to different parts of wheat: the citizens are the barley grain, the metics the bran. Both of them are valuable, though the bran part is inferior to barley grain. The word 'we' refers to these two parts, indicating that both were present at Lenaia.<sup>113</sup> The conclusion is, as the two editors referred to here state, that there were no laws forbidding resident foreigners or foreigners in general to be present at the Lenaia. P. Ghiron-Bistagne's findings support the conclusion. According to her, two of the winners she identified for Dionysia were also winners at Lenaia: Philonides of Zakynthos and Kephisodoros of Boiotia.<sup>114</sup> Along with these men, she was able to identify three other victorious foreign actors in the winner catalogues of the Lenaia. One is Archias of Thurii, winner in ca. 329. Another is Autolykos of Aitolia, winner in ca. 278. The third is Lykiskos of Kephallenia, victorious in ca. 272.<sup>115</sup>

## 5. Summary

When we examine the evolution of the rights of foreign residents in the public sphere in the Hellenistic period, we encounter a frustrating scarcity of sources which makes it impossible to construct anything more than a sketchy account.

This scarcity of sources is especially marked in regards to the foreign residents' judicial status and their participation in public cults. For the former, the latest detailed account is found in the Aristotelian *Athenaion politeia*. According to this document, cases where one of the involved persons was a metic were handled by the *polemarchos*, and the murder of a metic was prosecuted in a court called the Palladion. Otherwise we know that in Athens there were some public indictments concerning non-citizens, for instance γράφῃ ξενίας (pretending to be a citizen) and the charge concerning the lack of *prostates*. The Hellenistic sources indicate that the office of *polemarchos* survived throughout the Hellenistic period and that the courts remained active. We do not, however, have any indication whether or not the *polemarchos* still handled the cases involving foreign residents, and do not know whether these cases were prosecuted in the same courts as earlier or moved elsewhere. Much later, Pausanias describes the Palladion and mentions that cases concerning unpremeditated murder were prosecuted there. He does not talk about foreign residents, but this need not be due to anything else than the fact that Athenian citizenship had lost its practical significance long before Pausanias' time. It is extremely unlikely that the foreign residents would have lost their

<sup>112</sup> ἀλλ' ἐσμὲν αὐτοὶ νῦν γε περιεπτισμένοι· τοὺς γὰρ μετοίκους ἄχυρα τῶν ἀστῶν λέγω. Transl. J. Henderson (Loeb).

<sup>113</sup> The word ἄχυρα is a generic term for what is left over or removed when grain is processed. Here it should not be understood as 'straw' or 'chaff' but as 'bran', the rough but edible outer husks of barley-grain, which were sifted out after hulling. Olson 2002, 203.

<sup>114</sup> Philonides: *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 2325, fragm. z, l. 214 (ca. 276). Kephisodoros: 2325, fragm. α'. Ghiron-Bistagne also tentatively identified the third, Mynniskos of Chalkis, as winner at the Lenaia: the first six letters of the name are insecurely restored.

<sup>115</sup> Archias: *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 2325, fragm. u, l. 277. Autolykos: 2325, fragm. z, l. 213. Lykiskos: 2325, fragm. γ, l. 217. Archias is identified in Plutarch and Pausanias. He later served Antipater as commander of soldiers. Plu. *Demetr.* 28; *Moralia* 846f; 849b. Paus. 1.8.3. For Archias, see Ghiron-Bistagne 1976, 316, 340.



right to appeal to Athenian courts in the Hellenistic period. Not much else can be said with certainty.

The scarcity of sources is a problem concerning the foreigners' participation in public cults, too. Evidence for both Classical and Hellenistic period is comprised of epigraphical evidence (victor lists of festival competitions, references to the organisation of festivals and appearance of religious officials in inscriptions etc.) and scattered citations in literary sources such as fragments of New Comedy. The general picture is as follows. Foreigners never gained access to religious offices, because these were elective offices monopolized by citizens. In festivals and other cult contexts foreigners seem to have been mostly excluded from sacrifices until ca. 120, when the sons of foreign families gained access to *ephebeia* and thereby to the sacrifices which formed an important part of the training. As regards festival competitions, there were some that were open to citizens only, others open to all regardless of civic status. In terms of the sources we are best equipped to analyse the great state festivals Panathenaia and Theseia, due to the victor lists of the 2nd century. The Panathenaia competitions were composed of a part which was open to all and another in which only citizens could participate. Theseia was mostly for citizens, although foreigners appear as victors in some events. The third major part of state festivals was the procession. Foreigners were allowed to participate to some extent, at least in Panathenaia. Although we do not have a detailed account of the right of participation of foreign residents in public cults, it appears that in the sphere of the old, traditional cults there were relatively few changes in the Hellenistic period. This is because the cults were essential for Athenian identity and their continuity was important in the often insecure conditions in the 3rd century. Although we do not have actual evidence for this, a different case may have been the new festivals that began in the 3rd century, like Ptolemaia, founded in 224. Festivals like this did not have as strong a connection to traditions as the ancient ones, and it is possible that foreigners were given more extensive access to them.

We are in a much better situation with the sources referring to land ownership. The fact that *enktesis* is granted relatively frequently in honorary decrees well into the 2nd century proves that foreigners did not gain the right to own land in the Hellenistic period. The primary change was that from the ca. mid-3rd century onwards *enktesis* grants could define a maximum value of land and/or house in money. Apart from direct land ownership, there is evidence of the indirect land ownership by foreigners: they could own land as part of a larger whole which included citizens. An example is private (religious) associations that owned land, where the citizen members were the official owners of the land property.

As regards the most important rights of foreign residents in the public sphere, the most significant change that took place in the Hellenistic period concerned the status of the offspring of mixed marriages. According to the law of Perikles of 451/0 as well as the regulations of the second-half of the 4th century children of mixed marriage were citizens only if born of *astoi* on both sides. This rendered mixed marriage in practice invalid. Mixed marriages, in other words the unions of Athenians and foreigners, were never forbidden as such. What was forbidden was the pretence of a legal Athenian marriage, because this implied the pretence of *astos* status for both parties and enabled access to citizenship for children who had no legal right to it. A significant change took place in the status of the offspring of mixed marriages after 229/8: the requirement of

*astos* parentage on both sides disappeared, and children of mixed marriages were automatically citizens with full rights from the 220's onwards. This naturally eliminated any clauses in Athenian law concerning the pretence of legal Athenian marriage.

### III. State honours and privileges available to foreign residents

I have so far examined the development of their obligations towards the state, primarily connected to taxation and military service, and their rights in the public sphere (judicial issues, land ownership, marriages of Athenian citizens and foreigners and public cults). The evidence from sources as well as general considerations regarding developments in Athens point to the conclusion that *metoikia* was no longer in existence after 229/8. The payment of *eisphorai* and military service became standardized, and sometime after 229 *eisphorai* disappeared entirely. After 229 the offspring of mixed marriages were citizens with full rights. It seems likely that the metic tax was abolished as well. In land ownership and public cults changes were less significant. The scarcity of sources regarding the judicial status of foreign residents unfortunately prevents the construction of a comprehensive picture of the development of this aspect of the official status of foreign residents. The changes in the official status do not mean that the foreigners of Athens were henceforth citizens. It simply means that the specific civic category of *metoikoi* had ceased to exist.

One important aspect of the official status of the foreign residents still remains unexamined: the state honours and privileges, that is, honours and privileges awarded by decision of the assembly. State honours and privileges were an important aspect of the official status of foreign residents because their award might change this status significantly in relation to both citizens and the majority of the (free) non-citizens of Athens. The reception of Athenian citizenship naturally altered a person's status the most extensively. The grant of exemption from *metoikion* liberated the honorand from paying the metic tax which otherwise was obligatory to all metics. State honours and privileges were inherently connected to obligations towards the state. They were also related to rights, since being granted privileges ensured that the grantee was entitled to something that he had not been allowed before. I have no doubt that important honours and privileges affected the social status of a particular resident foreigner honorand as well: they increased the individual's public fame and honour – an important concept in Athenian society and in ancient Greek culture in general – because the honorary decrees were set up on *stelai* in public places where everyone could freely access and see them.

Honours and privileges awarded by the assembly can be classified and divided in various ways. Firstly, they might have guaranteed the recipient practical advantages (citizenship, exceptions in tax and military service obligations, *enktesis* etc.) or have been primarily of a honorary nature (for instance bronze statues and honorary seat in the theatre, crowns etc.). Secondly, division according to the status of the recipient: some were specifically metic privileges (*isoteleia*, exemption from *metoikion*, equal *eisphora* payment and military service with citizens), others were in theory available to all foreigners (citizenship, *proxenia*, *enktesis*, *epimeleia*,<sup>1</sup> *xenia*<sup>2</sup>), yet others still could be awarded to citizens and foreigners alike (*sitesis*,<sup>3</sup> *proedria*,<sup>4</sup> bronze statues etc.).

---

<sup>1</sup> Generally 'care, attention, diligence'. In the context of honorary decrees the responsibility of the state officials to look after the interests of the honorand, also in the sense of protecting his inviolability.

<sup>2</sup> The position of state guest, involving an invitation to dine at public expense in the *prytaneion*.

<sup>3</sup> Public maintenance in the *prytaneion*.

Moreover, another basis of division was contained in the content: privileges affecting civic status (citizenship), tax obligations (exemption from *metoikion*, *isoteleia*, equal *eisphora* payment), military service obligation (equal military service), land property (*enktesis*), judicial issues (*epimeleia*), *megistai timai* (*sitesis*, *proedria*, bronze statues), diplomacy and international relations (*proxenia*).

Specialised research has been undertaken concerning certain honours and privileges. M. J. Osborne's work on the naturalization practices of Athens<sup>5</sup> is both comprehensive and authoritative. Some specific research is available on the formulae of Athenian honorary decrees. A. S. Henry's book<sup>6</sup> covers state honorary decrees of all types, while that of J. Pečírka<sup>7</sup> concentrates on the formulae of the grants of *enktesis*. This earlier research does not, however, exclude the possibility of examining the particular honours and privileges in the context of my study, the status of the foreign residents of Athens. The earlier studies are more generalised in scope and cannot afford a detailed examination of every aspect.

As my study is limited in scope it would be out of place here to write a general history of Athenian state honours and privileges. The aim, rather, is to construct a picture of the development of the honours and privileges that were available to foreign residents. Thus I will refer to honours that had little influence on the status of resident foreigners only in passing: crowns were a fixed part of all types of honorary decrees, so a detailed study of them would not be very revealing. The same can be said for *xenia*, which invited the honorand to a meal in the *prytaneion* for a single occasion and did not by itself have a lasting effect on the status of the recipient. Also the so-called *megistai timai*, *sitesis*, *proedria* and bronze statues will receive only passing attention, because they were awarded to foreign residents extremely rarely. The greatest attention will be devoted to the kind of honours and privileges that brought practical advantage and significantly altered the official status of the resident foreigner grantee: citizenship and privileges of taxation, military service and land ownership. *Proxenia* will mainly be referenced in connection with other privileges. Although it was an institution that had a long history in the Greek world it was primarily connected to the spheres of diplomacy and international relations. Additionally, the title of *proxenos* was honorary and did not entail practical advantages. Thus, although some metics are known to have been made *proxenoi*, *proxenia* has little bearing on the official status of the foreign residents of Athens.

It is important to note that many of the Athenian privileges that had a tangible effect on the grantee's official status were not expressly reserved for, or limited to, foreign residents, but rather concerned them as potential honorands among other potential honorands. Thus there was no specific set of rules for foreign resident grantees that differed from the rules concerning other recipients of privileges. As a result of this it is impossible, and unadvisable, to entirely avoid general conclusions on issues such as the development of the rules and regulations and formulae of different honours and privileges. I will, however, attempt in all cases to integrate this general

<sup>4</sup> Privilege of front seats in the theatre.

<sup>5</sup> *Naturalization in Athens*, 1981–1983.

<sup>6</sup> *Honours and privileges in Athenian decrees. The principal formulae of Athenian honorary decrees*, 1983

<sup>7</sup> *The formula for the grant of enktesis in Attic inscriptions*, 1966.

examination to my specific subject, at the very least by citing cases of foreign resident recipients of the honours and privileges under examination.

The primary question is: did the development of the position of foreign residents in view of state honours and privileges parallel the development of other aspects of their official status? The following questions help in forming a conclusion on this. How many of the grantees of all the honours and privileges awarded in Hellenistic Athens were resident foreigners? Was there a significant change in this respect in comparison to the 4th century? How did the specifications concerning the content, rationale for grants and formulae change from the Classical to the Hellenistic era and during the period under examination? How did the motivations for grants to foreign residents differ from the motivations expressed in honorary decrees for other grantees? What about the formulae? Which honours and privileges disappeared and why? Were there any new types of honours or privileges created in the Hellenistic period?

I have selected the structure of the third part of my study specifically in relation to the subject: I will examine the specific metic privileges first. I will then move on to naturalization, and finally examine *enktesis*. Metic privileges did not alter a foreign resident's official status as comprehensively as naturalization; instead they directly concerned the foreign residents' rights and obligations towards the state. Since most of the state honours and privileges were not limited to foreign residents, beginning the examination with the metic privileges emphasizes the particular approach of my work. As to the general state honours and privileges, I have chosen to examine naturalization before *enktesis* because it naturally had a greater effect on the honorand's official status: *enktesis* gave the individual access to one important sphere of citizens' privileges, land ownership, whereas naturalization entailed access to all the rights monopolized by citizens, above all political rights.

## 1. Metic privileges

I use the term 'metic privileges' for privileges that were inherently connected to the official status of foreign residents in granting exemption from, or other advantages in regards to, their obligations towards the state: exemption from the metic tax, tax equality (*isoteleia*) and equal *eisphora* and military service obligations with citizens. The grantees were usually foreigners who lived in Athens, but could occasionally, at least in the Classical period, also be exiles of exceptional stature who sought refuge in Athens. The latter could receive privileges without restrictions or additional specifications, or only for the duration of their stay, like the Akarnanian exiles of *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 237. The exiles would then live in Athens as privileged metics. Metic privileges were never awarded to non-resident foreigners, for obvious reasons: not being under the authority of Athenian laws, they did not have metic obligations, and thus would not have had any use for the corresponding privileges. In being connected to one particular civic status, the metic privileges differed for instance from citizenship, which did not have different sets of rules or regulations according to whether or not the grantee lived in Athens.

Ἀτέλεια τοῦ μετοικίου/τῶν μετοικίων, a privilege for political exiles of exceptional stature

The award is formulated ἀτέλεια τοῦ μετοικίου (singular) or τῶν μετοικίων (plural), literally translated ‘freedom/exemption from the metic tax(es)’. I am unable to determine what the choice between singular and plural depended on. For instance, there is no correlation between one honorand and the singular form, or several honorands and the plural form. Likewise there is no correlation between descendants not mentioned and the singular form, or descendants mentioned and the plural form. It is an attractive idea to consider that the singular form in the formula would have meant that exemption from the tax applied for a limited time only, for instance, one year, whereas the plural would have indicated that the exemption applied to all metic taxes for an indefinite time. However, the sources do not provide support for this idea. ἀτέλεια without additional definitions was exemption (negation ᾠ-) from public burdens (τέλη). The corresponding adjective is ᾠτελής. As far as I am aware, no instances of the grant of plain *ateleia* to metics survive.<sup>8</sup>

The surviving cases of the grant of exemption from *metoikion* are very few and limited to the 4th century:

1. *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 106: unknown honorands, 409/8

A highly fragmentary *proxenia* decree<sup>9</sup> for several persons that also awarded exemption from *metoikion* Ἀθήνησι (‘in Athens’),<sup>10</sup> *epimeleia* and *xenia* (both partially restored). As J. Pečírka and M. B. Walbank noted, the wording of the decree reveals that the men honoured were political exiles who would become privileged metics through receiving these privileges.<sup>11</sup>

2. *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 61: A- of Sicily, before 378/7

A decree awarding exemption from *metoikion* οἰκοῦντι Ἀθήνησι. The grant is extended to the honorand’s descendants. The inscription is heavily restored, but as A. S. Henry

<sup>8</sup> *Ateleia* appears in some *proxenia* decrees in which the honorands are likely to have been non-resident foreigners (see also Pečírka 1966, *passim*): *SEG* XXXII 10, for Herakleides of Klazomenai (424/3 and 399/8); *SEG* XXXVI 142, for an unknown man (early 4th century); *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 53, for Philytos (390–370 or before 378/7; the latter date by Henry 1982, 114–116); *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 86, for an unknown (before 378/7); *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 180, for the descendants of Pyrrhos and Lykomedes, sons of Achilleus, Isomedes, brother of Lykomedes (ca. 375–350).

<sup>9</sup> M. B. Walbank noted that it is not certain that *proxenia* was granted: the surviving fragments do not carry a mention of the award. However, the surviving sections suggest that the grantees either were already *proxenoi* or hoped to gain this honour. Walbank 1978, 431.

<sup>10</sup> It is necessary to note that these lines are heavily restored. *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 106, ll. 6–8: ἔναι μὲν αὐτοῖς Ἀθένεσι ἀτέλειαν τ[ὸ μετοικίον, ἕως ἂν κατίσιν, . . . . . ]ς Ἀθένε[σι ---]. For instance, J. Kircher (*IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 48) suggested dropping [τὸ μετοικίον] and restoring an *enktesis* of house instead. On the other hand, for example J. Pečírka considered the inclusion of *enktesis* very improbable. He thought this due to later parallels both for the granting of *ateleia* of *metoikion* only to political exiles and for the granting of *ateleia* of *metoikion* and *enktesis*, and due to the fact that Kirchner’s restoration would require dropping both [τὸ μετοικίον] and [Ἀθένεσι], the second of which was very common in grants of *enktesis* until the mid-4th century. Pečírka 1966, 18.

<sup>11</sup> Pečírka 1966, 17–18. Walbank 1978, 421–432. See also Henry 1983, 244.

says, enough remains to justify the restoration.<sup>12</sup> The rest of the decree has not survived, so it is impossible to say whether or not it included other honours. As seen, the phrase ‘living in Athens’ appears in the previous decree where the honorands are political exiles who are granted privileges for the duration of their stay in Athens. However, it is also present in several other decrees where it is impossible to determine whether or not the grantees were political exiles.<sup>13</sup> The phrase also appears in *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 554 for the metic Euxenides of Phaselis. A similar case is *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 660, concerning Tenians who live in Athens. Thus, ‘living in Athens’ does not always indicate an exiled subject.

### 3. *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 211: Olynthian exiles, 348/7

The decree is connected to contemporary events: these Olynthians were exiled by Philip II and were received by Athens because of an alliance with Olynthos. Ll. 5 ff. might suggest that this decree was a reaffirmation. The formula is almost completely restored in l. 8, with the exception of the first three letters of the word ἀτέλεια. Yet fortunately, it survives earlier, in l. 5, in a better condition (ἀτέλεια, τοῦ μετοικ[ίου] almost intact). Thus the restorations are verifiable.

### 4. *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 237: Akarnanian exiles, 338/7

The primary honorands Phormion and Karphinas were naturalized (a reaffirmation of citizenship originally awarded to their grandfather). Other Akarnanians who arrived in Athens with them received privileges which were to be in force only for the duration of their stay (ἕως ὃν κατέλθωσιν, ‘until they leave’): *enktesis* of house,<sup>14</sup> exemption from *metoikion*, equal judicial rights<sup>15</sup> and *eisphora* obligations with citizens, and *epimeleia*.

### 5. *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 245: Boiotian exiles, shortly after 383/2?

Here the formula is partially restored (ll. 10–11): [ἀ]τέλ[ει]αν [τῷ μετοικίῳ]. In receiving exemption from *metoikion* Boiotians would live in Athens as privileged metics. The dating is by A. S. Henry.<sup>16</sup>

### 6. *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 545: Thessalian exiles

If correctly dated, this decree falls just within the time limits of my study. It concerns the events following the Lamian war (323–322): Thessalian cavalry played an important part in the battle of Krannon in 322, and after his victory Antipater took revenge on his

<sup>12</sup> Henry 1983, 244.

<sup>13</sup> In various honour combinations: *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 53, 83, 86, 180, 276, 287; Pečirka 1966, 43–45 (all before 321/0), 582, 722, 725+Add. p. 666; *SEG* XXV 84; *Agora* XVI 166 (295/6 or shortly after).

<sup>14</sup> Pečirka 1966, 51: ‘The grant of *enktesis* is restored, but in spite of the unusual formula the restoration is very probably correct.’

<sup>15</sup> ll. 26–27: διδόναι αὐτοὺς δίκας [καὶ λαμβάνειν κα]θ[ά]περ Ἀθηναῖοι, ‘they shall be given and are to take law-suits like the Athenians’. This is not common in honorary decrees. The formulation would seem to suggest that a metic who received this privilege was allowed to have his cases heard in the same lawcourts and otherwise according to the same procedures as the Athenian citizens.

<sup>16</sup> Henry 1982, 92–93.

enemies.<sup>17</sup> Similarly to the Akarnanians of *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 237 above, the Thessalians were granted privileges that would be in force only for the duration of their stay: exemption from *metoikion* and *enktesis*. These are recorded in ll. 11–13, heavily restored and subject to debate. J. Kirchner restored lines 12–13 as follows: ἀτελέ[σ[iv] τοῦ μετοικίου καὶ οἰκίας ἔγκτησιν ὡς τοῖς με]τοίκ[ο]ις.<sup>18</sup> As J. Pečirka notes, the last three words cannot be correct, because the restoration assumes that metics automatically had the right to buy and own houses. This was obviously not so, because well-preserved decrees exist in which metic honorands are awarded *enktesis* of house. Different restorations have been suggested, for instance versions that involve *enktesis* of both land and house. Pečirka's opinion is that all the restorations are to some extent conjectural and that the grant of *enktesis* was most likely to be of house only.<sup>19</sup> Finally, according to J. Kirchner's restoration, the decree awards the Thessalians *eisphora* and military service obligations 'in the same way as for the Akarnanian refugees'.<sup>20</sup> However, as A. S. Henry says, the restoration in l. 15 (the reference to the Akarnanian refugees) cannot be correct, since the Akarnanians in *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 273 (ll. 27–28) did not receive equality in military service.<sup>21</sup>

The decree for Thessalian refugees includes one interesting detail not seen elsewhere: the names were to be written in the records by, respectively, the secretary of the *polemarchos* and the *stratego*i (ll. 16–17). Since these refugees were to receive exemptions from the normal metic obligations, it may be that this specification was intended to ascertain that the appropriate authorities were aware of the exemptions. An alternative explanation is that since the Thessalians would become metics in somewhat exceptional circumstances, it was necessary to emphasize that the appropriate regulations of *metoikia* were to be followed.

The date of the decree is subject to debate. J. Kirchner dated it after 318/17, whereas J. Pečirka attributed it to 321/0. Both, however, connected the decree to the aftermath of the Lamian war. Thus, the variance in dating does not significantly affect the interpretation of the context of the decree. The Thessalians in question could well have arrived in Athens as refugees as a result of the Lamian war, and been awarded the privileges either immediately or shortly after, in the 310's.

Grants of exemption from *metoikion* are not known after this last decree, singularly or together with other privileges. On the other hand, *isoteleia* continued to be granted. Five awards of *isoteleia* from the 4th century before 322 and nine from the end of the 4th century and 3rd century have survived. The honorands of five of the six grants of exemption from *metoikion* can be identified as exiles, whereas among the recipients of *isoteleia* similar identification can be made for the honorands of one decree only (*IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 109b, 363/2). This would indicate that if people who arrived in Athens as exiles were granted a privilege that freed them from the specific tax obligations of metics, ἀτέλεια τῶν μετοικίων was preferred to *isoteleia*. It could be expected that the refugees would remain in Athens for a limited time and would return to their home cities when

<sup>17</sup> Pečirka 1966, 82–83.

<sup>18</sup> 'Exemption from *metoikion* and *enktesis* of house as metics have.'

<sup>19</sup> Pečirka 1966, 81–84 (including the other proposed restorations for these lines).

<sup>20</sup> Ll. 13–15: [καὶ] ε[ἰ]ν[α]ὶ αὐτοῖς τὰς εἰσφορὰς καὶ τὰς στρατείας καθάπερ τοῖς φεύγουσιν τῶν Ἀκαρνάνων ἔδωκεν ὁ δῆμος. Henry 1983, 259, n. 75 (on ll. 13–14): 'if vv. 13–14 are correctly restored'.

<sup>21</sup> Henry 1983, 259, n. 75.



conditions permitted. Nevertheless, they could be expected to stay long enough to be required to register as metics – as the 4th century *metoikia* regulations dictated – and therefore would be liable to pay *metoikion*. ἀτέλεια τῶν μετοικίων freed the honorand from the metic tax only, but *isoteleia* also included exemption from market tolls called *xenika*, enabling the practising of business in the agora, and, apparently, some other, unknown taxes. Persons who were already metics in Athens or who otherwise were expected to remain in Athens were more likely to become liable to pay these taxes than refugees only staying temporarily, and thus *isoteleia* would be preferred if privileges were awarded. Why were there no grants of exemption from *metoikion* after 322? The answer is most likely Macedonian control. In the last two decades of the 4th century and in the 3rd century Athens was seldom in a position to accept refugees, since in Greece proper such people were likely to be refugees directly or indirectly because of Macedonian actions and policies.<sup>22</sup> At other times, when Athens was theoretically free to decide upon such matters, accepting refugees could be risky.<sup>23</sup>

### *Isoteleia* decrees until the later satellite-state period<sup>24</sup>

In the first chapter I already examined *isoteleia* fairly extensively as evidence for the survival of *metoikion*: the tax was in existence for as long as grants of *isoteleia* were made. I will not re-examine this question in detail, but will instead concentrate on the different aspects of the surviving *isoteleia* decrees. Why were individual foreign residents awarded *isoteleia* and for what kind of benefactions? Why was this particular privilege preferred to something else in the known cases? How are the grant clauses formulated in the decrees? What kind of combinations does *isoteleia* appear in?

The most important sources are, naturally, the decrees that award *isoteleia*, either as the only practical privilege or together with other privileges that brought tangible advantage to the honorand, for instance equal *eisphora* and military service obligations or *enktesis*. The surviving decrees extend from the later 5th century to the period when Athens was a satellite-state of Macedon. The decrees from ca. the second or third quarter of the 4th century are the most useful for determining what kind of merits *isoteleia* was awarded for. Before this, the decrees seldom related the motivations in detail, and therefore the circumstances of a particular decree can only be determined in the rare instances where they are known from other sources. Along with the decrees granting *isoteleia*, there is the exceptional document SEG III 122, a decree of *isoteleis*

<sup>22</sup> Direct Macedonian occupation of the home cities or condemnation to exile as political opponents by the leaders who were supported or put in their place by the Macedonians.

<sup>23</sup> There is an earlier example of the Athenians' refusal to accept refugees due to political considerations: the famous affair of Harpalos. Alexander's treasurer at Babylon, he fled to Athens with the treasury, but the Athenians refused to accept him, fearing Alexander's wrath. Curt. 10.2, 1–3. Plu. *Alex.* 41.4; *Dem.* 25–26; *Phoc.* 21–22. D.S. 17.108.4–8. Some Athenian politicians, including Demosthenes, were accused of having accepted bribes from Harpalos. Deinarchos' and Hypereides' speeches against Demosthenes deal with this issue.

<sup>24</sup> The privilege (noun) is ἰσοτέλεια, the corresponding title (adj.) ἰσοτελής. It comes from two words, ἴσος (same, equal) and τέλος (tax, duty, toll). The literal translation of ἰσοτελής is 'paying alike, paying the same taxes/duties/tolls'. *Isoteleis* appear in private grave stones of the 4th to 2nd centuries. 4th century: IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 7863–7865, 7868, 7869, 7873, 7875, 7877, 7879, 7881, 8652. 3rd–2nd century: 7862, 7867, 7871–7872, 7874, 7876; *Agora* XVII 384, 385. There are grave stones with *isoteleis* from the last decade as well as those that have not been dated at all. See also *Agora* XVI 213 from the 240's, a decree concerning an *epidosis*, including a list of participants. An *isoteles* called Sosibios appears in I. 52.

soldiers stationed in Rhamnous for their superiors, from ca. 262/1–255/4. A third group of sources is the private grave *stelai* which display the name of the deceased and the title *isoteles*. These are more numerous than the decrees and are available for the whole period under examination and beyond. The grave inscriptions prove that *isoteleia* was more common than what is implied by the surviving decrees. They are, however, of little use for determining how long the *isoteleia* privilege survived and for examining the development of the privilege. The *isoteleis* here are representative of hereditary *isoteleia* grants. It is impossible in each case to know when the original award was made: the deceased himself might have been the first to receive the privilege or might have inherited it through his family who had been awarded the privilege several generations previously.

*Etymology of the word, the formulae and the content of the privilege*

The *isoteleia* grant clause has two variants: the honorand is awarded the privilege (*isoteleia*) or the title (*isoteles*). The former is found for instance in *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 505, ll. 51–52: εἶναι δὲ αὐτο[ῖς καὶ ἰ]σ[οτέλειαν] ('they are to have *isoteleia*'). Occasionally, the verb is δεδῶσθαι, 'is/are to be given'.<sup>25</sup> The verb is usually in passive and the subject, *isoteleia*, in accusative. An exception to this, provided the restoration is correct, is *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 583 (end of 4th century), l. 6, where the verb is in active and the subject in nominative. The title form appears, for example, in *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 554, ll. 27–28: εἶναι [αὐτὸ]ν ἰσoteλῇ ('he is to be *isoteles*', lit. 'he is to be paying equal taxes'). In both forms, the grantee is indicated with the pronoun αὐτός since he has been named earlier in the decree. In the privilege formulation the pronoun is in the dative, in the title formulation in the accusative. Additional definitions or amendments might be attached to the basic formula, for instance, the extension of the grant to the honorand's descendants: καὶ αὐτοῖς καὶ τοῖς ἐκγόνοις (privilege) or καὶ αὐτὸν καὶ τοὺς ἐκγόνους (title).<sup>26</sup> The phrase 'living in Athens' might also be added to the clauses, as seen for instance in *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 276 (342/1 according to A. S. Henry, before 336/5 according to J. Kirchner).<sup>27</sup>

Judging by the available evidence, the decision over the formulae depended on the number of honorands: the title formula was used when there was one honorand, the privilege formula when several.<sup>28</sup> There is no evidence of the title formula replacing the privilege formula in the course of time. This, in my opinion, supports the view that the *isoteleia* privilege remained unchanged for the duration of its existence. If the title formula had become prevalent, it could be interpreted as an indication that the importance of the *isoteleia* had diminished, with the privilege gradually losing its practical content and becoming a mere honorary title.

<sup>25</sup> See *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 287, l. 2 ff., and 802 (252/1 or 251/0), l. 7.

<sup>26</sup> The former is seen for instance in *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 505, the latter, without the article τοῦς, in *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 554.

<sup>27</sup> J. Kirchner's restored the phrase also in *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 214. Great caution is required: J. Pečírka did not accept Kirchner's restoration of *isoteleia*, *enktesis* and the 'living in Athens' phrase, and concluded that it is not possible to offer a definitive reconstruction. Pečírka 1966, 47–49. See also Henry 1983, 257, n. 55.

<sup>28</sup> *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 551 and 802 have the pronoun αὐτός in the singular dative (restored in the former but not contested by scholars). In both cases, however, the descendants are taken as equal with the actual grantee of the formula, indicated with the pronoun, and are connected to the latter with καὶ. Thus the object of the grant is αὐτῶι καὶ ἐκγόνοις and by nature plural. More commonly the extension of the award to descendants comes after the basic formula as an additional formulation.

*Isoteleia awarded for military achievements and financial contributions*

Unfortunately, the motivation clauses have not survived in the majority of the six 4th-century (prior to 322) decrees awarding *isoteleia* accompanied with other honours. *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 276 is an exception. This decree rewards a man named Asklepiodoros for his participation in a naval campaign that cannot be identified definitely since the prescript has not survived. What is clear is that the man in question had served on triremes. The award of *isoteleia* is extended to his descendants, and the formula includes the specification 'living in Athens', plus the unique phrase καθάπερ τοῖ[ς] ἄλλοις ἰσοτελέουσιν (ll. 13–15; 'just as the other *isoteleis*').<sup>29</sup> In terms of content, however, this latter formulation does not have particular significance: it merely emphasizes the fact that Asklepiodoros is to receive the regular type of *isoteleia*.

In terms of the preservation of motivation clauses the situation is much better with Hellenistic *isoteleia* grants. Of the eight decrees, two are so fragmentary as to prevent any conclusion regarding the motivations. The majority of the other six awards are for military achievements and/or financial contributions.

1. *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 505: Nikandros of Ilion, Polyzelos of Ephesos

This decree comes from the very end of the 4th century, after the Four Years' War (307–303) during which Cassander tried to recapture Athens. The two honorands, Nikandros, son of Antiphanes, of Ilion and Polyzelos, son of Apollophanes, of Ephesos, were metics who had resided in Athens for several decades. Their public services were varied and extensive: in 347/6–323/2 both paid *eisphorai*, then levied annually, altogether 10 talents each (ll. 11 ff.); during the Lamian war Nikandros and Polyzelos served on board a ship (ll. 17 ff.); they participated in *epidoseis* levied for the preparations of the Four Years' War with a thousand drachmae each (ll. 27 ff.), and during the war fought in both naval and land battles (ll. 36). Nikandros and Polyzelos were finally rewarded for their long-lasting dedication to Athens after the war: hereditary *isoteleia* privilege, *enktesis* of land and house, equal *eisphora* and military service obligations with citizens, *epimeleia* (protection against injustice), *prosodos* (the right to approach the council and the assembly whenever they wished). Thus, *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 505 is one of the decrees connected to the Four Years' War that rewarded the honorand(s) for current services as well for earlier achievements stretching back for several decades.

*IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 505 is exceptional among the surviving honorary decrees for foreign residents, both because it has been preserved almost intact and because of the extent of the benefactions of the honorands and the privileges awarded to them. It is the only example in the Hellenistic period<sup>30</sup> of a bestowal of the full array of practical privileges (excluding citizenship) available to foreign residents. This would indicate that if foreign resident grantees expected to receive the full combination of privileges, their

<sup>29</sup> See also Henry 1983, 247–248.

<sup>30</sup> *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 287 from the Classical period involves *proxenia*, *isoteleia*, *enktesis* of land and house, *eisphora* and military service equality and *epimeleia*. The motivation clauses have not been preserved, so it is impossible to know what the reasons for such a large array of honours and privileges were in this case. Considering the date of the decree, they might have been somehow to do with the growing influence of Philip II of Macedon, and perhaps preparations for this growing threat.

benefactions had to have been extensive, long-lasting and taken place in both of the two major areas of public services: private financial contributions and military achievements.

## 2. IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 554: Euxenides of Phaselis

The decision for Euxenides, son of Eupolides, of Phaselis, is yet another decree passed in connection with the Four Years' War. Euxenides' reward took place in the early phases of the war. The honours included hereditary *isoteleia* (granted in the title form) as well as *enktesis*. The latter appears to have been of house only, but this is not certain since the line is restored (l. 30). It is unknown whether the decree included other honours, because the inscription breaks just after *enktesis*. Euxenides is praised for having (earlier) eagerly paid all the *eisphorai* that the assembly allotted to metics (ll. 9–12), furnishing twelve sailors for the fleet during the Lamian war (ll. 12–14) and 'now' (for the Four Years' War) donating strings for bows (ll. 15–16). Additionally the text mentions that Euxenides eagerly and readily followed all the orders of the *strategoí* and *taxiarchoi* (division commanders) (ll. 16–19). This probably refers to a battle situation, but could in theory also mean that Euxenides was servant of the military commanders, because the verb used here, ὑπηρετέω, means both 'to obey' and 'to serve'.

## 3. IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 715: Hermaios, son of [Hermo-], beginning of the 3rd century

Due to the heavy restoration the interpretation of the decree is open to great uncertainty. This of course must be kept in mind when making any conclusions about the decree. Of particular note are certain points in both the content and wording that in my opinion affect the dating. Thus, the inscription deserves to be examined in detail.

In this honorary decree, dated to the very early 3rd century, Hermaios is awarded the title of *isoteles*, and probably other honours which have not survived: the inscription breaks after this word. The primary reasons for Hermaios' being awarded are 'fighting battles with the people', payment of all the *eisphorai* that the people allotted to him,<sup>31</sup> and the donation of 10 *minai* of silver for an unknown purpose:

Ll. 4–7: τὰς τε στρατ[είας στρατεύεται μετὰ τοῦ δήμου καὶ κατ[οικῶν Ἀθήνησιν .....][..  
τὰς] εἰσφορὰς [ἀπάσας ὅσαι ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου ἐπε]τάχθησαν α[ὐτῷ καλῶς εἰσενήνοχεν]. l.  
10: [... δ]έκα μνᾶς ἀ[ργυρίου] .....<sup>32</sup>

ll. 15–16: εἶναι δ' αὐτὸν ἰσ[ο]τ[ε]λῆ - - - - -<sup>33</sup>

<sup>31</sup> This should not be taken literally, as meaning that the assembly had specifically and individually allotted Hermaios a certain amount of *eisphorai* to pay. The meaning is rather that Hermaios had dutifully discharged his obligations in the payment of *eisphorai* according to what was required of the group he represented, the foreign residents.

<sup>32</sup> Ll. 4–7: 'fights the battles with the people and living in Athens ... paid all the *eisphorai* that the people allotted to him with merit' l. 10: '10 *minai* of silver' The words immediately before and after the reference to the sum of silver have not survived, so the exact nature of the donation is uncertain. It could have been either a private donation or participation in *epidosis*. *Epidoseis* are known both in connection with the Four Years' War and the immediate aftermath of the revolt of 287.

<sup>33</sup> 'he shall be *isoteles*'.

The restorations are by J. Kirchner. I have not been able to find any commentary concerning them. Kirchner dated the inscription to the beginning of the 3rd century, but in my opinion its content would allow placing it somewhat later as well, to the two decades of independence that began in 287 with the successful revolt of the Athenian democrats against Demetrios Poliorketes. The mention of Hermaios' 'fighting battles with the people' in any case refers to a situation in which actual fighting took place: the verb used here, *στρατεύομαι*, meant active fighting, as opposed to, for instance, being on guard duty in times of peace.

The sequence of events surrounding the revolt become clear from the account of Pausanias and a decree for a Macedonian mercenary commander Strombichos who was stationed in the Macedonian garrison on the Mouseion hill. The long decree for Kallias of Sphettos, from the 250's, provides additional information. The democrats revolted, elected the famous general Olympiodoros to command whatever forces he could muster against the garrison in the city. The rebels offered bribes to Strombichos who deserted to the Athenian side with some of his mercenaries. The rest of the garrison attempted to crush the revolt, but was defeated in battles in the streets and forced to seek refuge in the garrison on the Mouseion hill. Finally Olympiodoros stormed the garrison with the aid of Strombichos and his men, and captured the fort with the loss of only 13 men.<sup>34</sup> Demetrios laid siege to the city. With the assistance of various monarchs the siege was soon lifted and negotiations started, which led to the conclusion of a peace treaty that guaranteed Athens' independence, even though Piraeus and, at least in the beginning, the countryside fortresses, remained in Macedonian hands.<sup>35</sup>

If the motivation clauses of honorary decrees mention military deeds, they have very likely taken place during time of war, or in a situation that was otherwise critical in the military sense – a situation that was decisive for Athens.<sup>36</sup> Normal guard duty in peaceful times would scarcely have been important enough to be mentioned in an honorary decree. As I noted above, here in *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 715 the verb used in reference to the honorand's military activity meant active participation in fighting. The events that led to the liberation of Athens in 287/6, in particular the storming of the Macedonian garrison on the Mouseion, were certainly decisive for Athens. Hermaios could well have participated in the capture of the garrison. The language used in the decree would fit in with this occasion well. 'Fighting battles with the people' is unlikely to be evidence of an earlier grant of equality in military service, but rather rhetorical: an expression which implies that Hermaios was loyal to the *polis* where he lived, and to its people, uniting with them to fight at an important moment for Athens. The constitution after 287/6 was firmly democratic, and it would have made sense for the Athenians to show gratitude to a person who had performed deeds of merit in the event that restored independence and democracy for Athens.

Another possibility is that the decree for Hermaios is indeed to be dated to the very first years of the 3rd century. This may have been the years when Lachares was tyrant of Athens. The language of the decree seems typical for a democratic government (fighting with the people, paying the *eisphorai* allotted by the people), but since

<sup>34</sup> Paus. 1.26.1–2. *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 666, ll. 9–15 (the decree for Strombichos). Shear 1978, 2–4 (the decree for Kallias), 15 (comments). Osborne 1981–1983, II, 164. Habicht 1995, 102.

<sup>35</sup> Plu. *Demetr.* 46.1–2; *Pyrrh.* 12.4–5. Shear 1978, 22–24, 74–76. Habicht 1995, 101–103.

<sup>36</sup> Other examples are *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 505 and 554, examined above (pp. 91–92).

Lachares retained the external forms of a democratic government,<sup>37</sup> it would not be impossible to encounter such language in a decree of the era. In this case the mention of fighting with the people would refer to an earlier time, the nearest occasion providing the opportunity for the more important military achievements being the Four Years' War (307–303).

The verb forms used in the decree cause problems for this kind of a theory. In the reference to military action (ll. 4–5) the verb, *στρατεύεται* (restored), is in the present indicative (medium), suggesting action in present time. The immediately preceding sentence, connected to the following with 'and', informs us in present form that Hermaios continues (*διατελεί*, albeit restored, ll. 2–3) to display good will in every way towards the people (*demos*). If Hermaios' military achievements had taken place earlier, another tempus would have been used.<sup>38</sup> If Hermaios had taken part in the liberation and had been given honours shortly after, the Athenians might still have considered it an event in the present. Furthermore, the reorganisation of defence, along with securing the food supply, was of critical importance in the first few years following the liberation.<sup>39</sup> Hermaios could in some way have taken part in these actions as well. Due to the critical situation, the Athenians might have considered these actions as equivalent in importance as fighting. This would explain the present form of *στρατεύομαι*. Of course *στρατεύεται* might be taken as *praesens historicum*, a form used in historical narrative to describe past events. However, an assembly decree is hardly a place for historical narrative.

Hermaios did not receive *isoteleia* and whatever other privileges the decree included – it breaks after line – solely for his military accomplishments. Lines 6–7 state that he paid all the *eisphorai* the people had allotted him. This, in contrast to the preceding section, clearly refers to the past. The verbs are in passive aorist indicative ([ἐπε]τάχθησαν) and active perfect indicative ([εἰσέσκηνοχεν]): whenever *eisphora* was decreed, Hermaios dutifully paid the share he was supposed to pay. I would suggest the following: Hermaios had clearly resided in Athens for a longer period (l. 5: κατ[οικῶν Ἀθήνησιν]), during which there had been *eisphorai* (for instance in connection with the Four Years' War). When the Athenian democrats revolted in 287/6 he participated in the ensuing fighting and the storming of the Mouseion. After this, he acted with merit in the critical situation following the liberation, and was rewarded with *isoteleia* some time after the liberation. It is unlikely that the privileges granted to Hermaios were given solely for his financial services and that his 'fighting with the people' was insignificant, appended to the decree "on the side". Honorary decrees were official decisions passed by the assembly, and only the immediate causes for the honours in each particular case were expressed in the motivation clauses. Furthermore, if a decree was inscribed in stone, considerations of space had to be taken into account. The work was also time-consuming. An inscription of a state decree was not a place for blathering.

My suggestion for the interpretation and the dating of the decree is of course only a hypothesis, particularly as the decree has been heavily restored. In my opinion,

<sup>37</sup> See Habicht 1995, 88–93.

<sup>38</sup> Cf. the similar sentence in *IG II<sup>2</sup> 505* (ll. 36–38), in which the verb is in the imperfect, referring to battles that had taken place some time earlier: συνεστράτευνται (l. 36).

<sup>39</sup> Habicht 1995, 140.

however, the hypothesis is no less plausible than any other interpretation that has been put forward.

4. *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 768+802: [Aisch]ias, son of Akrotimos, of Pergamon

I examined this decree to some extent in the context of *metoikion* in the first main chapter.<sup>40</sup> The decree for this citizen of Pergamon is the last preserved instance of the awarding of *isoteleia*. Aischias' contribution consisted of participation in an *epidosis* 'for the security of the polis' (l. 12). The next, fragmentary line mentions silver, probably referring to the sum Aischias donated in the *epidosis*. Tracy's new edition of the entire inscription, which partially draws on earlier studies, involves a restoration of a value for the financial donation and a contribution in food supply in ll. 12–13.<sup>41</sup> Aischias was rewarded with the hereditary *isoteleia* privilege together with *enktesis* of house up to an unknown maximum value (the figure has not survived). The word *isoteleia* is restored (δεδόσθαι [αὐ]τῷ καὶ ἐγγ[όνοις ἰσοτέλειαν]).

Several dates have been suggested for the decree, depending on whether the *archon*, Antimachos, is placed to the late 250's or 233/2. J. Kirchner, originally editing the decree as two different inscriptions, had two dates: ca. 257/6 for *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 768 and after the mid-3rd century for 802. Since the two inscriptions are parts of one decree, the different datings must obviously be discarded. W. K. Pritchett and B. D. Meritt placed Antimachos to 251/0.<sup>42</sup> In 1977 D. Whitehead placed the inscription similarly in 251/0,<sup>43</sup> but later preferred 233/2.<sup>44</sup> Ch. Habicht came to the date ca. 250 largely on the basis of prosopographic arguments: the name and demotic of the secretary in *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 768 is known. He appears active in other decrees more securely dated to the mid-3rd century, and therefore the decree for Aischias should be dated to the same period.<sup>45</sup> In an article on two the letter-cutters of Attic inscriptions S. V. Tracy concluded, on the basis of the attested work of the cutter of the decree, that the date 251/0 is more likely than 233/2.<sup>46</sup> This view was shared by M. J. Osborne and S. G. Byrne in their catalogue of Athenian foreign residents.<sup>47</sup> A. S. Henry preferred the date 233/2.<sup>48</sup> Tracy examined the question of the dating again a few years ago and attributed *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 768+802 to 256/5, referring to an (at the time) unpublished inscription which records a sacrifice made by a *thiasos* in thanksgiving for a victory of King Antigonos.<sup>49</sup> It would appear that the arguments for a date in the 250's are stronger, and therefore the suggestions made by some scholars for dating the inscription to 233/2 can be discarded. Fragmentary decrees with a possible connection to the Four Years' War

<sup>40</sup> See p. 42 above.

<sup>41</sup> *Idem* 2003b, 137–141 (the text of the inscription printed in 139–140).

<sup>42</sup> Pritchett & Meritt 1940, xxi, 99–100.

<sup>43</sup> Whitehead 1977, 30.

<sup>44</sup> *Idem* 1986, 157, n. 60. Whitehead does not give his reasons for preferring 233/2, only providing the date with a question mark in the footnote.

<sup>45</sup> Habicht 1979, 128–133. See also *idem* 1982a, 23.

<sup>46</sup> Tracy 1988, 313, 320–321.

<sup>47</sup> Osborne, Byrne 1996, 253, no. 5990.

<sup>48</sup> Henry 1983, 247.

<sup>49</sup> Tracy 2003b, 130, 146–147, 167.

There are two other decrees awarding *isoteleia* that possibly had similar motivations to the four decrees examined above. They are extremely fragmentary, and the motivation clauses have not survived. However, in view of the dating they may be connected to war: they are attributed to the end of the 4th century, a period in which the immediate occasion for achievements meriting considerable rewards would have been the Four Years' War.

#### 5. IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 516: unknown honorands, end of the 4th century

The parts of the decree with prescript and motivation clauses have not survived, so the identity of the recipients is unknown. What is clear is that there was more than one honorand. The honorands were awarded *isoteleia* (the word is entirely restored) as well as equal *eisphora* and military service obligations (partially restored). The decree may have involved some other privileges because the inscription has been preserved only from the line with the *isoteleia* clause onwards. At least a crown must have been included, because crowns were, well before this time already, a fixed part of honorary decrees. The inscription was attributed to the end of the 4th century apparently on the basis of the type of the lettering, because the prescripts have not survived. If correctly restored and dated, it is possible that this decree was connected to the Four Years' War.

#### *Other public services in Athens as reasons for isoteleia award*

Judging by the surviving decrees, military achievements and financial contributions connected either to war preparations or the organisation of defence were the predominant reasons for the granting of privileges involving *isoteleia*. Yet in one case a person appears to have been awarded *isoteleia* for reasons that had nothing to do with these kinds of benefactions. IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 551 is a grant of hereditary *isoteleia* and *enktesis* of land and house to Nikostratos, whose *ethnikon* is not known. Unfortunately, the essential lines are restored so some caution is necessary.<sup>50</sup> The privileges were bestowed on Nikostratos for his honourable conduct and concern regarding the competitions of the Dionysia festivals and the *choregoi*. The decree reveals that Nikostratos always renders the services related to the gods to those who are *choregoi* (ll. 5–7: τοῖς χορηγοῖς τοῖς αἰεὶ χορηγοῦσιν προθύμως ὑπηρετῶν τὰ περὶ τοῦ θεοῦ). J. Kirchner referred to earlier editors who have identified Nikostratos as an *auletes*, an actor or a poet. He dated the decree to before 309/8 on the basis of the reference to *choregoi*: Demetrios of Phaleron abolished the *choregia* institution in this year.<sup>51</sup> J. Pečírka noted: 'We have no evidence for a precise date: before 307/6 is as much as we can be sure about.'<sup>52</sup> A. S. Henry dated the inscription to shortly before 307/6.<sup>53</sup> It may be that Nikostratos had eagerly worked for the success of this particular Dionysia festival. The traditional, large festivals were important for Athenian identity with the wider context of public religion (see pp. 70 ff. above), so the eager participation of a

<sup>50</sup> [δὲ καὶ ἀτέλειαν] has been suggested in the place of [δὲ ἰσοτέλειαν], see Pečírka 1966, 85, n. 1. Pečírka himself does not venture to make a choice between the two restorations: 'We know nothing of the status of Nikostratos: from the honours granted him (if *isoteleia* is correctly restored) he was probably a privileged metie ...'

<sup>51</sup> See the commentary for the inscription in IG II/III<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>52</sup> Pečírka 1966, 85.

<sup>53</sup> Henry 1983, 40.



foreign resident in their organisation might well have been considered a benefaction worthy of *isoteleia*.

*IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 660: an oddity in the Hellenistic period – a mass granting of privileges*

This granting of *isoteleia* and other honours to Tenians living in Athens is of special interest due to the fact that it is the only surviving honorary decree proper involving a mass granting of privileges. Mass awards were occasionally made in the Classical period – group naturalizations and awards of other honours in connection with the restoration of democracy at the end of the 5th century, honours for exiles in the 5th and 4th centuries.<sup>54</sup> Block awards of *isoteleia* were never common, although they did occur sometimes. *IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 660* is the first such grant to persons who were already residents in Athens when receiving privileges to occur since the end of the 5th century.<sup>55</sup>

The primary privilege – mentioned first – was *isoteleia*, granted in the normal privilege form despite the large number of recipients. According to J. Kirchner's restoration, in the original decree the Tenians were also to receive *enktesis* of house. As has been mentioned, there was the further condition that the privileges were to apply only to those who had already received equal *eisphora* and military service obligations with citizens.<sup>56</sup> Kirchner's restorations are not unanimously accepted.<sup>57</sup>

G. Reger suggested, partially following Ph. Gauthier, that the earlier decree should be identified as *IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 466*, of 307/6, which granted the Tenians a judicial agreement (σύμβολα) that gave them access to Athenian courts. The decree is connected to the liberation of Athens in 307/6 by Antigonos Monophthalmos and Demetrios Poliorketes. Tenian ambassadors were present in Athens alongside the representatives of various other states to celebrate the event. The Tenians were granted exceptional honours because Demetrios used Tenos, situated along the regular sea route from Delos to Athens, as his naval base to launch his recapture of Athens.<sup>58</sup> According to Reger, the specification of *IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 660*, 'Tenians who fight with Athenians,' could reflect Tenian participation in the liberation of 307. The reason why reaffirmation of the original honours would have been necessary in the 280's is that while the Athenian government in 307 was loyal to Demetrios, the government after 287 was not, and it was not at all certain that the old privileges would have still been valid.<sup>59</sup>

If the first decree in *IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 660* is indeed the one published as *IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 466*, G. Reger's suggestion for what motivated the reaffirmation in the 280's is acceptable. But his theory involves too many uncertainties, and the connection between the two inscriptions cannot be accepted straightout. The most significant problem is that not a trace remains of the motivation clauses of the first decree in *IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 660*. It is precisely

<sup>54</sup> Instances of block awards of citizenship: D1, D4–D6. Instances of block grants of other honours to refugees: *IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 109b* (*isoteleia*), 211, 237, 245 (exemption from *metoikion* and other privileges).

<sup>55</sup> D6 (401/0), for the heroes of Phyle, rewarded with citizenship those who joined the democratic forces in the early stages of the struggle for the restoration of democracy. Groups who joined the fight later were rewarded with *isoteleia*.

<sup>56</sup> See p. 32 above for J. Kirchner's restorations.

<sup>57</sup> For instance Henry 1983, 259–260 rejects [τελοῦσιν τὰς εἰσφορὰς] in ll. 8–9 and tentatively suggests Ἀθήνησ[ι], καὶ στρατεύεσθαι τὰς στρ]ατε[ίας]. For l. 39 he proposes καὶ τε[λοῦσιν τὰ τέλη καθάπερ Ἀθηναῖοι.

<sup>58</sup> Gauthier 1972, 101–102, 171. Reger 1992, 366–368.

<sup>59</sup> Reger 1992, 368–370.

this part of the decree which would be essential for determining if the reaffirmation of the privileges is indeed connected to any earlier, specific event. Reger opines that although all the lines of *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 466 have not survived, the missing lines may have been the ones that contained the grant of *isoteleia*. This sort of assumption is of course insecure. Reger also interprets the phrase ‘Tenians who fight with the Athenians’ (ll. 5–9, 39: Τηνίων ... στρατευομένοις ... μετ’ Ἀθηναίων) in *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 660 erroneously. As is apparent from the decree itself, it does not refer to actual participation in military actions but an award of equal military obligations granted sometime earlier: the new awards are to apply only to those who have earlier received military service and *eisphora* payment equality. The award might have been made for Tenian services connected to events that are the context for *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 466, but – again – nothing like this is visible in the decree as it survives today. The greatest uncertainty in Reger’s theory is his dating of *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 660. Following Ph. Gauthier, he does not place the decree in 285/4 as J. Kirchner did, but to 281, in connection with the supposed return of Piraeus to Athenian control. I have examined this issue at length earlier.<sup>60</sup> The recovery of Piraeus is a much-debated question, one side of the debate maintaining that Athens won back Piraeus at this date, the other side suggesting that this did not take place until 229/8. There is not enough evidence to settle the debate definitely either way.

It is unlikely that representatives of Tenos would have been sent to Athens to seek reaffirmation of the privileges awarded earlier to Tenians in Athens, if there had not been doubts whether the privileges were still valid. Since the motivation clauses of the original decree for the Tenians are lost, it is impossible to determine the specific connection. The seeking of reaffirmation might have been motivated by a specific event – the change of regime in Athens – but in my opinion it could equally have been due to the simple the passage of time and changing conditions during that time. Between the original grant, whether made in 307/6 or earlier, and the reaffirmation, political conditions in Athens had altered several times. The authorities on Tenos may have been aware of this and wanted to ascertain that the privileges granted to Tenians in Athens were still valid.

*SEG III 122: a mass granting of privileges made under exceptional circumstances*

This decree of Macedonian *isoteleis* soldiers stationed in Rhamnous, examined in detail earlier,<sup>61</sup> is, in a sense, another example of mass grantings of privileges: it is evidence of a slightly earlier award of *isoteleia* to a group of recipients. Otherwise it is wholly different from the first example, *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 660. The circumstances of this *isoteleia* grant are wholly detached from the normal rules according to which honours and privileges were rewards for services to the state. Here the privilege has been awarded to soldiers on active garrison duty who furthermore are in the service of the foreign power controlling Athens. The grant was not motivated by the services performed by the soldiers. The Athenians were obliged, practically forced, by the foreign controller to do it. Furthermore the recipients of the privilege did not in this case gain any practical advantage from the privilege since they were not under the authority of Athenian laws and administration and did not pay *isoteleia* or any other taxes.

<sup>60</sup> See pp. 35 ff. above.

<sup>61</sup> See pp. 39 ff. Above.

*Conclusion: isoteleia survives as a privilege granted by decrees until ca. 229/8*

The last of the decrees awarding *isoteleia*, IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 768+802, comes from the satellite-state period, the 250's. It is clear, then, that awards of *isoteleia* were made by decrees at least for some time in the period when Athens was a satellite-state of Macedon. It is unlikely that the content of the privilege would have changed or its importance diminished during the time when grants of *isoteleia* were still made. This kind of conclusion might be justified if the formulation with title (*isoteles*) had entirely replaced the one with privilege (*isoteleia*) in the grant clauses in the course of the early Hellenistic period. Had a development like this taken place, it could be viewed as a sign that *isoteleia* developed into something that was primarily an honorary title, losing its practical importance. However, both forms of the formula appear for as long as there are *isoteleia* decrees. The choice of formula seems to have depended on whether there was one (object in the singular) or more recipients (object in the plural). Furthermore, D. Whitehead's suggestion that SEG III 122, the decree of Macedonian *isoteles* mercenaries, represents a general trend in the development of *isoteleia* – the disappearance or diminishing of its practical importance – cannot be accepted. The granting of *isoteleia* to mercenaries in the service of the Macedonian King was an exception and was made in an exceptional situation.

The question of the *isoteles* in grave inscriptions is problematic. Most grave inscriptions can only be dated to a particular century, and the grave *stelai* of *isoteles* are not an exception. The *isoteles* appearing here represent hereditary titles, but it is impossible to know when the grant of *isoteleia* in each particular case was originally made. Some hypotheses on the connection between the *isoteleia* decrees and *isoteles* grave inscriptions do come to mind. One possibility is that if grants of *isoteleia* were made after 229/8, the decrees simply have not survived. However, this could be considered unlikely: a wealth of honorary decrees has survived from the last three decades of the 3rd and the first half of the 2nd century. The *stelai* of *isoteleia* decrees were usually set up in similar places to all honorary decrees, so their discovery would have been equally likely to that of other types of honorary decrees. On the other hand, one could suggest that the assembly continued awarding *isoteleia* after 229/8 too but for some reason these decrees ceased to be set up in public. Yet why would this have occurred? Other types of honorary decrees for foreigners – citizenship, *proxenia* etc. – continued to be set up. Finally, there are plenty of honorary decrees, also from the 2nd century, that are so fragmentary that nothing can be determined from them. It is possible that some of these would have been *isoteleia* decrees. However, if we take into account the evidence we actually have in our possession, the most likely conclusion is perhaps that grants of *isoteleia* were no longer made after 229/8. The most likely reason for this is that the resident foreigners of Athens no longer paid *metoikion*, which in turn significantly diminished the practical value of the *isoteleia* privilege. The presence of *isoteles* in grave inscriptions from the 2nd century and later does not necessarily contradict this conclusion. Such cases are few: three from the 2nd century, and three dated from the 2nd–1st and centuries 1st century, together.<sup>62</sup> These could be cases where the family of the deceased had an exceptionally long history in Athens. The original grant could have been made before 229/8, and it would have been a matter of

<sup>62</sup> 2nd century: IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 7862, 7872, 7876. 2nd–1st and 1st century: 7866, 7867, 7878.

exceptional pride that the privilege had been in the family for so many generations, even if by the 2nd or 1st century it was primarily an honorary title that no longer retained any practical value.

### *Eisphora* and military service equality: somewhat rarer than *isoteleia*, no longer in existence after 229

The sources for the privilege of *eisphora* and military service equality are slightly fewer than those for *isoteleia*: there are five decrees from the Classical, three from the Hellenistic period. The most recent ones are from the end of the 4th century. The grant of this privilege is expressed ‘shall pay *eisphorai* and fight (battles) along with the Athenians’. As can be seen, it combines a tax privilege with a privilege concerning military service. In all but one case both are awarded together. *Eisphorai* were paid in the 4th century in groups called *symmoriai*. Metics paid one sixth of each *eisphora* in their own *symmoriai*, the *symmoria* of each person depending on his wealth. On military service, citizens and metics served in different units, and the metic units were not generally taken on military expeditions abroad, but reserved as territorial troops and for defence duties.<sup>63</sup> Equal *eisphora* and military service obligation thus meant that the foreign resident grantee gained access to citizen *symmoriai* and military units.<sup>64</sup>

#### *Formulaic variations*

The formulaic variations in the decrees are as follows:

*IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 218 (346/5), ll. 33–34: εἰ[σφ]έρειν δὲ αὐτοὺς [τὰς εἰσφορὰς καὶ στρατεύεσθαι] μετὰ Ἀθηναίων -----

*IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 237, ll. 27–28: τὰς εἰσφορὰς [ἐάν τινες] γ[ίγ]ν[ωνται μ]ετὰ Ἀθηναίων εἰσφέρειν (*eisphora* alone)

*IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 287, ll. 4–7: τ[ὰς] εἰσφορὰς εἰσφέρειν καὶ τὰ τέλη τελεῖν καθάπερ Ἀθηναῖοι, καὶ τὰς στρατείας στρατ[εύ]εσθαι μετὰ Ἀθηναίων

*IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 351+624 (330/29), ll. 30–32: στρατεύεσθαι αὐτὸν τὰς στρατείας καὶ τὰς εἰσφορὰς εἰσφέρειν μετὰ Ἀθηναίων

*IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 360 (325/4), ll. 19–21: στρατεύεσθαι αὐτοὺς τὰς στρατείας καὶ εἰσφέρειν τὰς εἰσφορὰς μετὰ Ἀθηναίων

*IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 505, ll. 53–56: τὰς εἰσφορὰς αὐτοὺς εἰσφέρειν μετ’ Ἀθηναίων καὶ [τὰς στρατε]ίας στρατεύεσθαι ὅταν καὶ Ἀθηναῖοι [στρατεύων]τα[ι]

*IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 516, ll. 2–3: [τὰς] στρατι[ὰς] στρατεύεσθαι καὶ τὰς εἰσφ[ορὰς] εἰσφέρειν μετὰ Ἀθηναίων

*SEG XXIV* 117 (end of 4th century), ll. 5–7: τὰς στρατε[ί]ας στρατεύεσθαι αὐτοὺς] καὶ τὰς εἰσφορὰς εἰσφέρειν μετὰ Ἀθηναίων

The *eisphora* and military service parts switching places (for instance in 218 and 360) is a phraseological alteration and does not indicate difference in content or regulations. The same notion applies to *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 505. The phrase ‘whenever also the

<sup>63</sup> See pp. 24–26 above.

<sup>64</sup> Thomsen 1964, 205–206, 225. Whitehead 1977, 79–80. Hakkarainen 1997, 11.

Athenians fight' simply emphasizes the fact that the military service of Athenian citizens and foreign residents was differently arranged (see pp. 25–26 above). The military service systems of citizens and foreign residents differed from one another not only in terms of the division of units but also temporally: campaigns abroad were seldom exactly simultaneous with defence duty in Attica. The phrase in *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 505 emphasizes this temporal aspect.

*IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 237 is the sole instance where only one half of the privilege was granted, in this case equality in *eisphora* payment. Explanation can be sought in the circumstances at the time when the decree was passed, 338/7. The privilege was granted immediately after the Greek defeat at Chaironeia, a battle which resulted in the deaths of a thousand Athenians. The right of equal military service with citizens meant that the recipient would be allowed in citizen units and therefore on military campaigns abroad. It might have been that following such a resounding, recent defeat, after which Athens was required to place its armed forces in the service of Philip II and Alexander, that the Athenians did not believe an independently conducted military campaign could be possible for a long time to come. Thus it might have been useless to award a group of foreigners the right to enter citizen units. *Eisphorai*, on the other hand, were not only used for preparations of military campaigns but also to finance things such as the repair of fortifications.<sup>65</sup> The Athenians firmly intended to recover from the defeat, as the project led by Lykourgos to restore the *polis*' strength and state treasury shows.<sup>66</sup> It could be expected that *eisphorai* would be needed, and sources indeed indicate that they were regular until 323/2.<sup>67</sup> Thus, *eisphora* privileges were purposeful in this era. An alternative explanation is provided by the fact that the persons in question were refugees and were not expected to stay permanently in Athens. The decree itself reveals this: the awarded privileges are to be valid temporarily, until the refugees leave. These people could well serve on guard duty while they were in Athens, but it would not have been practical to take them on a military expedition, had there been the opportunity for one.

The phrase καὶ τὰ τέλη τελεῖν καθάπερ Ἀθηναῖοι in the middle of the formula in *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 287 is another exception to the normal formulation of the privilege. The decree is a *proxenia* award accompanied by *isoteleia*, equal *eisphora* and military service obligations, *enktesis* of land and house and *epimeleia*. One possibility is that the phrase emphasizes the meaning of the preceding τ[ὰς] εἰσφορὰς εἰσφέρειν. Τὰ τέλη means generally 'that which is paid to the state, a tax, duty, toll, due'. Τελεῖν (τελέω) is the corresponding verb, but since in Athens citizens were traditionally distributed into classes according to their property, the verb also had the meaning 'to be rated' or 'assessed' in a certain class, 'to belong to, be classed among.' This latter sense can most likely be seen in the phrase καὶ τὰ τέλη τελεῖν as well: with the privilege the grantee would gain access to citizen *symmoria* groups, that is, would be rated in a different class than previously. It is in theory possible that the phrase in fact refers to the award of *isoteleia* immediately preceding the *eisphora* and military service privilege, or some

<sup>65</sup> Epigraphical evidence for such usage is available: the annual *eisphorai* 347/6–323/2, mentioned in *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 505, ll. 14–17 cannot all have been for actual war preparations. *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 834 (shortly after 229), for the Athenian leader Eurykleides of Kephisia refers to *eisphorai* for paying off the Macedonian troops in the fortresses and the project of the repair of fortifications that was begun after the liberation of 229. *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 835 for Apollas has the same context.

<sup>66</sup> Habicht 1995, 33 ff.

<sup>67</sup> *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 505, ll. 14–17.

other tax/taxes we have no knowledge of. But if that is the case such a phrase would most likely have been inserted before or after the *eisphora* and military service privilege formula, not in the middle of it. Furthermore, it is hard to see why it would have been necessary to emphasize the *isoteleia* award again in the sentence which immediately follows. Unfortunately the motivation clauses of the decree and the honorand's name have not survived, so the circumstances are unknown. Perhaps irregularities or problems in the payment of *eisphorai* had occurred at the time of the grant, which is why it was necessary to ascertain with an additional phrase that the rules were going to be adhered to.

*The privilege disappears due to conditions during the satellite-state period*

The epigraphical evidence reveals that the formulation and content of the *eisphora* and military service privilege did not undergo significant changes. The alterations in the formulation (the primary components switching places etc.) are phraseological variations rather than indicative of changes in the privilege itself. The greater differences seen in a couple of instances are due to specific circumstances relating to the period of the grant, rather than evidence of consistent development in the formula or content of the privilege. Had these been signs of definite change, they would have remained as part of the award formula after their first appearance.

The latest grant of the *eisphora* and military service privilege to resident foreigners is IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 505. There is a chance that some of the later, fragmentarily preserved decrees included this privilege, but the possibility cannot be used as a basis of argumentation. There is, however, epigraphical evidence from a later date of the survival of the privilege itself, in IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 660: the awarding of further privileges only to those persons who had received the *eisphora* and military service privilege earlier. I think it likely that the privilege would not have been mentioned in the reaffirmation, had it not been understood to have validity in the present. As I noted earlier, the restoration of the formula has been subject to some debate with A. S. Henry disagreeing with J. Kirchner.<sup>68</sup> Both scholars' restorations for l. 39 would nevertheless suggest that the privilege in this case did include both the *eisphora* and military service components. The phrase *τελοῦσιν τὰ τέλη* (Henry) means generally 'pay tax/toll/duty', but in connection with the preceding *στρατευομένοις καὶ* – which has survived intact – it could only refer to *eisphorai*. The only other tax privileges known are *isoteleia* and exemption from *metoikion*, and they had their own formulae. Henry's restoration is perhaps preferable because of the correspondence between the verb and the noun. In all the preserved cases of the *eisphora* and military service privilege, the verb corresponding to *eisphora* is *εἰσφέρειν*. *τελεῖν* appears in IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 287 but in an addition inserted in the middle of the formula.

The privilege disappears from records after 285/4. There are references to the payment of *eisphorai* until shortly after 229.<sup>69</sup> After this date, *eisphorai* disappear from records altogether. Considering this gap between the last attestation of the privilege and the last attestation of *eisphorai* themselves, the logical conclusion would seem to be that the *eisphora* and military service privilege ceased to be awarded by the assembly at

<sup>68</sup> See p. 32 and p. 97, n. 57 above.

<sup>69</sup> IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 834, for Eurykleides of Kephisia, and 835, for Apollas.

some point during this time. I find it unlikely that this would have happened as early as during the period of independence 287/6–262/1. There is the indirect evidence that it occurred in the year 285/4, and it is known that large resources were needed for the restoration of defences, grain supply and diplomatic contacts. Altering the system of honours and privileges may not have been the most immediate concern later: Athens' situation remained insecure because Macedonian troops still held at least some of the countryside fortresses,<sup>70</sup> and most of the 260's were taken up by the Chremonidean War. If the system of *eisphora* payment and military service, as well as the privilege, were unchanged in 287/6–262/1, things seem to have altered between 262/1 and the liberation of 229/8. In *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 835, l. 7, Apollas is seen paying *proeisphorai*, not *eisphorai*. This indicates that at least the *eisphora* obligations of citizens and foreign residents had become standardized.

The most obvious date for the disappearance of the *eisphora* and military service privilege would be 262/1–229/8, when Athens was a satellite-state of Macedon. The likely reason for the development would have been that citizens and foreign residents were no longer differentiated according to status in *eisphora* payment and military service. There is no direct evidence concerning the latter but considering Athens' position at this time it is logical to assume that such a system of division in the military was purposeless or altogether impossible. After the end of the Chremonidean War, Athens was placed under the authority of a royal governor. The functioning of the administrative organs was strictly restricted, and the King reserved the Athenian armed forces for his own use, obliging the Athenian troops to follow him on military campaigns.<sup>71</sup> One of the primary consequences of the division of citizens and foreign residents into different units had been that the latter were not taken on military expeditions. With Athens' own troops being under foreign control, the Athenians could not independently embark on military campaigns. On the other hand, if Athenian troops had followed the King on a campaign, they would have formed such a minor portion of a foreign army that such a system of division would have been outright impossible. This eradicated the purpose of the division of military units according to status. A few years later Athens regained some of its freedom,<sup>72</sup> but for the most part conditions did not change regarding the function of the Athenian armed forces. In such conditions, bestowing the *eisphora* and military service privilege would not have had any practical purpose. The disappearance of status division in the payment of *eisphorai* occurred due to similar conditions. With the liberation in 229, the *eisphora* and military service privilege could have been actively reinstated. However, the fact that there is no sign of *eisphorai* in the sources after the early 220's would indicate that this form of taxation was no longer in existence from that point. I have discussed this development and the reasons for it earlier.<sup>73</sup>

<sup>70</sup> *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 657, ll. 35–36. Shear 1978, 79. Habicht 1979, 78–79, 96. *Idem* 1982a, 101–103. Pausanias relates the achievements of Olympiodoros in 1.26.3, stating that restoring Piraeus to Athens' control was among these. This event has most commonly been dated to 281/0. See pp. 35 ff. above for the debate concerning the recovery of Piraeus and the interpretation of Pausanias' excerpt.

<sup>71</sup> Habicht 1982a, 13. *Idem* 1995, 154–156, 161, 164.

<sup>72</sup> *Idem* 1995, 155.

<sup>73</sup> See pp. 54–56 above.

## 2. Naturalization of foreign residents much rarer than that of other foreigners

Naturalization was the highest honour a foreigner could receive in Athens since it most changed the civic status of the honorand, giving him political rights that could not be gained through any other state privilege. As I stated in the introduction to chapter 3, the reason that I did not begin my examination of state honours and privileges with naturalization is that Athenian citizenship was not an honour reserved solely for foreign residents. Theoretically any free non-Athenian could be naturalized.

The evidence for naturalization in Athens was compiled by M. J. Osborne in the early 1980's.<sup>74</sup> Since then, no new, important pieces of evidence have been published. The most important part of the evidence is the actual naturalization decrees, since these, provided that they have survived in good condition, directly display the practices, regulations and formulae used in each period. Osborne lists 98 decrees for the Hellenistic period. All of these fall within my time limits, 322–120. As for my comparative material, the evidence for naturalization in the Classical period, Osborne's data includes 22 naturalization decrees (the earliest from the last third of the 5th century). Apart from the decrees, definite or very likely cases of naturalization, known from other types of inscriptions and literary sources, are also included in the data. There are 37 cases in the Hellenistic and 82 in the Classical period (from the first third of the 5th century onwards). This additional data is of limited use in the examination of the naturalization practices and regulations, because the information available for each particular case of naturalization rarely refers to these kinds of details. The material offers no evidence at all for the development of the formulae. The situation is somewhat better concerning the motivations for grants of citizenship: in many cases references to the grantees are found in other sources, which enables us to determine the reasons, or some of the reasons, for naturalization in these instances. An excellent example of this is the famous banker Pasion, a freed slave and thus metic who was eventually naturalized. Pasion is known from several references in Demosthenes and Isocrates.<sup>75</sup>

55 of the total of 98 Hellenistic naturalization decrees are so badly damaged that neither the identity of the honorand nor the reasons for his naturalization can be determined. The 22 Classical decrees are better preserved: only four inscriptions are too fragmentary to allow any conclusions. Fortunately enough survives of the Hellenistic citizenship decrees to allow us to track the development of naturalization practices and regulations. The relatively well-preserved decrees span almost the entire period under examination – until ca. 140's – and are relatively evenly divided, without large chronological gaps in between. Furthermore, other sources give us more information on the grantees of some of the decrees.

Examination of the evidence compiled by Osborne readily reveals the fact that only a small minority of the naturalized foreigners, whether in the Classical or Hellenistic period, are identifiable as residents in Athens. The main aim in this chapter is to determine the reason for this. Did the percentage of resident foreigners change

<sup>74</sup> *Naturalization in Athens*, 1981–1983.

<sup>75</sup> [D.] 45.85; 53.18; 59.2 (D. 36 *passim*; [D.] 45 *passim*; [D.] 53. *passim*. Isoc. 17 *passim*). See also Osborne, 1981–1983, III, T30 (+ T31).



from the Classical to the Hellenistic period? Were the motivations for naturalization different in regard to metics and other foreigners? I will not examine in detail other regulations concerning naturalization and the general development of formulae in this context, because Osborne's work deals with these issues extensively, and, as can be seen there, the regulations were not different depending on the civic status of the grantee.

### Naturalized metics/resident foreigners

Because the cases of naturalization with the grantees identifiable as resident foreigners are so few, they can be listed here. They are in chronological order, and presented according to M. J. Osborne's listing.<sup>76</sup> Only two Hellenistic naturalization decrees for persons certainly known to have lived in Athens survive.

#### 1. D50: Euenor of Akarnania, 319/8–318/7 or ca. 307–301

Euenor, originally from Argos in Akarnania, had by the time of his naturalization resided in Athens for at least two decades. He was a doctor, and apparently a famous one, since his opinion on water is quoted by Athenaeus alongside that of Hippocrates.<sup>77</sup> The decree mentions as motivations Euenor's dedication in his profession and donations of money in the past, and 'now' a participation in *epidosis* εἰς τὴν παρασκευήν, 'for the preparation', with the sizeable sum of one talent of silver (ll. 4–10). The lines are partially restored. Euenor is known from an earlier decree, *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 373, passed in 322/1. It cites an earlier decree granting *proxenia*, praises Euenor for his dedication in the care of his patients, and awards the further privileges of *enktesis* and *epimeleia*.

Editors have traditionally dated the naturalization decree to the brief period of democracy between the oligarchy of 322–319/8 and the rule of Demetrios of Phaleron which began in 318/7. However, M. J. Osborne noted the way the decree clearly distinguishes an earlier period of benefaction and a current contribution. He interpreted the phrase 'for the preparation' as referring to the Four Years' War and thus dated the decree to ca. 307–301, noting the existence of other decrees of the period which similarly reward benefactors for earlier and current contributions.<sup>78</sup> About a decade later M. B. Walbank identified the first decree in *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 373 as the very fragmentary *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 242, dated to 337/6 on the basis of the surviving prescript. He suggested that Euenor was one of the many Akarnanian exiles that came to Athens in or shortly before 337/6 and that the reference to his treatment of patients was connected to the casualties of the battle of Chaironeia. On the basis of the dating for the earliest decree, Walbank argued that Euenor's naturalization should be dated to 318.<sup>79</sup> However, I do not see why the dating of the earliest decree would necessitate the attribution of Euenor's

<sup>76</sup> For reasons of consistency I have used the listing in Osborne 1981–1983. The cases marked with the letter D and a number refer to the list of naturalization decrees in vol. I (commentary in vol. II). Items marked with the letter T and a number refer to the list of certain or almost certain naturalization cases known from sources other than naturalization decrees (vol. III). The available testimonia and details for each particular case are found in Osborne.

<sup>77</sup> Ath. 46d. See also Osborne 1981–1983, II, 130–131.

<sup>78</sup> Osborne 1981–1983, II, 130. See his footnotes 558 and 559 for the other decrees.

<sup>79</sup> Walbank 1991, 199–203.

naturalization precisely to 318. Furthermore, Walbank ignores the wording of D50, especially the reference to an *epidosis* εἰς τὴν παρασκευήν. No trace of *epidoseis* survives in the brief period of democracy, whereas epigraphical sources do contain references to *epidoseis* for the preparations of the Four Years' War (for instance *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 505). These points make me inclined to accept Osborne's dating.

## 2. D78: Strombichos, 266/5

Strombichos was a mercenary commander in the Macedonian garrison on the Mouseion. In 287/6 he defected to the Athenian side. Afterwards Strombichos seems to have remained in Athens and played a significant role in the Chremonidean War (268/7–261/0). The decree does not mention specific honours in connection with Strombichos' earlier merits, but, as M. J. Osborne noted, it is likely that he received some for his services to Athens. His achievements during the Chremonidean War were the immediate motivation for his naturalization.<sup>80</sup>

Four cases are known from other sources:

### 1. T93: Diodoros, son of Dion, of Sinope, 295/4 or later *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 10321. Ath. 235d

Diodoros was the younger brother of the famous New Comedy poet Diphilos of Sinope. His naturalization is known from the family funerary *stele*, which was discovered in Piraeus and includes the names of his father and his more famous brother. The last entry, his own name, was cut in ca. 275–250. Both Diodoros' father and brother remained Sinopean; only his own name appears with Athenian demotic. The fact that the grave monument was found in Piraeus indicates that the family was established in Athens. In M. J. Osborne's view, the reason for Diodoros' naturalization may have been nothing more than his poetic skill. He notes, however, that if this is so, it is perhaps surprising that his more famous brother remained a Sinopean.<sup>81</sup>

### 2. T97: Philokrates, of the demos Hamaxanteia, son of Philon of Sikyon, ca. 250 *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 9052

The date of Philokrates' naturalization is suggested by M. J. Osborne. The inscription was found on a family grave monument in Kerameikos, with the latest entries dating to the early-2nd century. The inscription includes the names of three generations and a grave epigram for Philokrates' father Philon. Philon, a native of Sikyon, was a resident foreigner and doctor. Philokrates was naturalized around the middle of the 3rd century, for reasons the monument does not reveal, entered the *demos* Hamaxanteia and married into an Athenian family. The last entry on the monument is the name of the son born of the marriage, Philon, who died at some point in the early-2nd century.<sup>82</sup> The grave monument represents the integration of a foreign resident family into the Athenian citizenry. Philokrates was certainly a resident foreigner at the time of his naturalization.

<sup>80</sup> Osborne 1981–1983, II, 164–167.

<sup>81</sup> *Idem* III, 87.

<sup>82</sup> *Ibid.* 90.

The monument does not give any indication as to whether Philon of Sikyon had moved to Athens himself or if the family had longer roots there.

3. T99: Chrysippos, son of Apollonios, of Soloi, ca. 232  
Plu. *Moralia* 1034a 1 ff. Str. 14.671. D.L. 7.179

The date of Chrysippos' naturalization is by Osborne. The well-known Stoic philosopher came from Soloi in Kilikia, where his father, originally from Tarsus, lived as a metic. Chrysippos came to Athens ca. 260. He first attended the lectures of Arkesilaos, then head of the Academy, but was converted to Stoicism by Kleanthes, Zeno's successor as leader of the Stoic school. Chrysippos succeeded Kleanthes in the position in 232. His naturalization can be assumed from the fragment of Antipater, preserved by Plutarch.<sup>83</sup>

4. T116: Karneades, son of Philokomos (or Epikomos), of Cyrene, ca. 150  
D.L. 4.9. Str. 17.837 f. Suid. κ 400. *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 3781. (Kirchner, *PA* 8257)

Again, the date of naturalization is by M. J. Osborne. Karneades was head of the Academy, a position he gained sometime before 155.<sup>84</sup> He was also founder of the so-called New Academy. He was leader of the famous philosophers' embassy to Rome. Athens had invaded and sacked Oropos on the border of Attica and Boiotia. The Oropians appealed to the Roman senate, which put a 500 talent fine on Athens. Karneades was sent to Rome together with the leaders of Academy and Peripatos, and this philosophers' embassy managed to persuade the Senate to significantly reduce the fine. The philosophers also caused great excitement about Greek philosophy in Rome.<sup>85</sup> The inscription is a dedication of Attalos and Ariarathes to Karneades, who appears with the demotic *Azenieus*. Some scholars have argued that the two dedicants were King Attalos II of Pergamon and Ariarathes, King of Kappadokia.<sup>86</sup> Osborne refers to H. B. Mattingly,<sup>87</sup> who proved that the argument is without foundation. Osborne suggests that Karneades' naturalization took place after he became head of the Academy. In his view the grant need not have been motivated by anything other than this, because citizenship grants to men of scholarship and arts were relatively common in Athens.

M. J. Osborne's arguments on the reasons for Karneades' naturalization are unconvincing. It is true that many foreign scholars and artists were naturalized in Athens, but most of these are not known to have performed services of great political importance. The embassy led by Karneades was indeed politically significant: Rome was the leading power in Greece at this time, and maintaining good relations with her was essential for Athens. The success of the embassy must have greatly assisted this goal. The economic importance of the embassy was great, since 500 talents was not an insignificant amount in Athenian financial terms, even if Athens experienced a new era

<sup>83</sup> *Ibid.* 91.

<sup>84</sup> *Ibid.* 101–102.

<sup>85</sup> Cic. *Att.* 12.23, 2; *De Or.* 2.154 f.; 2.161; *Tusc.* 4.5. Plu. *Cat. Ma.* 22.1–23. Gell. 6.14, 8–10. Ael. *VH* 3.17.

<sup>86</sup> See for instance Meritt 1961, 228 ff. Ferguson 1974, 300 ff.

<sup>87</sup> Mattingly 1977, 165 ff.

of prosperity in the 2nd century.<sup>88</sup> The excitement about Greek philosophy caused by the leaders of the three schools must have greatly enhanced Athens' image in Rome since the scholarship of these men represented the philosophy practiced in Athens. As we are familiar with Karneades' achievements and know that he was naturalized, it would be logical to see a connection between these two things. However, this question cannot be solved definitely, since the actual decree for Karneades' naturalization has not survived.

These few cases, then, are the only ones from the Hellenistic period for which it is possible to say for sure that the grantees were established in Athens prior to their naturalization. There are however other, possible instances. The celebrated poet of New Comedy, Philemon, son of Damon, of Syracuse in Sicily or Soloi in Kilikia, was naturalized sometime before 307/6. He seems to have established himself in Athens, but the preserved testimonia does not reveal whether this was before or after his naturalization.<sup>89</sup> The same applies to some other poets: Apollodoros of Karystos, naturalized in the 280s or later, and the tragic poet Herakleitos, son of Dion, of Argos, naturalized in the 250s. Also Sokrates, son of Socharis, of Rhodes, an *auletes* who received citizenship ca. 250, can be included in this group.<sup>90</sup> M. J. Osborne and S. G. Byrne list all these in their catalogue, but the available testimonia does not indicate if they were established in Athens prior to their naturalization.

The comparative material of the Classical period is not extensive. The decrees are mostly from the late 5th century. D2, of 410/9, awards citizenship to Thrasyboulos of Kalydon for the merit of assassinating Phrynichos, the leader of the government of Four Hundred. The assassination marked the beginning of the end of this regime. Though the sources do not indicate this directly, it would appear that Thrasyboulos lived in Athens. He is included in the catalogue of M. J. Osborne and S. G. Byrne (no. 2652). D4, D5 and D6, all from the very end of the 5th century, are for groups of people. The first two are for Samians, both for individuals who were not expected to come to Athens and persons who lived there, including Samian metics. D6 votes citizenship and other honours for foreigners who joined the democratic forces in the overthrow of oligarchy at the end of the 5th century. Those who joined the struggle in its early stages were naturalized. Since all this took place in Attica, most of these individuals are likely to have been metics.

These are the only Classical decrees where the status of the recipients is identifiable with relative certainty. A possible case is D8 for Sthorys of Thasos (394/3), also listed by M. J. Osborne and S. G. Byrne (no. 2315). In Osborne's interpretation Sthorys was a member of an influential family in Thasos who were partisans for Athens. He may have come to Athens: he attached himself to the staff of the Athenian general Konon, and at the time of his naturalization was receiving an official salary. From 323/2 comes D25, for a Bosporan. The decree is very fragmentary but mentions participation in *epidoseis* in ll. 6 ff. It is possible, but in my opinion unlikely, that a citizen of Bosporos merely visiting Athens would have wanted to participate in an *epidosis*. If this had been a case of a private donation of a person residing in Bosporos, I believe some other terms referring to financial donations would have been used. Since

<sup>88</sup> Habicht 1995, 219–222.

<sup>89</sup> See Osborne 1981–1983, III, T81, T85 for the testimonia.

<sup>90</sup> *Ibid.* 88–90, T95, T96, T98.

*epidoseis* were decided by the Athenian assembly, the term has a specific meaning and does not appear in honorary decrees indicating private financial donations in general. However, this conclusion is not certain: there is *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 768, shortly after 229/8, to Aristokreon of Seleukeia. He visited Athens but did not stay there to live, yet he did participate in *epidoseis* for the defence works begun after the liberation of 229/8. It could be assumed, though, that Aristokreon had strong ties to Athens and therefore wished to do something for her even though he was not a permanent resident: he studied philosophy in Athens and his uncle Chrysippos was leader of the Stoic school.<sup>91</sup>

Among the naturalizations of the Classical period known from other sources to the actual citizenship decrees there are some interesting cases from the 4th century, all to do with wealthy metics. The famous banker Pasion, a manumitted slave, was naturalized in ca. 390–386 together with his son Apollodoros. The reason was evidently Pasion's considerable financial contributions to Athens.<sup>92</sup> Some decades later Pasion's manumitted slave Phormion and his two sons were naturalized. Phormion married Pasion's widow under the terms of the latter's will and also became guardian of his younger son Pasikles. Phormion's two sons were born of the marriage.<sup>93</sup> In the late 330s, members of another wealthy Athenian metic family were naturalized, for similar reasons to Pasion, as M. J. Osborne suggests: Chairephilos, son of (?) Pheidon, and his three sons. The titles of two speeches of Hypereides and some allusions by comic writers would seem to suggest that the family had amassed its wealth in the fish industry, but this evidence should not be taken at face value.<sup>94</sup> Around the same time, or a little later, two metic bankers, called Epigenes and Konon, were awarded citizenship. The testimonia does not directly indicate why they were naturalized, but Osborne suggests that they alleviated matters in Athens during the great corn shortage of the early 320's.<sup>95</sup>

As can be seen from the above, only a minority of the honorands in all the known naturalization cases can be identified as having been resident foreigners in Athens. This is true for both the Classical and Hellenistic periods. There are no significant changes in the number of naturalized foreign residents from Classical to Hellenistic periods. Unfortunately a little over a half of the citizenship decrees of the Hellenistic period are so fragmentary that nothing can be said about the identity of the honorands. These may or may not have included foreign residents. The available data is not extensive enough to deduce clear-cut patterns in the development of the naturalization of foreign residents, in terms of the motivations, regulations and formulae of citizenship awards. However, some general remarks can be made about the motivations. Considerable financial contributions are represented: in the 4th century some metic bankers and other wealthy metics were rewarded with citizenship for their contributions to the state. In the late-4th century the Akarnanian doctor Euenor participated in an *epidosis* for the preparation of the Four Years' War with one talent of silver. Another possible reason for naturalization was unusual military achievements. In the late 260s the mercenary commander Strombichos received citizenship for his role in the overthrow of the

<sup>91</sup> D.L. 7.85. Pečírka 1966, 107–111. On Chrysippos: Arnim 1899, 2502–2509.

<sup>92</sup> Osborne 1981–1983, vol. III, T30, T31.

<sup>93</sup> *Ibid.* T48–T50.

<sup>94</sup> *Ibid.* T75–T78.

<sup>95</sup> *Ibid.* T80–T81.

Mouseion garrison in 287/6 and in the Chremonidean War. Nearly 150 years earlier the foreigners who joined the struggle for the restoration of democracy in its early phases were naturalized in a mass grant. Extensive financial donations and unusual military achievements, then, were considered important services to the state both in the Classical and Hellenistic periods. A third group, more prominent in Hellenistic times though not an entirely new phenomenon,<sup>96</sup> represents naturalizations of men of scholarship and arts. At least some of them were established in Athens during the Hellenistic period. It is to be noted, however, that at least in the case of the philosopher Carneades, the motivations were probably to do with services to the state along with scholarly achievements.

To further establish patterns of development in the naturalization of foreign residents it is necessary to examine the cases of non-resident foreign honorands, who are in the majority among the naturalization cases that have survived. What were the reasons for naturalization here? What kind of regulations were in effect and formulae used? Comparing the few decrees for foreign residents to the other testimonia, are these uniform? The non-resident cases should give some indication as to why naturalization of foreign residents was so rare.

### Honorary citizenships for Hellenistic monarchs and their aides and officials

Many foreign monarchs and members of royal houses were made Athenian citizens in the Classical period. Although several of them had actually made great benefactions to Athens,<sup>97</sup> the bestowal of Athenian citizenship in these cases was primarily honorific, a tool of advancing relations with valuable allies. Represented are, for instance, Dionysios, tyrant of Syracuse, and his sons (D10 (*IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 103), 369/8), members of the royal house of the Crimean Bosphoros (T21–T24, T32–T35, T63, T64, ca. 431–347/6) and Thracian Kings (T4, 431; T36, ca. 384; T54, ca. 360; T65, ca. 359–343; T66, ca. 360–342). The new situation that arose from the expansion of Macedonian power through Philip II and Alexander the Great and the formation of the kingdoms of the Diadochi, is strongly reflected in citizenship grants of the time. The Antigonids, Ptolemies, Seleucids and Attalids were now the ones best able to render valuable and much-needed assistance to Athens and whom therefore it was essential to maintain good relations with. Therefore, although some of the “old” royal houses like that of the Bosporan Kings (T84, T91) still appear, the new royal houses are in the majority among the naturalized members of royalty. All the Diadochi are represented.<sup>98</sup>

The presence of members of the Hellenistic royal houses among the honorands is unsurprising given the long traditions of honorary naturalizations of monarchs. What is striking, however, is the significant growth of the number of naturalization decrees for the aides and officials of these monarchs. Some few are known from the Classical

<sup>96</sup> The famous painter and sculptor Polygnotos was naturalized in the 460's, but he apparently did not stay in Athens for very long before this (T2). Another example is a minor comic poet called Alkaios, son of Mikkos, who originated from Mytilene and was awarded Athenian citizenship at the turn of the 5th and 4th century. He is only known from an entry in Suda (Suid. α 1274. See also T26).

<sup>97</sup> Osborne 1981–1983, IV, 189–190.

<sup>98</sup> Philip II and Alexander the Great (T68, T69; 338), Antigonos Monophthalmos and Demetrios Poliorketes (T87, T88; 307/6), several Ptolemies (T101, T102, T105, T118; 224–ca. 150), Attalids (T103, T108–T111; 200–178/7), Antiochos IV Epiphanes (T106, ca. 180–175)

period already,<sup>99</sup> but in the Hellenistic period a new factor entered the picture: foreign control. This situation was new for Athens. Thus in the late-4th century the aides and officials of the Macedonian generals are well-represented among the honorands. Persons connected to the Antigonids are predominant in 307–301 and 295–287.<sup>100</sup> In 314/13 citizenship was awarded to Asandros of Macedon, satrap of Karia, who was first appointed by Perdikkas, and later by Antipater (D42). There are several naturalized aides and officials of Antigonos Monophthalmos and Demetrios Poliorketes: Neaios (D44), Eupolis (D45), Oxythemis of Larisa (D47), Nikomedes of Kos (D51), Alkaios of Ainos (D60), Solon of Bargylia (D61), Zoes (D66), Herodoros (D68) and Phokinos, son of Eualkos, of Megara (T92). Much later, in the 230's, a citizenship decree was passed for Bithys, son of Kleon, of Lysimacheia, who may have been an official of Demetrios II.<sup>101</sup>

In the periods when Athens was independent, 287/6–262/1 and after 229/8, it was the aides and officials of the royal houses other than the Antigonid that were honoured with Athenian citizenship: Artemidoros, son of Apollodoros, of Perinthos, an agent of Lysimachos, who greatly assisted Athens in diplomatic relations with the King immediately after the revolt of 287/6 (D74, 286/5); Philokles, King of Sidon and *nauarchos* (naval commander) of Ptolemy I (D77, ca. 286 or shortly afterwards). The reason for his naturalization is connected to the fact that the Ptolemaic fleet, present in Attica immediately after the revolt, provisioned Athens with corn. Philokles was the senior Ptolemaic naval officer in the Aegean and was therefore in the position to ratify the decisions and actions taken by those under him concerning aid to Athens.<sup>102</sup> In the 2nd century officials of the Pergamene and Seleucid rulers are attested: Hikesion of Ephesos, placed in Aegina as governor by Eumenes II (D106, ca. 190–165); [Me/Zen]odoros, son of Eumenes, who was in the service of Antiochos IV (T107, ca. 180–175); Philonides of Laodikeia (?) and his two sons Philonides and Dikaiarchos, connected to the Seleucid court, who assisted Athenian envoys and also aided relations with Demetrios Soter (162–150) (T113–T115, 160s).

In many of the citizenship grants to royal aides and officials the motivations were partially to do with actual benefactions. For instance, the honorands might have greatly assisted in providing corn for Athens, a form of aid that was often urgently needed. Several decrees indicate that one of these circumstances came immediately after the revolt of 287/6.<sup>103</sup> As seen above, several aides and officials assisted Athenian envoys

<sup>99</sup> For instance T39–T42, for Areobarzanes, the Persian satrap of Hellespontine Phrygia and his sons, ca. 368–366.

<sup>100</sup> On the other hand, citizenship decrees are very few in the period when Athens was a satellite of Macedon, 262/1–229/8. Mostly these are for men of the arts or other, non-political figures (T96–T99). There are two naturalization decrees from this period, D88 and D89, but they are very fragmentary, and the identity of the honorands is not known. Only one person naturalized is known to have had a connection to a monarch, see Bithys of Lysimacheia below. The scarcity of naturalization decrees in the satellite-state period and the nature of the known honorands are probably due to the conditions in Athens in these decades. In the first ca. decade the powers of the assembly were limited to routine, day-to-day administration. After this the assembly regained some of its freedom, but it is probable that “safe” candidates were preferred: persons who were not politically significant and could not pose a risk in terms of endangering Athens’ relations with the King.

<sup>101</sup> D87. Theories have been put forward that this Bithys was a courtier of Lysimachos who was sent to aid Athens in the 280s. Osborne does not accept this: see II, 172–177.

<sup>102</sup> Osborne 1981–1983, II, 162–163.

<sup>103</sup> IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 651, for two citizens of Nesos (286/5; see also Pečirka 1966, 93). IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 653, for Spartokos, King of Bosporos, who answered Athens call for help with a sizeable donation of corn. D76, for Audoleon,

and/or facilitated Athens' relations with the King who they served. However, the naturalization of monarchs and their officials from 322 onwards also reflected Athens' position among and in relation to the new powers. The impact of foreign control was emphasized in 321–287, and especially in 307–301 and 295–288, judging by the several decrees for Antigonid officials and aides. In being so eager to vote citizenships for Antigonid officials the Athenians were probably hoping it would go some way towards ensuring the goodwill and leniency of the Kings, who in this way might be less inclined to impose harsher terms of control. Foreign control was not a factor in the naturalization decrees for the officials of the Ptolemaic, Seleucid and Attalid courts, but here, too, the motivations had something to do with maintaining good relations. The members of these three royal houses were often generous in aiding Athens, something that was seriously needed. Maintaining good relations was important for the continuation of this benevolence.

From 322 to 229/8 amicable relations not only with the Macedonian generals and the Antigonids but also with the other royal houses were extremely important for Athens. The resident foreigners of Athens could only in very rare cases have a sufficiently close relationship with any monarch to advance and aid political and diplomatic relations. Philosophers who were based in Athens, who often travelled extensively and were favoured by the Antigonids or had connections to other royal houses, might have been exceptions. According to Diogenes Laertius, Aristotle's student and successor Theophrastos, was granted an audience by Cassander and his favours were courted by Ptolemy I.<sup>104</sup> Lykon (299–225), another leader of the Peripatos, was favoured and supported by the Attalid Kings Eumenes and Attalos I.<sup>105</sup> The founder of Middle Academy, Arkesilaos, was furnished with large sums by Eumenes, who according to Diogenes Laertius was also the only contemporary King to whom he dedicated any of his works.<sup>106</sup> Diogenes also mentions that Antigonos Gonatas courted the favour of Zeno, the founder of the Stoic school.<sup>107</sup> These are just a few examples. None of these philosophers are known to have been naturalized in Athens,<sup>108</sup> but they could have in theory had enough influence with one of the Kings to advance Athenian relations. Generally speaking, however, ordinary, private resident foreigners could not gain citizenship because of political/diplomatic considerations.

The alternative reason for naturalization, tangible benefactions significant enough to merit the highest honours, were more often than not equally beyond the reach of the average Athenian foreign resident. These sorts of benefactions mostly took place in times of crisis and great need, and consisted of large financial donations, assistance in corn supply and important military achievements. As chapter 3.2.1 reveals, there are a

---

King of the Paionians, who was similarly asked for help by the Athenians and responded by sending 7500 *medimnoi* of corn to Athens. *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 655 for an aide of Audoleon, in charge of the actual delivery of the grain (285/4). Shear 1978, 2–4 (decree) + 5 ff. (translation and comments), for member of a prominent Athenian family, Kallias of Sphettos (270/69). Kallias was, around the time of the revolt of 287, in Ptolemaic service and facilitated the corn supply.

<sup>104</sup> D.L. 5.37

<sup>105</sup> D.L. 5.67.

<sup>106</sup> D.L. 4.38.

<sup>107</sup> D.L. 7.6 ff.

<sup>108</sup> Zeno and his pupil and successor Kleanthes were offered Athenian citizenship but they declined, saying that they did not want to offend their native city by relinquishing its citizenship. Plu. *Moralia* 1034a.



couple of foreign residents naturalized for benefactions of this type, Euenor of Akarnania (D50), and the mercenary commander Strombichos (D78). Usually, however, foreign residents simply did not have the capability to discharge important enough services in times of crisis or need to be rewarded with citizenship. They did perform the kind of services mentioned above, but tended to be rewarded with lesser honours like *proxenia*, *isoteleia* and *enktesis*.<sup>109</sup>

The above examination largely explains the small number of foreign residents among the grantees of Hellenistic citizenship decrees where the honorand is identifiable, and among naturalization cases known from other sources. Foreign monarchs and people connected to them dominate the list. The predominant motivations were diplomatic relations and significant benefactions for which only foreign monarchs, their aides and officials, and other important political figures (leaders of independent *poleis*) had sufficient resources. Often both of these played a part in the motivations for the naturalization of a particular person. The benefactions were usually military aid or financial/material donations. Foreign residents performed services, but in the prevailing conditions their services were generally speaking not considered important enough to be rewarded with an honour as high as Athenian citizenship.

### Regulations altered: descendants of naturalized persons made citizens by right after 229

Perhaps the greatest change in the regulations concerning the recipients of citizenship took place in ca. 229. As noted by M. J. Osborne, approximately from this date the naturalization decrees no longer specify that the descendants of the naturalized persons shall also be citizens. The stipulation had been standard since the 380's.<sup>110</sup> In turn, D. Ogden correctly interpreted this to mean that henceforth the descendants were automatically citizens with full rights.<sup>111</sup> The specification concerning descendants was intended to ascertain the position of the children of the naturalized men, who were often already married when they came to Athens. Since their wives were not *astai* and did not become citizens by virtue of the marriage on the event of naturalization, and since according to the law of Perikles (451/0) only the children born of *astoi* on both sides were citizens with full rights,<sup>112</sup> the specific stipulation was needed for the children of the naturalized men.<sup>113</sup>

Very few of the honorands in the surviving naturalization cases were residents in Athens. The post-229 cases of naturalized foreign residents are known not from actual decrees but other types of inscriptions. The change of regulations applied to naturalization in general, and therefore the new development also concerned the few foreign resident honorands. In practice it is likely that it would have been more significant for the naturalized foreign residents than other recipients of citizenship. Naturalized persons had to have their citizenship implemented separately.<sup>114</sup> Many of the honorands – in the Hellenistic period foreign royalty and royal aides and officials in

<sup>109</sup> For example Herakleides of Salamis (*IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 360), Nikandros of Ilion and Polyzelos of Ephesos (*IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 505), Apollas (*IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 835).

<sup>110</sup> Osborne 1981–1983, IV, 152–153.

<sup>111</sup> Ogden 1996, 82.

<sup>112</sup> Arist. *Ath.* 26.4.

<sup>113</sup> Osborne 1981–1983, IV, 152–153.

<sup>114</sup> *Ibid.* 171 ff.

growing numbers – never came to Athens, and so citizenship of the *polis* had no real value for them. In contrast, for the foreigners who lived in Athens implementation of citizenship would have had tangible and practical value, since it gave them access to the political life and administration of the city that was their home, as well as, obviously, to rights of land ownership. Full citizen-status of the descendants was essential particularly concerning the inheritance of land. A naturalized citizen could freely purchase and own land, but his descendants could not inherit the land if they did not have full citizen rights. The specification concerning descendants in naturalization decrees guaranteed citizen status for the children, but such a separate stipulation might be thought to include a certain element of uncertainty. The descendants being automatically citizens with full rights from ca. 229 onwards eliminated this uncertainty.

### 3. The development of *enktesis* – foreign residents as grantees

Throughout antiquity, land was the primary source of livelihood and wealth, and therefore the most important form of property. Because of its importance throughout the Classical period, the Greeks in both democratic and oligarchic *poleis* restricted the right to own land to citizens.<sup>115</sup> These factors also made land ownership a matter of status, in terms of it constituting a great distinction not only between citizens and non-citizens in the *poleis*, but also between ordinary citizens and gentlemen: ownership of land was a befitting and acceptable preoccupation and source of wealth for a gentleman; in fact it was widely considered the only acceptable way of attaining wealth for a gentleman.<sup>116</sup>

Non-citizens could cross the barrier of citizens' monopoly of land ownership only by receiving a special privilege, which gave them the right to buy and own land. The privilege was usually awarded by state decrees. Thus, although some references are found in Greek authors, the most important sources are epigraphic. This is especially true for Athens due to the exceptionally large number of preserved inscriptions.

There were two special issues in Athens that had a strong influence on all aspects of land ownership and therefore also on the awarding of *enktesis* privileges. The primary issue was a practical one: the scarcity of arable land in Attica. Only 18–20 % of the soil was suitable for the purpose.<sup>117</sup> Even in the Classical period grain had to be imported in large quantities.<sup>118</sup> Thus, since the citizens were the privileged group in the *polis*, it was natural that the limited amount of land that could be made productive was in the first hand reserved for them. This most likely discouraged the granting of *enktesis*, since the privilege naturally increased non-citizen land ownership in Attica. The second element is idealistic: the Athenians' traditional tendency to assert themselves as the original, native inhabitants of Attica. This was reflected in a myth appearing in literary sources as early as in the 470's in Pindar.<sup>119</sup> Whether or not the assertion was based on fact is irrelevant. What is essential to acknowledge here is the existence of the assertion. By the Hellenistic period a significant part of the citizenry must have been foreign in origin,

<sup>115</sup> Finley 1974, 49. *Idem* 1975, 48, 95. Ste. Croix 1983, 40, 120.

<sup>116</sup> Ste. Croix 1983, 120 ff.

<sup>117</sup> Finley 1950, 49. Carlton 1977, 141, 143–144.

<sup>118</sup> Ca. 1 200 000 bushels by the middle of the 4th century. Carlton 1977, 141, 143–144.

<sup>119</sup> Pi. O. 13.1–3.

due to the naturalizations over the centuries. Nevertheless, something of the traditional assertion most likely survived as a kind of romanticized, idealized way of thinking.

Considering the importance of land, the fact that land ownership was a citizens' monopoly in the Greek world, and the special elements in Athens mentioned above, the examination of *enktesis* grants in Athenian inscriptions is obviously important for studying the development of the official status of foreign residents in Hellenistic Athens. Extensive changes in the regulations and practices of granting *enktesis* would suggest changes in issues of land ownership as well. The complete disappearance of *enktesis* might indicate that land ownership ceased to be monopolized by citizens. A significant growth in the number of grants would indicate that it became much easier for non-citizens to acquire the right to own land, and that the attitudes or regulations regarding non-Athenians possessing land in Attica became more relaxed. The same might be concluded if at some point grants of *enktesis* began to be made hereditary much more often than had been the case in the preceding times.

It should be noted that approximately half of Athenian state decrees including a grant of *enktesis* are very fragmentarily preserved. In many cases the identity and status of the honorand – whether he was a resident in Athens or not – cannot be ascertained, because his name and/or the motivation clauses of the decree have not survived. This makes the study of some aspects of *enktesis* difficult. For instance, it is impossible to conclude with certainty whether at any time the number of grants made to foreigners who lived in Athens changed significantly, because it is not known how many of the honorands in the fragmentary decrees were Athenian residents. However, as long as the grant clauses have survived, the fragmentariness of the decrees does not prevent us studying the development of the formulations and regulations of *enktesis*, or the numbers of grants in different periods. *Enktesis* was never a specific metic privilege, as the honorands in the well-preserved decrees indicate. The formulations of the grant clauses and regulations as evidenced by the content of the decrees applied to all recipients of the privilege, whether they were residents in Athens or not. Thus the presence of *enktesis* in an honorary decree does not as such indicate a metic honorand. This kind of identification can be made on the basis of the presence of some particular honours and privileges (for instance *isoteleia*) and/or the context of the decree (information provided by the motivation clauses).

As I am studying the development of *enktesis*, and changes in the regulations and other aspects of the privilege from the point of view of the official status of foreign residents, it is necessary to make comparisons to the state of affairs in the Classical period. Furthermore, there are some problematic issues concerning *enktesis* of the Classical period which need to be solved before one can examine changes and developments in the Hellenistic period. Because the earliest grant of *enktesis* to an individual person for secular purposes is from the year 410/09, all references to Classical period in my examination will refer to the last ca. 100 years of the era. In the Classical period, awards of *enktesis* to benefactors identifiable as metics, either on the basis of other privileges awarded, motivation clauses of the decree, or information provided by other sources, are few: only eight or nine cases. Seven or eight of these are awards to

individuals,<sup>120</sup> one is a one-time grant to the Cyprian community in Piraeus for the specific purpose of building a temple.<sup>121</sup>

### Basic formulations and regulations in the Classical and Hellenistic periods

The earliest, securely datable example of a grant of *enktesis* to an individual is *IG I*<sup>3</sup> 102, from the year 410/09. The decree is connected to the murder of the oligarchic leader Phrynichos in 411. The formula, if correctly restored, is unusual: [καὶ ἔγκτεσι]ν εἶναι αὐτοῖς ὅμπερ Ἀθηναίοις, [καὶ γεπέδο]ν καὶ οἰκίας, καὶ οἴκεσιν Ἀθένεσι (Il. 30–33).<sup>122</sup> *Enktesis* continues to be granted to ca. mid-2nd century.

The word ἔγκτησις means possession of property specifically in a foreign country. The corresponding verb is ἐγκτάομαι ('to acquire possessions in a foreign country'). The basic formula was: εἶναι αὐτῶν/αὐτοῖς γῆς καὶ οἰκίας ἔγκτησιν ('he/they shall have *enktesis* of land and house'). The privilege involved the right to both buy and own property. Occasionally, the right to buy or own a house only was awarded (e.g. *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 237). *Enktesis* of land alone does not figure in the epigraphic sources. Additional definitions might be attached to the basic formula. The phrase 'according to the law' (κατὰ τὸν νόμον) appears relatively often. I believe it does not change the meaning or content of the privilege, but merely emphasizes the fact that the grant was in accordance with existing laws or regulations. A. S. Henry has this view as well, referencing scholars who held similar opinion.<sup>123</sup> Other phrases of which there is evidence are 'in Athens' (Ἀθήνησι) and 'living in Athens' (οἰκοῦντι/-σι Ἀθήνησι). The grant of *enktesis* might apply to the grantee alone, or might be extended to descendants as well. At some point in the 3rd century a new element appears in the *enktesis* clauses: a specification regarding the maximum values for land and houses.<sup>124</sup> Other restrictive specifications are seen more seldom. In *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 373 Euenor of Akarnania seems to have been awarded *enktesis* of land and house excluding some areas of Attica. Unfortunately the crucial line has not survived entirely, and the restoration is highly uncertain (Il. 30–31): ἔγκτησιν ἀπέχοντι τῶν [κ]οι[νῶν καὶ τῶν ὁρίων].<sup>125</sup> A greater change in regulations concerning the privilege of land ownership seems to have taken place by the mid-2nd century, when it had become possible to request *enktesis*.<sup>126</sup>

<sup>120</sup> *SEG* XXXII 10 (see also Osborne, Byrne 1996, no. 2901); Osborne 1981–1983, I, D2; *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 83 (shortly before 370?), 287, 343+*Add.* p. 659+*SEG* XXIV 103 (323/2?), 351+624, 360+*Add.* p. 660, 373. J. Kirchner restored *enktesis* of house in *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 214 but the case is highly uncertain, see p. 90, n. 27 above.

<sup>121</sup> *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 337 (333/2). See also Pečirka 1966, 60.

<sup>122</sup> Pečirka 1966, 19.

<sup>123</sup> Henry 1983, 214–215.

<sup>124</sup> See e.g. *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 835.

<sup>125</sup> A. Wilhelm restored the line ἀπέχοντι τῶν [ὁ]ρίων τῆς Ἀττικῆς ('excluding the border regions of Attica'), later [κ]οι[νῶν καὶ τῶν ὁρίων ('the common borders'), a restoration adopted by J. Kirchner. The restorations were based on a Prienean inscription but have been discarded on the basis that Euenor was from Akarnania, with which Athens had no common borders, and the fact that there is no other reason why Athens would have needed to protect their border regions in this particular case. Pečirka 1966, 72–74. Henry 1983, 214–215.

<sup>126</sup> *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 907. See also Henry 1983, 215–216.

*Enktesis* becomes increasingly rare in the Hellenistic period, both for foreign residents and more generally

There are 30–31 grants of *enktesis* from the period ca. 420–322, 22–23 awards from the next hundred-year period up to and including the year 229/8. Thus, at least judging by the prevalence of *enktesis*, foreigners' land ownership did not change significantly before 229/8. The comparison of the numbers of awards to individual resident foreigners in both centuries leads to a similar conclusion concerning their land ownership specifically: eight or nine awards in ca. 420–322, six or seven in 322–229/8.<sup>127</sup> However, it is necessary to note that nearly half of the surviving decrees with *enktesis* are too poorly preserved to allow us to identify the status of the grantee(s) as residents or other foreigners, and so the conclusion is uncertain. Looking at the different types of honorary decrees where *enktesis* appears, *proxenia* decrees continue to be the largest group, their percentage falling only negligibly in 322–229/8. The number of decrees with *enktesis* attached to *isoteleia* is greater in this period. These cases are rare, generally speaking, with only four to six decrees from the ca. two hundred years. Four or five of them are from 322–229/8.<sup>128</sup> The number of decrees for individual persons with *enktesis* as the primary award – mentioned first among the privileges with practical value – remains the same: there are four decrees both in the Classical and Hellenistic period.<sup>129</sup>

*Foreign masters, foreign allies, uncertainty in agriculture, preference for other privileges*

Why there were fewer *enktesis* grants in the Hellenistic period, both in general and in cases where the grantees were foreign residents? The first thought would be that this is a sign of the increased severity of regulations and requirements concerning the awarding of the privilege. This kind of development, in turn, would seem contrary to the general trend of gradually diminishing status differentiation – even if the general trend was brought about by circumstances in Athens rather than the formal alteration in regulations. Explanation might be found, yet again, in the fact that Athens was mostly under foreign control and in the often changing political, economic and other conditions. Since *enktesis* was a general privilege, theoretically available to all foreigners, and not a metic privilege, foreign residents would have been affected by the conditions as one group among others. I have been unable to find factors that would

<sup>127</sup> For the eight or nine awards to residents before 321, see pp. 115–116, nn. 120–121 above. Awards ca. 321–229: *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 466, 505+*Add.* p. 661, 551, 554; *SEG XXIV* 117 (all last decade of 4th century); *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 768+802. *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 660 can be included if J. Kirchner's restoration is accepted, with reservations. J. Pečírka considered Kirchner's suggestion incorrect on the basis of the fact that it would be the only example of a multiple grant of *enktesis* of house without time limit. He further noted that although the Athenians occasionally awarded this privilege to political exiles for the duration of their stays in Athens, the grantees in *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 660 were not refugees. Pečírka preferred to restore the privilege of equal military service and *eisphora* payment in the place of *enktesis*. Pečírka 1966, 93–95. Henry 1983, 257, n. 55 accepted Pečírka's view without further comment.

<sup>128</sup> *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 505, 551 (309/8), 554, 768+802, with great reservations also 214 and 660 (see p. 90, n. 27 and n. 127 above).

<sup>129</sup> Classical period: Osborne 1981–1983, I, D2; *IG I*<sup>3</sup> 125 (405/4); *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 137, 279. Hellenistic period: *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 545; *SEG XXV* 84 (beginning of the 3rd century); *Agora XVI* 166; *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 725+*Add.* p. 666 (1st half of the 3rd century ?).

have had an effect on the prevalence of *enktesis* awards to foreign residents but not on the prevalence of grants to other recipients.

Stated simply, the purpose of awarding honours and privileges was to reward benefactions with a view to securing others. Decrees indicate this purpose by the later-4th century.<sup>130</sup> The state's need for benefactions of private persons was greater at some times than others. The presence of new and formidable powers, the Diadochi, and the fact that in the first hundred years of the Hellenistic period Athens was mostly under the control of Macedon, brought new angles to the awarding of honours: the Athenians bestowed honours on the Antigonids and their aides and officials in the hope of maintaining their favour and, through that, ensuring their leniency. On the other hand, foreign control might have had a preventive effect on the assembly's activity in awarding honours and privileges. Antigonids and the other royal houses had the largest resources and thus were in the best position to provide extensive aid for instance in the event of a grain shortage. In the period of independence 287/6–262/1, the support of the Seleucids or Ptolemies would have been an important opposing force to the Antigonids.

The need to guarantee the goodwill of those who controlled Athens was especially prominent in 307–301, when Antigonos Monophthalmos and Demetrios Poliorketes were masters of Athens. 44 decrees have survived from this short period, 28 of them naturalizations. The grantees include both Antigonos and Demetrios,<sup>131</sup> and seven persons who were aides or in the service of either.<sup>132</sup> The other decrees are awards of *proxenia* (usually with *enktesis*), some grants of *isoteleia* and one of bronze statue to a foreign ambassador. The need to obtain aid and have strong allies was reflected in the honorary decrees of 287/6–262/1. Again, naturalizations dominate the list of surviving decrees: 16 in all. Furthermore there is one award of *proxenia* and one of *isoteleia*.<sup>133</sup> The grantees include an agent of Lysimachos, who facilitated Athens' relations with the King (D75), and a *naurchos* of Ptolemy (D77). Securing the grain supply was of primary importance after the storming of the Mouseion hill in 287/6, and the decrees indeed give praise for donations for this purpose: reaffirmation of citizenship and two bronze statues to Spartokos, King of Bosphoros (IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 653); citizenship and a bronze statue to Audoleon, King of the Paionians (D76); praises for help in grain supply for an associate of Audoleon (IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 655), and *proxenia* with *enktesis* for two citizens of Nesos (IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 651). Also the form of the constitution in Athens in 308/7–302/1 and 287/6–262/1 may explain in part the large number of honorary decrees for foreigners. In these periods the constitution was democratic and the assembly very active. A contrary development can be seen in the moderately oligarchic regime of Demetrios of Phaleron (318/7–308/7), from which only five state honorary decrees survive.<sup>134</sup>

The preventive effect of foreign control is especially prominent in 262/1–229/8, when Athens was a satellite-state of Macedon. 10 or 11 honorary decrees for foreigners are datable to this period, but apart from the award of *isoteleia* to Macedonian

<sup>130</sup> Osborne 1981–1983, IV, 146.

<sup>131</sup> *Idem* III, T87, 88. Two new tribes were established in their honour at this time.

<sup>132</sup> *Idem* I, D44, 45, 47, 51, 60, 61. Antigonid officials were naturalized also in the second period of Demetrios Poliorketes' control over Athens, 295/4–287/6, although fewer cases are known. One of these is D68, for Herodoros.

<sup>133</sup> Naturalizations: Osborne 1981–1983, I, D74–D84; *Idem* III, T95; IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 653. *Proxenia*: IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 651. *Isoteleia*: IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 660.

<sup>134</sup> Osborne 1981–1983, I, D42; *Idem* III, T84–T86; IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 551.

mercenaries (*SEG* III 122), there were none from 262/1–ca. mid-250's, when the *polis* was controlled by a royal governor and the assembly's authority was severely restricted. Athens regained juridical freedom around the middle of the 250's but remained in political and military control of Macedon. Although the assembly was now freer to make decisions, the Athenians had to be careful not to bestow honours that might be contrary to the wishes of the Antigonids and jeopardise Athens' position in relation to Macedon. This must necessarily have limited the number of "safe" choices for recipients of honours and privileges. Indeed, such riskfree choices are well represented in the honorary decrees of the period. Two were resident foreigners: Aischias of Pergamon<sup>135</sup> and the Sikyonian Philocrates, who was naturalized and whose family was well established in Athens.<sup>136</sup> Two dramatic poets and one philosopher were naturalized.<sup>137</sup>

It is possible to explain the decrease in the number of *enktesis* grants in 321–229/8, both by preference for the particular types of honours and privileges when the assembly was active, and by the restriction of the assembly's authority when Athens was under strict Macedonian control. In 308/7–302/1 the Athenians resorted to naturalization to an unusual extent. This was done at the cost of other types of honours and privileges. Since *enktesis* was either awarded with these other types of honours or alone as the only tangible privilege, grants of *enktesis* became rarer. The same applies to honorary decrees in 287/6–262/1, when the highest honours were undoubtedly used to guarantee the beneficence of those who were in the best position to help Athens, whether as political allies and supporters or in terms of aid such as grain donations. In 262/1–229/8 foreign control had a discouraging effect on the awarding of honours in general, until ca. the mid-250's. This was due to the actual restriction of the assembly's authority, and after that it was due to the limited range of "safe" candidates for high honours. Thus, nothing suggests that the increasing rarity of *enktesis* grants would have been the result of the regulations and requirements regarding the awarding of *enktesis* becoming stricter.

Nothing suggests that any contrary development took place, that is that it became possible for foreigners to gain the right to buy and own land in other ways than through *enktesis*. Had something like this taken place, the need for *enktesis* would have diminished significantly. In fact, any other means of access to land ownership most likely would have made the privilege redundant and led to its disappearance from honorary decrees.

*Enktesis* grants to resident foreigners specifically<sup>138</sup> seem to follow a similar, slightly decreasing pattern as the awards of *enktesis* in general. This would not have necessarily needed to be the case, since for instance during the three decades of Macedonian control in 262/1–229/8 resident foreigners could easily have met the definition of safe candidates for honours. Very few of them were likely to have political contacts with enemies and opponents of the Antigonids. However, important honours and privileges were rewards for benefactions to the state, and resident foreigners seldom had the resources and opportunities for extensive benefactions. In 307–301 a

<sup>135</sup> *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 768+802.

<sup>136</sup> Osborne 1981–1983, III, T97.

<sup>137</sup> *Ibid.* T96 (Herakleitos of Argos), T98 (Sokrates of Rhodes), T99 (Chrysippos of Soloi).

<sup>138</sup> See pp. 115–116, nn. 120–121 and p. 117, n. 127 above.

considerable number were rewarded for benefactions in connection with the Four Years' War.<sup>139</sup> On the other hand, in 287/6–262/1 resident foreigners could not easily reach accomplishments deemed worthy of rewards, since honorary decrees at this time seem to have been primarily aimed at securing powerful allies and extensive donations for grain supply.<sup>140</sup> Also the fact that *enktesis* was still most commonly awarded in connection with *proxenia* – just over a half of *enktesis* grants – in the first hundred years of the Hellenistic period plays a part. As *proxenia* was traditionally, to a great extent, a tool of diplomacy and more seldomly awarded for other purposes, metics were in the Classical period in the minority among the recipients of the title. Between 321 and 229/8 only one grantee of *proxenia* appears to have been resident in Athens.<sup>141</sup>

One further factor that might have caused the decrease in the number of *enktesis* grants needs to be considered: the uncertainties of the period certainly affected agriculture in Attica, and this might in turn have discouraged the awarding of the privilege. The presence of Macedonian troops in the fortresses of Attica would not have had such an effect, because causing systematic disruption and destruction to the farming and crops would scarcely have served Macedonian interests since it would have complicated the rations supply to the garrisons.<sup>142</sup> However, during the first hundred years of the Hellenistic period Attica was threatened relatively often by invasions of varying scale by enemy troops, that is to say, either troops of the enemies of Athens or the enemies of the Antigonids who controlled Athens from time to time. It was the norm in Greek warfare to cause destruction to the enemy's crops, because few *poleis* in Greece could withstand a long siege if this happened.<sup>143</sup> This was, perhaps, an especially dangerous prospect for Athens because of the scarcity of arable land in Attica. There are various instances known from the history of Athens when the disruption of normal grain trade quickly led to a severe shortage or actual famine. In the 320's the entire Greece and the Aegean suffered from severe grain shortage.<sup>144</sup> At some point in the early 290's, a severe famine occurred in Athens, which enabled Lachares to

<sup>139</sup> Osborne 1981–1983, I, D50 (citizenship); *SEG* XXIV 117 (*proxenia*, *enktesis*, *eisphora* and military service equality, *epimeleia*); *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 479, 483 (only awards of honorary nature), 505 (*isoteleia*, *enktesis*, *eisphora* and military service equality, *prosodos*, *epimeleia*), 516 (*isoteleia*, *eisphora* and military service equality), 554 (*isoteleia*, *enktesis*), 583 (*isoteleia*, perhaps other privileges).

<sup>140</sup> Two decrees have survived where the honorands can be identified as residents: in *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 660 (285/4) for the Tenians, and Osborne 1981–1983, I, D78 (see vol. II for commentary) for the mercenary commander Strombichos.

<sup>141</sup> *SEG* XXIV 117 (unknown honorand). Naturally, only the inscriptions in which the grantee's status can be deducted either on the basis of the motivation clauses or the types of honours are included here. It is always possible that some of the honorands of the more fragmentary decrees were foreign residents, but this possibility is not very helpful to the issue.

<sup>142</sup> I refer here to peaceful, disturbance-free times when the Athenians did not attempt to free themselves from Macedonian control. The situation changed for instance in 287/8: after the Athenians stormed the garrison on the Mouseion, the Macedonian troops resorted to ravaging the countryside with the purpose of preventing the Athenians from provisioning the city to withstand the siege which Demetrios soon would soon raise. See e.g. Shear 1978, 16, 19.

<sup>143</sup> Carlton 1977, 195.

<sup>144</sup> *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 360, ll. 8–9. Plu. *Moralia* 851b. D. 34.37 ff. provides information on the rise of prices that ensued from the grain shortage, and the emergency measures taken. See also [D.] 42.20. See also Garnsey 1988, 154–166.



take control.<sup>145</sup> Famine was feared in 287/6 judging by the great efforts taken to ensure the safety of the harvest (see below) and secure donations of grain.<sup>146</sup>

Epigraphic and literary sources of/for the Hellenistic period provide evidence of enemy troops causing destruction to crops in Attic soil, as well as of Athenian attempts to protect the crops against this kind of enemy activity. During the Four Years' War, Cassander attempted to recapture Athens. In 304, his troops besieged and assailed Athens, laying waste to Attica and conquering the fortresses of Phyle and Panakton, and the island of Salamis.<sup>147</sup> In 287/6, after the overthrow of the Macedonian garrison on the Mouseion hill, the first concern of the Athenian leaders was to secure the harvest and protect it from falling into enemy hands, that is, the Antigonid forces. The task was performed with the help of a thousand elite soldiers of Ptolemy I, under the leadership of Kallias of Sphettos and his brother Phaidros, then hoplite *strategos*. The assembly passed a decree in honour of Kallias some time later.<sup>148</sup> During the Chremonidean War in the 260's Antigonos Gonatas invaded Attica and, according to Pausanias, ravaged the countryside.<sup>149</sup> In the early 240's Attica was threatened by Alexandros of Corinth, Antigonos' nephew and rebellious governor, and the assembly passed a decree appealing for donations to secure the harvest.<sup>150</sup> The recurring threat of enemy invasions to the Athenian agriculture very likely helped discourage the Athenians from bestowing new rights of land ownership since the protection of existing farmlands was the primary concern. Certainly, the threat of enemy invasions is likely to have had a discouraging effect on the willingness of those who did receive *enktesis* of land to actually implement the grant, to purchase land and make it productive.

*Drastic decrease in awards of enktesis in ca. 229/8–120: scarcity of opportunities for benefactions*

Only six awards of *enktesis* survive from the second hundred years of the Hellenistic period, ca. 229/8–120.<sup>151</sup> Three or four are from the last decades of the 3rd century. It can be noted immediately that such a great decrease in the number of *enktesis* grants after 229/8 cannot be explained by the assembly's inactivity. The assembly evidently was not inactive, since a large number of assembly decrees pertaining to all areas of life have survived from this period.

It is perhaps possible that *enktesis* as such did not become rarer after 229/8. The scarcity of surviving decrees after 229/8 might simply be explained by the fact that the

<sup>145</sup> FrGH 257a F, 4.

<sup>146</sup> Shear 1978, 2–4, ll. 24–27. IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 651+SEG XXIV 122; 653+Add. p. 662; 655; 657 (l. 31, failed attempt to secure aid from Lysimachos); 670 A+SEG XXV 91; D75. Plu. *Moralia* 851d ff. See also Osborne 1979, 190–191.

<sup>147</sup> Plu. *Demetr.* 23. D.S. 20.105–106. IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 492, ll. 8–9. Crosby 1937, 453–454, no. 4.

<sup>148</sup> Shear 1978, 2–4.

<sup>149</sup> Paus. 1.1.1; 1.30.4.

<sup>150</sup> Agora XVI 213. See also Habicht 2003, 54–55.

<sup>151</sup> IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 786, 835+Add. p. 668, 862, 884, 907+Add. p. 668, 947. IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 732+Add. p. 666 is dated 'ca. 229', but I have included it in my account as belonging to the period 322–229/8. Its placement is of course not precise due to the uncertainty in the dating. Nevertheless, this is not important for my argument. The decree, which awards *proxenia* and *enktesis* (partially restored but accepted by Pečirka 1966, 102–104 and Henry 1983, 217–218) to honorands whose names have not survived, is extremely fragmentary in the motivation clauses, and thus is not helpful in determining why there were so few grants of *enktesis* after 229/8. What is important here is that the number of *enktesis* grants, whether six or seven, was very small in the second ca. hundred years of the Hellenistic period.

majority of the grants from this period have not survived. There are several extremely fragmentary inscriptions in which the lines that contained the awarded privileges have not been preserved: for instance *Agora XVI* lists some 50 inscriptions that seem to have been state honorary decrees and thus might theoretically have included *enktesis*.<sup>152</sup> However, in my opinion there are some factors that limit this possibility. Firstly, *enktesis* had always been most commonly attached to *proxenia*. Only one such fragmentary *proxenia* decree exists where the grant of *proxenia* itself has survived but the lines that contained the other honours and privileges have not.<sup>153</sup> After the abandonment of metic privileges, particularly *isoteleia*, it was the only type of honorary decree where *enktesis* was appropriate, with the exception of the possible cases in which *enktesis* alone was awarded. The Athenians did not create or adopt from elsewhere any new privileges (theoretically) available to either all resident foreigners or all non-Athenians. It would have been pointless to apply *enktesis* to a naturalization decree, since a citizen automatically had the right to buy and own land. There are no instances of *enktesis* as the only practical privilege: all the grants after 229/8 appear in *proxenia* decrees. Furthermore, in the second hundred years of the Hellenistic period the number of *proxeniai* falls as well: from 21 in ca. 322–229/8 to 15 in 229/8–120. The Athenians did not seem to consider it necessary to alter the regulations of *enktesis* or the granting of privileges in general until ca. the mid-2nd century (see below). Nevertheless, it is necessary to remain cautious about these conclusions since it is impossible to know with certainty how many of the fragmentary privileges of the era originally were *proxenia* decrees that possibly contained *enktesis*. However, bearing in mind earlier and contemporary parallels, I do not consider it likely that a higher survival rate of decrees would add considerably to the data of *enktesis* grants after 229/8. Firstly, the majority of the surviving, identifiable decrees after 229/8 are naturalizations: while there are 15 *proxeniai* in the late-3rd century and 2nd century, there are 34 naturalizations known from citizenship decrees and other sources in the 2nd century alone. A portion of the fragmentary decrees would have been naturalizations. There would have been a number of *proxenia* decrees, but following the parallel of the decrees where the type can be identified, a significant portion would not have included *enktesis*: of the 15 *proxenia* decrees of 229/8–120 nine do not involve *enktesis*.

The principle of important honours and privileges as rewards for services to the state appears to have survived until ca. the mid-2nd century: by then it was possible to request privileges. There is evidence for this for *enktesis*, *proxenia* and citizenship.<sup>154</sup> For the citizens and other residents of Athens, benefactions meant primarily achievements in two areas: financial contributions and military feats, and for citizens also political services. A different group were leaders and citizens of other *poleis* rewarded for their pro-Athenian stance. In the Hellenistic period the concept of benefactions was applied to the aides and officials of the Antigonids, especially those of Demetrios Poliorketes. Benefactions were the theoretical reason for the awards in

<sup>152</sup> See *Agora XVI*, pp. 318, no. 222 ff.

<sup>153</sup> *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 892, ca. 188/7.

<sup>154</sup> *Enktesis*: *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 907+*Add.* p. 668 (Lucius O-/Ho-, Roman citizen). *Proxenia*: *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 984 (Ap- of Pergamon, mid-2nd century). Citizenship: Osborne 1981–1983, I, D113 (Menestheus, son of Apollonios, of Miletos, ca. 150).

these cases: the honorands are usually said to have advanced and aided Athenian relations to the Kings. It is impossible to know in every case whether the grantees had actually done something concrete or whether the Athenians simply hoped that their rewarding would be advantageous. Certainly the Athenians had a powerful motivation to secure Antigonid good will.

The last three decades of the 3rd century, until Athens became allied to Rome in 200, provided opportunities both for benefactions and the rewarding of honours and privileges. This was true especially for the wealthier foreigners in Athens. Immediately after the liberation resources were needed to pay off the Macedonian garrisons and for the restoration of defences. The benefactions of two of our recipients of *enktesis*, Aristokreon of Seleukeia (*IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 768) and Apollas (*IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 835) were expressly for these purposes. Aristokreon had connections with Athens through his uncle Chrysippos, whilst Apollas was a resident in the city. Athens' situation was by no means secure after the immediate situation had been dealt with: the temporary weakness of Macedon, caused by confusion in succession to the throne,<sup>155</sup> soon dissipated under Philip V, who proved to be a strong and effective leader.<sup>156</sup> With only limited resources, Athens needed outside assistance. On the other hand, the Athenians were now free to act in international affairs, which provided opportunities for awarding honours with diplomatic motivations. Later, having become allied with Rome, Athens could to some extent rely on Roman support and assistance,<sup>157</sup> which meant that the pressure on its own capabilities and resources diminished. In the 2nd century Athens was seldom under direct military threat. In terms of financial contributions, private resources were primarily needed for civil purposes. Thus there were fewer opportunities for individuals to prove themselves worthy of significant, tangible privileges, bestowed on them by individual honorary decrees.<sup>158</sup> Indeed, the most prominent motivations for honorary decrees in the 2nd century were diplomatic contacts and the aid of citizens of other cities to visiting Athenians. Four of the surviving eight or nine *proxenia* decrees of the time involve motivations of this type.<sup>159</sup> In the naturalization cases known from actual decrees and other sources these motivations are immediately evident in 19 instances out of a total of 34. Honorary citizenships to the Attalids, Ptolemies and Seleucids and their aides and officials are

<sup>155</sup> Habicht 1995, 176. Hammond 1989, 318 ff.

<sup>156</sup> Hammond 1989, 331 ff.

<sup>157</sup> Alliance with Rome: Plb. 26.16.9. Liv. 31.14.5; 31.15.5; 31.44.29; 41.23.1. Instances of Roman troops aiding Athens: Plb. 16.27.1–3. Liv. 31.16.2; 31.24.1–25.2. See also Habicht 1995, 195 ff.

<sup>158</sup> Some decrees survive which collectively praise participants in *epidoseis* for building projects: *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 2332, 2334. It appears that these kinds of services were not considered important enough for individual honours. The reason may have been that *epidoseis* were not freeform donations but were decreed by the assembly when the need arose, and – judging by the example of *Agora* XVI 213 – the sum each participant was asked to donate was limited.

<sup>159</sup> *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 844.III (reaffirmation), 884, 909, 947. Some have identified the Roman citizen in *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 907, Lucius O-/Ho-, as Lucius Hortensius, praetor in 170 and commander of the Roman fleet in the war against Perseus. Others have rejected this theory, for instance, on the basis that it would have been odd for such a notable Roman to request *enktesis* in Athens. It has also been suggested that this Lucius was a private Roman citizen residing in Athens. See the commentary of Pečírka 1966, pp. 119–120. The other *proxenia* decrees are fragmentary, and nothing can be discerned of the honorand's identity nor the motivations behind the awards: *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 892, 926, 984. *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 862 has the dating of ca. 200, so it is uncertain whether or not it should be included here.

common. It is necessary to note that many of the surviving naturalization decrees are so fragmentary that nothing of the motivation clauses survives.

As can be seen from the above figures, the great majority of honorary decrees and other known cases of the granting of honours in the 2nd century are naturalizations. Political and diplomatic “honorary” citizenships and *proxeniai* were prevalent: the honorands often had no interest in implementing their awards. In these circumstances it is not surprising that so few *enktesis* awards survive from the 2nd century. They were naturally never included in naturalization decrees. Only two *proxenia* grants include *enktesis*.<sup>160</sup> Neither of the honorands in these instances can definitely be identified as resident in Athens. If we take all the awards of all types of honours and privileges in this era, only in one case can the honorand be certainly identifiable as resident: Karneades, the leader of Academy, who was naturalized in ca. 150 B.C.

### *Enktesis* rarely hereditary until the end of the 3rd century. Automatically hereditary in the 2nd century?

When the first mention of the grantee’s descendants is in the *enktesis* formula, the reference is explicit: καὶ ἐγγύοις. If they have been already mentioned earlier in the decree, they are simply subsumed in the *enktesis* formula in the plural pronoun αὐτοῖς.<sup>161</sup> Grants of *enktesis* were seldom made hereditary in the Classical period: only six of 29 decrees mention descendants.<sup>162</sup> There are some decrees in which the apparently non-hereditary *enktesis* is immediately preceded by an award, most commonly *proxenia*, which is hereditary.<sup>163</sup> Assuming that in such cases the specification about descendants applied also to the *enktesis* award, J. Pečírka was reluctant to believe in a non-hereditary *enktesis*.<sup>164</sup> I am inclined to agree with A. S. Henry who sees no problem in this: unless the grant was explicitly hereditary, the descendants were presumably required to realize the value of the property at the death of the grantee.<sup>165</sup>

Two of the honorands were metics: the unknown in *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 287 and Herakleides of Salamis in *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 360. In the other four decrees the honorands cannot be identified. However, in these the main award is *proxenia* and it is not accompanied by any actual metic privilege (*isoteleia*, *eisphora* and military service equality, exemption from *metoikion*). In all but one of the Classical period *proxenia* cases where it is possible to identify the grantee as metic, the award of the title is accompanied by a metic privilege.<sup>166</sup> Thus, whatever the exact identity of those unknown recipients of hereditary

<sup>160</sup> *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 907+Add. p. 668, 947. *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 862 does include *enktesis* but it is only approximately dated to ca. 200, so it is not certain if it should be taken into account here.

<sup>161</sup> Osborne 1981–1983, III, 208–209. An example of the explicit reference to descendants is found in *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 373, for the metic doctor Euenor of Akarnania. Descendants are implicitly mentioned for instance in *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 287.

<sup>162</sup> *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 80, 162(bc), 287, 360, 425; *SEG* XXI 300.

<sup>163</sup> *Proxenia* or *proxenia* and *euergesia*: for example *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 132 1.7–9, 426.1–4. *Euergesia* alone: *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 351.

<sup>164</sup> Pečírka 1966, 149.

<sup>165</sup> Henry 1983, 210.

<sup>166</sup> *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 83, 287, 288 (*isoteleia* restored), 360. All but the last one are identifiable as metics from the metic privileges awarded, especially from *isoteleia*. *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 360 is detailed and in good condition, and the motivation clauses aid in the honorand’s identification. The exception is *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 343: the honorand, Demetrios of Sidon, a merchant based in Athens (see also Osborne, Byrne 1996, no. 6654), was awarded a

*enktesis*, it is perhaps acceptable to assume that they were not metics. *Enktesis* was extended to the honorand's descendants only in exceptional cases. Despite the presence of two metics among the grantees of the six decrees, it does not seem likely that metic status by itself would have increased the benefactor's chances of receiving hereditary *enktesis*. As seen above,<sup>167</sup> only eight or nine awards of *enktesis* to metics survive. Six of them were not hereditary. The decision whether or not to extend the award of *enktesis* to the honorand's descendants would more likely have depended on how highly his benefactions were rated. In the case of Herakleides of Salamis the benefactions were valuable and extensive: a wealthy merchant, he donated a large sum for the purchase of grain and sold large amounts of grain at lowered prices during the severe food shortage in the 320's.<sup>168</sup>

*Hereditary enktesis more common after 322 due to specific events, not changes in regulations*

In the ca. first century of the Hellenistic period, the number of hereditary *enktesis* grants rises slightly: eight cases of hereditary *enktesis* out of the total of 23,<sup>169</sup> when in the preceding hundred years the ratio had been 6 cases out of 29. Thus there were fewer grants of *enktesis* but more hereditary awards than before. In five of the decrees in 322–229/8 the grantees can be certainly identified as resident foreigners, on the basis of the motivation clauses and/or the types of privileges awarded. Furthermore, the grantee of one other decree may have been a resident foreigner if the editors' comments are to be accepted.<sup>170</sup> In the preceding hundred years two out of six grantees had been metics. The question is whether the increase in hereditary *enktesis* grants in general and in the grants to metics specifically is explainable in the changes of regulations concerning the descendants of the grantee? That is, were the rules defining when and in what circumstances *enktesis* could be made hereditary relaxed so that the privilege began to be extended to the grantee's descendants more often than before? Or was it simply a matter of circumstances regularly demanding awards of more rather than less significant privileges? If the Athenian state was in greater need of individual aid and resources, hereditary instead of non-hereditary *enktesis* might have been preferred in order to guarantee the continuing benevolence of old benefactors and to encourage new ones. In the case of wealthier foreign residents this might have been a significant encouragement: with hereditary *enktesis*, not only could they obtain land but also keep this property in the family.

As seen,<sup>171</sup> the basic formulations of the *enktesis* clause remained mostly unaltered in the last hundred years of the Classical period and in the first hundred years of the

---

hereditary status of *proxenos*, *enktesis* of land and house and gold crown of 1000 *drachmae* but no metic privileges. Henry 1983, 248 proposes, on the basis of *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 288, that if the inscription is correctly restored, it may imply that *isoteleia* for *proxenoi* was a matter of course by the mid-4th century (citing Whitehead 1977, 13).

<sup>167</sup> See pp. 115–116, nn. 120–121 above.

<sup>168</sup> *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 360, ll. 8–12, 29–31, 54–56, 66–68, 70–71. See also Pečírka 1966, 71–72.

<sup>169</sup> *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 373 (322), 505, 554; *SEG* XXI 300, XXIV 117, XXV 84; *Agora* XVI 164 (300/299–295/4); *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 768+802. Of these, *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 554 and 768+802 have *enktesis* of house only.

<sup>170</sup> *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 373, 505, 554; *SEG* XXIV 117; *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 768+802. According to the commentary of *Agora* XVI 166 (p. 239, citing earlier editors), the very fragmentary *SEG* XXV 84 probably originally involved a grant of *isoteleia*. If this is correct, the unknown honorand would be a foreign resident.

<sup>171</sup> See p. 116 above.

Hellenistic period. The same basic formula prevails, and the same additional elements are seen in both periods. The only new element is the specification of maximum values that appears at some point during the 3rd century. I will examine this in detail later. Judging by the variance of identities among the grantees in 322–229/8, the terms of eligibility for *enktesis* were not changed, either by restricting or extending it: there are foreign residents,<sup>172</sup> ambassadors and citizens of other states who had helped Athens<sup>173</sup> and refugees who were awarded privileges.<sup>174</sup> These all appear among grantees before 322, too. In p. 117 I noted that the types of honours *enktesis* appears with remained the same after the Classical period: *proxenia* grants continued to be the largest group, while there were also some *isoteleia* decrees with *enktesis* and some cases with *enktesis* as the primary award.

It is necessary to ask if any legal definitions existed at all for when and under what circumstances it was appropriate to make the *enktesis* privilege hereditary. It is entirely possible that even if formal regulations existed for the ways in which the extension of *enktesis* to the grantee's descendants was expressed in the grant clauses, the choice between hereditary and non-hereditary *enktesis* would have instead depended on circumstance: factors such as the value of the grantee's services and political considerations. If any formal rules existed, their relaxation would naturally have affected the foreigners who lived in Athens as well as anyone else who was eligible for the privilege, as it would now have at least in theory been easier to gain a hereditary right to acquire and own land. However, I do not believe that the increase in the number of *enktesis* grants in 322–229/8 was due to a formal changing of the rules. There is no direct evidence of anything like this in the epigraphic sources. The other features of *enktesis* survived in a relatively static form, which begs the question: why would only one single feature have been altered?

Is there a correlation between the extent of the grantee's services and hereditary *enktesis*? Such a correlation cannot be investigated for some decrees with hereditary *enktesis* because the motivation clauses have not survived.<sup>175</sup> *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 373, for Euenor of Akarnania, appends a hereditary *enktesis* of land and house to an earlier award of *proxenia*. The motivation clauses refer to the *proxenia* grant and his treatment of patients (ll. 23–26), which may be a reference to the casualties of the battle of Chaironeia.<sup>176</sup> The benefactions of another metic grantee, Euxenides of Phaselis (*IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 554) were fairly extensive: military service, payment of *eisphorai* and providing twelve sailors for the Lamian war, a donation and, apparently, participation in military action during the Four Years' War. However, his *enktesis* was of house only. The two metic benefactors of *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 505 (+*add.* p. 661), Nikandros of Ilion and Polyzelos of Ephesos, had paid large sums of *eisphorai* and participated in *epidoseis*, and had taken part in battles in two wars. They received the full array of privileges available to foreign residents.<sup>177</sup> In the decree, the reference to descendants is implicit and seems to

<sup>172</sup> *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 373, 505+*Add.* p. 661, 551, 554; *SEG* XXIV 117; *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 768+802, perhaps 660 (see p. 117, n. 127 above).

<sup>173</sup> *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 466; *Agora* XVI 111 (307/6–302/1); *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 651, 801.

<sup>174</sup> *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 545.

<sup>175</sup> Thus *SEG* XXI 300, XXIV 117; *Agora* XVI 164; *SEG* XXV 84.

<sup>176</sup> See pp. 105–106 above.

<sup>177</sup> See pp. 91–92 above.

apply both to *isoteleia* and *enktesis*.<sup>178</sup> Glancing at the Classical period, the metic merchant Herakleides of Salamis (*IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 360) was rewarded with *proxenia* and *enktesis* of land and house, both hereditary, and *eisphora* and military service equality. Herakleides' benefactions were connected to the severe grain shortage at the start of the decade: he is praised for having twice sold 3000 *medimni* (bushels) of grain, on one occasion for five drachmae, and another time for three drachmae per bushel 'first of the merchants who sailed to port';<sup>179</sup> and for donating 3000 drachmae to *epidoseis* for buying grain.

Obviously, then, the scale of benefactions had a strong bearing on the choice between hereditary and non-hereditary *enktesis*, at least with metic benefactors. Nikandros and Polyzelos discharged great financial services for two decades, and both financial and military assistance in connection with two wars. The services of Herakleides were likewise provided during a critical period. The benefactions of Euxenides were also to do with military and financial services, although they were apparently considered less important than those of Nikandros and Polyzelos, since he was awarded *enktesis* of house but not of land. The need to maintain good relations with the Macedonian lords of Athens does not seem to have been a consideration in the choice between hereditary and non-hereditary *enktesis*. This can easily be understood in the case of resident foreigner grantees, because very few of them had any relationship or connection with any of the Kings, let alone an amicable enough one so as to be able to influence them.<sup>180</sup> As for the non-resident grantees, none of them can be identified as aides, officers or other officials of Antipater, Cassander or the Antigonids. As noted earlier (pp. 110 ff.), naturalization was generally favoured when rewarding these persons with the motivation of maintaining good relations to their masters.

The majority of the recipients of hereditary *enktesis* in the surviving decrees from 322–229/8 were resident foreigners. Despite this I do not believe that their preponderance among the grantees was directly due to their official status as resident foreigners. On the other hand, the fact that a foreigner was living and present in Athens may have had an influence on a more individual and personal level when it came to the assembly deciding whether or not to make the award of *enktesis* hereditary. It is impossible to find verifiable instances of this in the sources of the period. However, we can well imagine that the fact that the grantee had established himself in Athens and had a family there, and had shown dedication to his adopted home, would have created a favourable attitude among the citizenry participating in the assembly meeting which

<sup>178</sup> Henry 1983, 209. Ll. 51–53: εἶναι δὲ αὐτοῖς καὶ ἰσ[οτέλειαν παρὰ τοῦ δήμου καὶ αὐτοῖς καὶ τοῖς ἐγγ[όνοις αὐτῶν] καὶ γῆς καὶ οἰκίας ἔνκτησιν καὶ τὰς εἰσφοράς] αὐτοὺς εἰσφέρειν μετ' Ἀθηναίων καὶ τὰς στρατε[ί]ας στρατεύεσθαι ὅταν καὶ Ἀθηναῖοι [στρατεύωνται].

<sup>179</sup> L. 10: πρῶτος τῶν καταπλευσάντων ἐμπόρων.

<sup>180</sup> Certain philosophers based in Athens were exceptions. According to Diogenes Laertius (7.6 ff.) Antigonos Gonatas was a great admirer of Zeno, the founder of the Stoic school, and had a habit of listening to his lectures when visiting Athens. Antigonos also invited Zeno to his court, but the latter refused referring to his old age, and instead sent his student Persaios. According to Diogenes, Zeno was also greatly respected by the Athenians: he was awarded the keys to the city wall and a bronze statue. Paus. 1.29.15 mentions that Zeno received the rare posthumous honour of burial in the Kerameikos at the expense of the state. If Diogenes' account is accurate, Zeno probably would have been able to influence the King on behalf of the Athenians. The surviving evidence of his life does not reveal whether or not he actually ever used his influence. The philosophers of the *Peripatos* since Aristotle are supposed to have had close connections to the Macedonian Kings.



was to pass the particular honorary decree. This kind of a person was “rooted” in Athens. He could be trusted with the important right of land ownership which he could pass on to his descendants, and his descendants, in turn, could be expected to remain in Athens and care for the land they had inherited.

On a more general level, I believe, a larger factor was that there were more situations in which the need for the benefactions of private individuals was unusually great. This would have provided additional opportunities for foreigners living in Athens to perform services which were rewarded with high honours: warfare in which Athens and Attica were directly threatened and which had a great effect on Athens’ situation with Macedon. A first-rate example of the former is the Four Years’ War during which Cassander attempted to recapture Athens. As for the second case, the storming of the Macedonian garrison on the Mouseion hill changed Athens’ position significantly, since it was able to regain independence – even if an uncertain independence – following that. The restoration of defences and the securing of the grain supply after the liberation had, on the other hand, provided opportunities for individual financial services in the form of donations. In the Chremonidean War Athens attempted to free its entire territory from Macedonian control. It is true that Athens had waged several wars and campaigns of varying sizes during the Classical period. But as these often took place abroad, and metics were usually not taken on expeditions, the latter seldom had opportunities to perform military feats worthy of rewards. In the Four Years and Chremonidean Wars there was military action in Attica, and foreign residents could participate in the defence of the territory. The same applies to the storming of the Mouseion and the other conflicts at the time.

Indeed, honorary decrees rewarding foreign residents for services connected to all three of the military events mentioned above have survived. The decrees for Euxenides of Phaselis, Nikandros of Ilion and Polyzelos of Ephesos are connected to the Four Years’ War although they also reward benefactions discharged in connection with the Lamian war. The fragmentary decree for Pyr- of Herakleia is also most likely connected with the Four Years’ War. This person’s benefactions seem to have primarily consisted of donations of money and had been considered lesser than those of the above: he is crowned with an olive crown and promised other honours in the future.<sup>181</sup> Perhaps Pyr- did not participate in fighting? Another metic doctor, Pheidias of Rhodes was awarded, but only with an olive crown, in 304/3.<sup>182</sup> The motivation seems to have been simply Pheidias’ dedication to the care of his patients (ll. 15 ff). The decree does not mention the war, but the date would fit the same context. Since Pheidias apparently did not make donations or make other public benefactions, it is questionable whether simply showing dedication to one’s profession would have merited public honours in normal times.<sup>183</sup> In 266/5 a greater honour, naturalization, was bestowed on Strombichos, the mercenary commander who took part on the

<sup>181</sup> IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 479, 480.

<sup>182</sup> IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 483.

<sup>183</sup> It is true that important, tangible privileges were bestowed on individuals for extensive benefactions. This does not mean, however, that crowns and other honours without tangible advantage were granted offhand to anyone. In ancient societies, especially in the Greek *polis*, public honour and fame (τιμή) was an important concept and valued as such. *Philotimia*, the love of honour (for oneself) was believed to be an essential feature of human character. In democratic Athens it was the basic feature of society and economy. Whitehead 1983, 55 ff. Hakkarainen 1997, 17 ff.



Athenian side in the capture of the Macedonian garrison on the Mouseion hill, subsequently stayed in Athens, and later played a significant role in the Chremonidean War.<sup>184</sup> J. Osborne notes accurately that there is no reason to believe that Strombichos was not honoured in some way too immediately after the revolt in 287: the fact that he was not naturalized then is easily explained by the fact that in the years following the revolt citizenship grants were extended primarily to the highest ranking officials of Hellenistic courts and to independent monarchs.<sup>185</sup>

Thus, circumstances in 322–229/8 were frequently unusual in there being many situations in which the services of private individuals were needed to an uncommon extent. The total number of *enktesis* grants as well the number of grants to foreign residents specifically diminished, because a large percentage of the honorands at certain periods were high officials of the Hellenistic courts and independent monarchs, and in their case naturalization was the preferred honour. But when a foreigner who lived in Athens did perform services that were awarded with *enktesis*, the reward was more likely to be hereditary than had been the case in earlier times.

*References to descendants disappear in the 2nd century. Enktesis now automatically hereditary?*

The evidence for *enktesis* after 229/8 is scarce. Only six awards survive from ca. 229/8–120:

IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 786: Aristokreon, son of Nausikrates, of Selcukeia  
(hereditary *proxenia* with hereditary *enktesis* of land and house)

IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 835+Add. p. 668: Apollas, son of Tharrynon  
(hereditary *proxenia* with non-hereditary *enktesis* of land and house)

IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 862: Dionysios, son of Simi-  
(hereditary *proxenia* with non-hereditary *enktesis*; the latter formula not surviving completely)

IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 884: Heris, son of Kothon, of Byzantion  
(*proxenia* with *enktesis* of land and house; descendants not mentioned)

IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 907+Add. p. 668: Lucius O- (or Ho-), a Roman citizen  
(*proxenia* and *enktesis* of land and house; descendants not mentioned, both granted by request of the grantee)

IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 947: a son of Theophilos; Theophilos, of Pergamon  
(*proxenia* with *enktesis* of land and house; descendants not mentioned)

According to Diogenes Laertius (7.185) Aristokreon came to Athens sometime during his uncle Chrysippos' lifetime (ca. 281/277–208/204). It is not known how long he stayed and whether he visited again, but it seems clear that he did not settle in Athens. The decree reveals (l. 6) that Aristokreon donated money to the *epidoseis* for the defence works after the liberation of 229/8. He is honoured as an ambassador of his home city (l. 11).<sup>186</sup> Apollas, mentioned several times earlier in this work, paid

<sup>184</sup> Osborne, 1981–1983, I, D78

<sup>185</sup> *Ibid.* II, 164–167.

<sup>186</sup> See also Pečirka 1966, 107–111.

*proeisphorai* and participated in *epidoseis* to pay off the Macedonian garrisons and to help with the defence works. Heris of Byzantion appears to have been an ambassador or commander of a ship: his companions, rewarded in the decree with lesser privileges, were *trierarchoi*.<sup>187</sup> The Roman citizen in the list has variously been identified either as Lucius Hortensius, praetor and commander of the Roman fleet in 170 in the war against Perseus, or a private individual who lived in Athens. Neither assumption is certain, because so little of the name remains.<sup>188</sup> The Pergamenian Theophilus was an aide of Eumenes II.<sup>189</sup> The identity of the other two grantees on the list is unknown.

Only one grant on the list, the one made to Aristokreon of Seleukeia, is explicitly hereditary. The award is attached to hereditary *proxenia*. Two other honorands were awarded hereditary *proxenia* but their descendants were not mentioned in connection with the *enktesis* grant. As seen earlier, some scholars have suggested that in such cases the reference to descendants covered the *enktesis* award as well. However, as noted earlier, I agree with those who do not believe this to be the only possible, or even the most likely, conclusion.<sup>190</sup> At least considering the Hellenistic grants, I find it more likely that if the descendants of the grantee were not explicitly mentioned, then the award of *enktesis* applied only to the original grantee. There are cases in which both *proxenia* and *enktesis* are explicitly hereditary and those in which the descendants are mentioned with *proxenia* but not with *enktesis*.<sup>191</sup> Such a distinction in the decrees would be pointless if the award in the latter cases had nonetheless applied to the original grantee's descendants.

From ca. 200 onwards descendants are never mentioned either with *enktesis* or *proxenia*. As the short list of *enktesis* awards after 229/8 indicates, the evidence for this privilege consists of three decrees only, spread over a few decades. The evidence for *proxenia* is slightly more extensive: eight decrees including the three with *enktesis*.<sup>192</sup> *Proxenia* was not always made hereditary in the Classical period or in the Hellenistic era before the end of the 3rd century, but the majority of grants were extended to the grantee's descendants. Although from ca. 200 the number of decrees is limited, they are divided over some five decades and reference to descendants is consistently lacking in all of them. It is tempting to see a parallel evolution to the development that took place in naturalization practices. From ca. 229/8 onwards the descendants of the naturalized persons were automatically citizens, as evidenced by the disappearance of the specification concerning descendants. It is entirely possible that a similar step was taken with *proxenia* some decades later. Since both honours were used for similar purposes, and to a great extent as tools of diplomacy and international relations, it may be the case that the Athenians soon began to consider it pointless to distinguish between hereditary

<sup>187</sup> *Ibid.* 117.

<sup>188</sup> *Ibid.* 119–120.

<sup>189</sup> *Ibid.* 122.

<sup>190</sup> See p. 124 above.

<sup>191</sup> Other instances of the former in Hellenistic period: *SEG* XXI 300, XXIV 117; *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 801. Instances of the latter: *SEG* XXIV 114 (4th century or a little later); *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 396 (321/0–319/18; partially restored but 'highly plausible even if not certain in every detail'. Pečirka 1966, 74); *Agora* XVI 111; *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 582 (end of 4th century); *Agora* XVI 164; *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 706+*Add.* p. 665 (*proxenia* entirely restored; 1st half of 3rd century), 723 (3rd century or a little earlier).

<sup>192</sup> *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 884, 907+*Add.* p. 668, 909, 911, 926, 947, 984, 1024. Possibly also *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 892, but since the grant clauses are fragmentary, this case is uncertain.

and non-hereditary *proxenia* and changed the regulations akin to those concerning naturalization. Due to the close connection between *proxenia* and *enktesis*, the change might have been applied to the latter as well. Although there are no actual instances of a person certainly recognizable as resident in Athens receiving *enktesis* after 200, it is nevertheless a natural assumption that if this kind of a development did take place, it would have been especially advantageous to foreigners who lived in Athens.

### *Enktesis* of land and house, or of house only

It is logical to think, as A. S. Henry does,<sup>193</sup> that *enktesis* of house alone was less valuable a privilege than *enktesis* of both land and house. Land was, as has been stated several times, the most important source of income and wealth throughout antiquity. 'House' in this context of course meant existing buildings. At least in practice, if not in terms of regulations, the lesser *enktesis* would have applied primarily to the city and Piraeus. These were the only areas in Attica that were likely to have any significant quantities of houses available for purchase. Furthermore, if houses had been available in the countryside, they would have been of little practical value to a recipient of the privilege if he was not allowed to purchase farming land. The great majority of surviving *enktesis* grants are of both land and house. There are only eight or nine decrees, four or five in ca. 420–322,<sup>194</sup> four after that,<sup>195</sup> out of the total of 59 decrees, where *enktesis* of house alone is awarded. As a rule, then, the grant of *enktesis* was of land and house, and the award of the lesser *enktesis* was an exception to the rule. The terms for these exceptions were most likely not defined formally in the regulations, but the decision to award *enktesis* of house was rather made when the circumstances seemed to require it.

In some cases the grantees of *enktesis* of house were evidently refugees. In the Classical period, at least, refugees were required to register as metics if they remained in Athens beyond the defined time limit. Being awarded privileges, they became privileged metics. This is the case in *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 237, where the honorands are Akarnanian exiles who arrived in Athens soon after the battle of Chaironeia. The decree indicates clearly that the awarded privileges were to remain valid only until the refugees left Athens. The exiles were likely to live in the city, rather than in the countryside, for the duration of their sojourn. Soon after the Lamian War a group of Thessalian refugees arrived in Athens and were awarded some form of *enktesis* and exemption from *metoikion* (*IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 545). The lines containing *enktesis* are restored, but Pečírka believed it most likely that *enktesis* of house only was awarded: he noted the fact that the privileges were to be in force until the refugees left Athens and that there is no parallel to a collective grant of *enktesis* of both land and house.<sup>196</sup> In *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 206, the honorand seems to have aided Athens in his own country and did not necessarily come to Athens for any more than short visits. One of the decrees is heavily restored, and it is not at all certain that it ever included *enktesis*. The honorands of the remaining two

<sup>193</sup> Henry 1983, 205.

<sup>194</sup> *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 125; *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 53, 130, 206, 237. Pečírka, examining the earlier, partial edition *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 174, doubts the restoration of *enktesis* of house in the first inscription, considering it improbable that the decree included *enktesis* to begin with (1966, 39). D. 20.42 mentions that the honorand, Epikerdes of Cyrene, aided Athenians who were at the time prisoners in Sicily.

<sup>195</sup> *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 545, 554, 768+802, perhaps 660 (see p. 117, n. 127 above).

<sup>196</sup> Pečírka 1966, 82–83. See also Henry 1983, 227, n. 21.

decrees may have been refugees, or in any case individuals who had come to Athens and were expected to stay long enough to be subject to Athenian laws. Philytos (*IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 53) was made Athenian *proxenos* and received *enktesis* of house 'in Athens', *ateleia* 'in Athens', and the right to have his judicial matters handled by the *polemarchos* 'like other *proxenoi*'.<sup>197</sup> Sochares, son of Chares, of Apollonia (*IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 130), was awarded *enktesis* of house with hereditary *proxenia*. According to J. Pečírka it is very likely that he was a political supporter of Athens forced to flee his own country. Sochares aided Athens (ll. 10–12) in connection with the fighting for Methone, which fell into Philip's hands in the summer of 354.<sup>198</sup>

On the other hand, all the recipients of *enktesis* of house were not refugees. This was the case with Euxenides of Phaselis (*IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 554), the Tenian residents of Athens in *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 660 (if J. Kirchner's restoration of *enktesis* is accepted), and Aischias, son of Akrotimos, of Pergamon of *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 768+802.

Clearly, however, *enktesis* of house was the preferred form of the privilege in the case of refugees. There may even have been a specific policy to limit their residence to within the city area, and even to limit the duration of their sojourn, through the awarding of a form of *enktesis* that did not enable them to become landowners in Attica. Farming and making the soil productive required extended dedication. Had the exiles been awarded *enktesis* of land they might have been tempted to settle in Athens, which in the question of a larger group like this might have caused a significant growth of foreign land ownership on Athenian soil. On the other hand, one cannot exclude the possibility of the grantees' own motivations having influence as well. If the refugees were intending to return to their home cities when circumstances allowed, they may not even have had the desire to purchase land and become involved in agriculture in Attica. The Athenians may have assumed that this kind of a lack of motivation existed and considered the awarding of *enktesis* of land unnecessary. In the particular case of D16 positive motivations may have played a part as well. The Akarnanians had been Athens' allies in the war against Philip II,<sup>199</sup> so the Athenians may well have wanted to allow the exiles to purchase accommodation to show their respect and gratitude, rather than leaving them to find rental apartments. Similarly, Thessalian cavalry had played an important part in the battle of Krannon in 322.<sup>200</sup> In the case of the three decrees for foreign residents, the lesser *enktesis* was most likely motivated by the simple fact that their services were not considered important enough to merit the full privilege in addition to the other privileges they received. Furthermore, concerning the Tenians, the Athenians were probably reluctant to award *enktesis* of both land and house to such a large group.

Athens was rarely in the position to accept refugees in the Hellenistic period, due to her political position. Indeed, to my knowledge, no honorary decrees for refugees survive from the 3rd century or later. This must have limited the usability of the lesser

<sup>197</sup> Pečírka 1966, 28 notes that the Philytos received this right concerning judicial issues does not prove that he was a metic in Athens, as had been suggested before him: the judicial issues of metics were automatically under the jurisdiction of the *polemarchos*. They would not have needed a grant of this right by decree. With the status of *proxenos* and the privileges he received, Philytos did, however, become a privileged resident foreigner in Athens.

<sup>198</sup> Pečírka 1966, 36.

<sup>199</sup> *Ibid.* 50.

<sup>200</sup> *Ibid.* 82–83.

*enktesis*. Now the available candidates were groups of people on whom the Athenians wanted to bestow privileges without giving access to land ownership to too many non-Athenians in one go. The lesser *enktesis* continued to be usable as an award to persons whose benefactions were not regarded important enough for greater honours. For instance Aischias of Pergamon (*IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 768+802) seems to have been this kind of a benefactor. Provided the words in the extremely fragmentary lines (12–13) are correctly restored, he participated in an *epidosis* for the ‘protection of the *polis*’ (τῆς πό[λεω]ς [φ]υλακῆν [ἐπέδ]ω[κε] with an amount of silver. The decree is too damaged to determine the context of the *epidosis*. It is also impossible to know for certain whether Aischias had discharged any other services, although S. V. Tracy appears to accept the restoration which suggests that he also contributed to the food supply.<sup>201</sup> However, it is reasonable to assume that if Aischias’ benefactions had been considered important enough and/or they had taken place in a situation that was critical for Athens, he would have received full *enktesis*. Aischias can be compared to Apollas (*IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 835), who discharged financial benefactions in connection with the liberation of 229/8 – a situation that certainly was critical for Athens – and was awarded *enktesis* of land and house.

#### Ἀθήνησι and οἰκοῦντι/-σι Ἀθήνησι: not indicators of residential status

The simple locative Ἀθήνησι appears seven or eight times in ca. 420–322,<sup>202</sup> and twice after 322.<sup>203</sup> The phrases are attached to other privileges as well: *isoteleia* (*IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 83), exemption from *metoikion* (*IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 48), *ateleia* (*IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 53, 180). All are “local” privileges, only applying to the area of Attica. In contrast, the locative does not appear in connection with *proxenia*, which was to a great extent a tool of diplomacy that was often awarded to foreign politicians and citizens of other states who did not necessarily ever come to Athens beyond short-term visits.

A closer look at the recipients of *enktesis* ‘in Athens’ is appropriate. If M. J. Osborne and S. G. Byrne are correct Herakleides of Klazomenai (*SEG* XXXII 10) was resident in Athens.<sup>204</sup> The unknown honorand of *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 83 was a resident in Athens, indicated by the fact that his honours included *isoteleia*. As J. Pečirka notes, agreeing with an earlier study, there is no evidence of *isoteleia* ever having been granted to anyone who was not resident in Athens.<sup>205</sup> In *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 53, Philytos is possibly a refugee or in any case a person who had come to Athens but was not expected to remain permanently. He was awarded *enktesis* of house and *ateleia* ‘in Athens’. Basing his argument on the fact that the decree seems to deal with wider issues, Pečirka suggests that Bion of Tenos (*IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 279) was an ambassador for his home city or a private Tenian with a complaint that was being looked into.<sup>206</sup> Euxenides of Phaselis (*IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 554) was resident in Athens. Circumstances in the other cases are unknown. Considering the various identities of the persons awarded *enktesis* ‘in Athens’, it is

<sup>201</sup> Tracy 2003b, 138–139.

<sup>202</sup> *SEG* XXXII 10; *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 53, 83 (partially restored), 162bc (restored), 180, 279, 422 (336–318?; probably, see Henry 1983, 213). Additionally, *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 184 (350–325) should be included, if J. Kirchner’s restoration is accepted. However, Pečirka 1966, 43–45 leaves this part in l. 4 unrestored.

<sup>203</sup> *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 554; *SEG* XXV 84. It is restored in 725+*Add.* p. 666. But Henry 1983, 213, notes that since the appropriate lines are entirely restored, the presence of Ἀθήνησι is extremely doubtful.

<sup>204</sup> Osborne, Byrne 1996, no. 2901.

<sup>205</sup> Pečirka 1966, 33.

<sup>206</sup> *Ibid.* 54.

unlikely that the locative denoted any particular legal status or that its usage depended on the legal status of the honorand. When it appears, it simply seems to emphasize that the awarded privileges were to be valid only in the area of the Athenian *polis*.

To me, the locative seems somewhat purposeless, if the intention was indeed to emphasize that the privileges were to be valid only in Attica. Athens self-evidently would not have had the authority to grant privileges outside of its own territory. It is unlikely that the privileges 'in Athens' would have applied to the city of Athens alone. In state decrees 'Athens' normally refers to the entire *polis*. Taking the example of Philytos: if he was indeed a refugee and the Athenians wanted to limit his sojourn in Attica to the city, 'in Athens' would have been logical for excluding the rest of Attica from the sphere of *enktesis*. However, Philytos was also awarded *ateleia*, exemption from certain taxes, 'in Athens'. There is no historical evidence to suggest that it was ever Athenian practice to exempt people from taxes in the city but to leave them liable to them elsewhere in Attica. This is because taxation was under the authority of the central government, and there were no different sets of taxes for the city and the rest of Attica.<sup>207</sup> In Philytos' honorary decree *enktesis* of house and *ateleia* appear in the same clause and are bound with a single 'in Athens'. Thus it seems unlikely that with the *enktesis* the meaning of the expression would have been specifically restrictive, with *ateleia* being something else.

Οικοῦντι/-σι Ἀθήνησι appears, in plural, in the decree for Akarnanian exiles (*IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 273), where the phrase applies both to *enktesis* of house and exemption from *metoikion*. Otherwise it has been restored in four cases.<sup>208</sup> Like the locative Ἀθήνησι, οἰκοῦντι/-σι Ἀθήνησι appears also in connection with other privileges.<sup>209</sup> The phrase follows immediately the pronoun αὐτῶν/αὐτοῖς. The verb is in the present participle, agreeing with the number and case of the pronoun and being followed by a locative. The participle here is circumstantial, denoting the circumstance under which an action, generally the main action, takes place.<sup>210</sup> The phrase can be translated 'living in Athens', 'while living in Athens', 'while he is/they are living in Athens' or 'as he is/they are living in Athens.'

With the exception of *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 273, all the cases of οἰκοῦντι/-σι Ἀθήνησι can be discounted: J. Pečírka and A. S. Henry have argued convincingly that the restoration of the phrase cannot be accepted in these decrees. In *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 86 the spelling in the restored οἰκοῦντι is contrary to the orthography of the rest of the decree. Both Pečírka and Henry prefer inserting a reference to *ateleia* in the place of the phrase.<sup>211</sup> In the case of *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 582, the stone does not confirm the reading.<sup>212</sup> For the third case, *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 722, both scholars prefer the alternative restoration κατὰ τοὺς νόμους.<sup>213</sup> Finally, the restoration in *Agora* XVI 166 is based on a single letter in l. 5, which might be either *theta* or *omicron*. Earlier B. D. Meritt considered the reading of *theta* certain, which to

<sup>207</sup> *Demoi* did collect certain fees from their members. But with these it would have been the business of the deme authorities, not of the central administration, to exempt an individual from them.

<sup>208</sup> *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 86, 582, 722 (301–294); *Agora* XVI 166.

<sup>209</sup> *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 61 (exemption from *metoikion*), 109b (*ateleia*), 276 (*isoteleia*), 287 (*isoteleia*), perhaps 214 (*isoteleia*; according to J. Kirchner's restoration).

<sup>210</sup> Smyth 1956, §2054.

<sup>211</sup> Pečírka 1966, 33–35. Henry 1983, 212.

<sup>212</sup> Pečírka 1966, 91–92. Henry 1983, 212.

<sup>213</sup> Pečírka 1966, 98–100. Henry 1983, 212–213.

him justified the restoration of the οἰκοῦντι/-σι Ἀθήνησι phrase. Henry inspected the photograph of the stone, noting that it is insufficient to determine the reading of the crucial letter and that the letter may in fact be *omicron*. Thus the ‘according to the law’ phrase could be inserted in the place of ‘living in Athens’.<sup>214</sup> In conclusion, in the only instance where οἰκοῦντι/-σι Ἀθήνησι appears with certainty, IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 273, the meaning of the phrase is restrictive: it emphasizes the specification, also expressed by the words ‘until they leave’, that the privileges are to be valid only for the duration of the recipients’ stay in Athens. There is no evidence that the phrase was used more generally with *enktesis*. When attested with the other privileges for which there is evidence of the phrase, *ateleia* and *isoteleia*, οἰκοῦντι/-σι Ἀθήνησι seems to lack any regulative purpose: in these cases it simply makes reference to the fact that the honorands were residents in Athens – in the general sense of living in Athens rather than the civic status of resident – at the time of the awards. Although the honorands are metics, the phrase is not a similar, official denominator of metic status as the οἰκῶν/οἰκοῦσα ἐν formula. As Henry notes, the phrase is particularly applicable to these types of privileges.<sup>215</sup>

### Specifications of maximum values for land and house appear in decrees in the 3rd century

One major change took place in the formulae of the *enktesis* grant clause in the course of the 3rd century: maximum values began to be set for land and house. This meant that the recipients of *enktesis* could no longer purchase a limitless amount of land property or houses in Attica. The definition of maximum values appeared sometime before the mid-3rd century and remained in use well into the 2nd century. The maximum values varied from case to case. However, one should note that in many of the surviving decrees the appropriate lines are restored, and thus there can be no certainty of the correct values.

IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 706+Add. p. 665: unknown

ll. 1–2: ἔγ[κη]σι[ν οἰκίας μὲν ἐντὸς XXX, γῆς δὲ ἐντὸς TT]<sup>216</sup>  
(*enktesis* of house within 3000 [*drachmae*], of land within two talents)

IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 732+Add. p. 666: unknowns

ll. 12–13: [εἶναι δὲ καὶ ἐγκτησιν γῆς καὶ οἰκίας μὴ πλῆονος τίμημα]το[ς] - - -<sup>217</sup>  
(he shall also have *enktesis* of land and houses no more than to the value of ...)

IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 768+802: [Aisch]ias, son of Akrotimos, of Pergamon

802, l. 8: ἔ[γκη]σι[ν οἰκί]α[ς] τιμήμα[τος] . . .  
(*enktesis* of house to the value of ...)

IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 786: Aristokreon, son of Nausikrates, of Seleukeia

ll. 26–28: εἶναι αὐτῶι τε καὶ ἐγγόνοις καὶ ἐγκη[σιν οἰκίας μὲν ἐν]τὸς XXX, γῆς δὲ TT  
(he and his descendants shall also have *enktesis* of house within the value of 3000 [*drachmae*], of land within the value of 2 talents)

<sup>214</sup> Henry 1983, 213.

<sup>215</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>216</sup> Pečirka 1966, 97–98: due to problems concerning the number of letters, the proposed figures cannot be accepted. See also Henry 1983, 217, 220–221.

<sup>217</sup> *Ibid.* 103: the restoration is too short, and furthermore there are problems because the statement of value in the words following what is restored here cannot apply to both land and houses.

*IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 801: Apollonios of Klazomenai

ll. 10–11: [εἶναι δὲ] αὐτῷ καὶ ἔγκ[τησιν γῆς μὲν ἐντὸς TT τιμῆς, οἰκίας δὲ ἐντὸς XXX δραχ]μῶν<sup>218</sup>  
(he shall also have *enktesis* of land within the value of 2 talents, of house within the value of 3000 *drachmae*)

*IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 810+*Add.* p. 667: unknown, before 230

ll. 1–3: [ἔγκτησιν] γ[ῆ]ς καὶ οἰκία[ς, γῆς μὲν μέχρι T τιμῆς, οἰκίας δὲ ἥς ἐν τῇ αἰ]τήσεται γ[έ]γραπται<sup>219</sup>  
(*enktesis* of land and houses, of land up to the value of one talent, of house as was written in his appeal)

*IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 835+*Add.* p. 668: Apollas, son of Tharrynon

ll. 26–27: ὑπάρχειν δ' αὐτῷ καὶ ἔγκ[τησιν οἰκίας ἐντὸς ταλάν]του, γῆς δὲ δυεῖν ταλάντ[ων]<sup>220</sup>  
(he shall also be granted *enktesis* of house within the value of one talent, of land two talents)

*IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 862: Dionysios, son of Simi-

ll. 7–8: ὑπάρχειν δὲ αὐτῷ[ι ----- δρα]χμῶν X<sup>221</sup>  
(he shall be given ----- 1000 *drachmae*)

*IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 947: a son of Theophilos; Theophilos, of Pergamon

ll. 3–4: [δεδοσθαι δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ ἔγκτησιν γῆς μὲν μέ]χρι ταλάντου τιμῆς, οἰκίας δὲ μέχρι τρισχιλίω[v]  
(he shall also be given *enktesis* of land up to the value of one talent, of house up to 3000 [*drachmae*])

Aischias of Pergamon and Apollas have been mentioned several times. For Aristokreon of Seleukeia and Theophilos of Pergamon, see pp. 129–130 above. Apollonios of Klazomenai was an ambassador, and is named by Polybius.<sup>222</sup> The remaining honorands in the list are unidentifiable. As can be seen, in some cases the amounts have not survived at all. The values are restored in *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 706+*Add.* p. 665, *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 801 and *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 810. In the decrees where the values for land and house have survived either entirely or nearly intact, the value for house varies between 1000 *drachmae* and one talent.

<sup>218</sup> *Ibid.* 111, does not accept the restoration as far ἐντὸς goes, substituting it with the word μέχρι. He further notes that it is certain that the formula included the values for both land and houses, but that we do not know either of them. Henry 1983, 220, proposed restoring the value with the expression μέχρι ... τιμῆς.

<sup>219</sup> Pečirka 1966, 112–113, notes that the entire restoration is extremely uncertain. Henry 1983, 216 discards the restoration of maximum values and instead suggests: [ἔγκτησιν κατὰ τοὺς νόμους ὥσπερ ἐν τῇ αἰ]τήσεται γέγραπται.

<sup>220</sup> Pečirka 1966, 115, questions the correctness of restoring ἐντὸς. In his view it is practically certain that the decree ‘offers either an “anomaly” in regard to our present evidence or a wording of the formula of *enktesis* that is not yet attested.’: the suggested restoration for the entire formula is not certain, and the highest value for houses we have evidence of apart from this decree is half a talent. Indeed, Henry 1983, 218–219 proposes: ἔγκ[τησιν οἰκίας μὲν <τίμηματος> ἡμιταλάν]του, assuming that τίμηματος, which is required here, may have dropped out through a mason’s error.

<sup>221</sup> There are various different restorations for these lines. They are examined by Pečirka 1966, 116–117. Some propose *enktesis* of both land and houses, others of house only. All suggestions involve the value of 1000 *drachmae* for the houses. For land one suggestion is half a talent, but the more cautious ones leave it blank. Pečirka notes that there is no evidence to support the value of half a talent. According to him, it is impossible to obtain certainty in the restoration of the *enktesis* formula: it might have involved *enktesis* of both land and houses, or of house only.

<sup>222</sup> Plb. 28.19.



It is likely that the maximum values in each case did not depend on the civic status of the honorand but on the importance of his benefactions and the circumstances in which these benefactions were discharged. It is true that Apollas lived in Athens and received *enktesis* with the largest maximum values we have knowledge of (one talent for house, two for land), but his benefactions were extensive: he made generous financial contributions in the critical situation in, and immediately following, 229/8. Chrysispos' nephew Aristokreon was awarded *enktesis* of land with the same maximum value as Apollas, the value for house being half of that awarded to the latter, but he was not resident in Athens. It is likely that a person's reputation had some influence when he was awarded privileges. It is also likely that people were more familiar with the benefactions of a foreigner who had lived in the *polis* for some years or even decades, than, say, of a citizen of another *polis* who was voted honours due to political and diplomatic considerations. It is furthermore logical to assume that the benefactions of a long-time resident of Athens would have been more favourable received by the citizens who participated in the assembly session where the proposition of awarding the person in question was discussed: the fact that a resident foreigner was keen to do services for his adopted home was likely to be interpreted as a sign of dedication. Despite these considerations the available sources do not warrant the conclusion that the status of resident foreigners would have automatically guaranteed a grantee *enktesis* with bigger maximum values.

One method of determining the significance of the maximum values specification could be to first define how large an amount of land, in terms of acreage, the grantee could actually buy with the amounts of money specified in the decrees, and then compare this data to the information we have about the acreages of estates in Attica. If during earlier times the recipients of *enktesis* could purchase an unlimited amount of land, and if the maximum values restricted the acreages significantly, this would indicate that the purpose of the new definition was specifically restrictive. The Athenians would have been concerned that too much of the land of Attica was owned by, or was in danger of ending up in the hands of, people of non-Athenian origin, and consequently would have attempted to curb this development by limiting the amount of land the grantees of *enktesis* were allowed to buy. Unfortunately, ancient writers do not report the acreage of landholdings but instead the monetary value, normally self-assessed and questionable for several reasons, or a single year's gross income. Furthermore, they frequently will only give a figure or describe an estate in cases where it is unusual or extreme. The total number of individual figures known today is minimal.<sup>223</sup> Forming any kind of picture of the scale of landholdings in Attica at any time is practically impossible. There are other problems as well. Determining how much land a given sum could buy at different times would require an extensive knowledge of land prices. Ancient sources do not provide enough data for this to be achievable.

One of the likely motivations for the introduction of maximum values was to advance clarity: since land ownership by foreigners was something of an exception in Attica because they could only gain access to it through a special privilege, it was perhaps considered necessary to keep track of the property of landowners of non-Athenian origin. This would have been easier to achieve if there were official decisions

<sup>223</sup> Finley 1975, 98.

and documents on how much property a given recipient of *enktesis* could buy. Other issues need to be considered too. Despite the lack of data for a quantitative study, it seems probable that the maximum values were indeed intended as a preventive or restrictive measure. One factor is the possible concern of the Athenians that foreign land ownership had become, or was in danger of becoming, too extensive. There are eight cases with maximum values, whereas the total number of *enktesis* grants from the ca. mid-3rd century onwards is 11. Thus the above conclusion seems likely. I examined in earlier the decreasing trend in the number of *enktesis* grants in the Hellenistic period, and the effects of the Macedonian control and the insecure agricultural conditions caused by the recurring threat of enemy troops, as possible reasons for this. In the circumstance the Athenians may have wanted to change the existing land tenure conditions as little as possible and protect the old landholdings in order to secure the annual crops. In consequence fewer awards of *enktesis* were made, and in the course of the 3rd century the Athenians found it necessary to begin setting a value limit on the awards of the privilege. A further factor is that hereditary *enktesis* became somewhat more common, at least on the basis of the surviving decrees, from ca. 420–322 to 322–229/8. This was due to a combination of Athens' increased need for the resources of private individuals on various occasions, and the rewarding of these individuals with more rather than less significant honours in order to secure new benefactions. More hereditary *enktesis* grants would have increased the land ownership of people of foreign origin, as more often than before the descendants were being allowed to keep the land property after the original grantee died. Perhaps the introduction of maximum values was partly motivated by the desire to counteract this development.

Apart from practical considerations, one must not overlook the influence of purely ideological factors on the desire to limit the land tenure of foreigners on Attic soil. As has been pointed out, land was the most important form of property and source of income and wealth throughout antiquity. The Greeks retained a citizens' monopoly on land ownership. Wealth was generally understood to be wealth in land. The ownership of land also bestowed status: it was considered to be the one truly "proper" source of wealth, and was seen as a becoming occupation for a citizen, especially for a gentleman. From a practical angle, access to, or qualification to take part in many public and functions such as the board of *proeispherontes* and the cavalry was measured on the basis of land ownership. Thus, land ownership was probably the strongest dividing line that separated citizens and non-citizens. A resident foreigner might have been viewed as "local" in many senses, but nevertheless a foreigner's status was not essential in relation to the question of limiting the land ownership of non-citizens. Although the facts that foreign residents actually were present in Athens and participants in its everyday life were likely to have some positive effect on attitudes, the crucial point regarding land ownership was that they continued to be treated as non-citizens.

#### 4. Summary

Until now, Athenian state honours and privileges have not been examined comprehensively from the point of view of the official status of foreign residents. A relatively large amount of research has been conducted on the metics of Classical

Athens, but it is to great extent founded on literary sources, with epigraphical sources being used in a complementary role. State honorary decrees are mostly not examined as themselves but as sources for information on the aspects of the official status of foreign residents: obligations towards the state, judicial status and so on. In the research that concentrates on honorary decrees the resident status of a foreign honorand is usually stated but the awarded honours and privileges are not examined in the context of this status. This is because the majority of the research on Athenian state honorary decrees is philological and inspects the formulations and linguistic constructions of the decrees rather than their content. Finally, there are no comprehensive studies on the foreign residents of Athens in the Hellenistic period. Thus, state honours and privileges awarded to foreign residents have also received little attention. Nevertheless, a detailed examination of the state honours and privileges available to foreign residents is important: they were an essential part of the foreign residents' official status since they affected their obligations and rights and often changed their status significantly both in relation to Athenian citizens and the majority of the free non-citizen residents of Athens. Changes in the awarding of foreign residents would reflect changes in their official status. Foreign residents emerge in the context of state honours and privileges in two special roles. Firstly, as recipients of the special metic privileges that were not awarded to non-resident foreigners. Secondly, their residence in Athens, in the sense of their continuous presence in its everyday life could have been a factor when honours and privileges were bestowed on them. This factor could have been either negative or positive. In the former case it might have been more difficult for a foreign resident to gain public honours, in the latter it might have made attitudes towards his being awarded more favourable.

*Metic privileges: confirming the conclusions of the disappearance of metoikia by 229/8*  
Although not the most significant state honours in Athens, metic privileges are the logical starting point in that they were an integral part of the official status of foreign residents. The state honorary decrees with metic privileges confirm the conclusions of the first main chapter: the *metoikia* system appears to have no longer been in existence after 229/8. This is reflected in the fact that grants of metic privileges disappear after the satellite-state period. Also, the Athenians appear not to have introduced a new state honour (theoretically) available to all foreign residents. The *paroikoi* in the honorary decrees of foreign soldiers stationed in Rhamnous for their superiors from ca. 229/8 to shortly after 200 do not imply a new general metic privilege. Rather, they were foreign soldiers, perhaps skilled fighters who had proven themselves in battle, who were awarded certain privileges to motivate them to serve in the *demos* and fortress of Rhamnous which, although a crucial point in the defence system of Attica, was a remote area far from the centre, the city of Athens.<sup>224</sup>

The award of exemption from *metoikion* is not seen after the 4th century. In all, six cases survive, until ca. 321 or the 310's. The honorands in five of the six decrees are identifiable as political allies or otherwise persons who had performed great services for Athens, and who because of this had been forced to flee their home cities and come to Athens as exiles. The conclusion would seem to be that the privilege of exemption

<sup>224</sup> See appendix 1, pp. 163–164 below.

from *metoikion* was primarily awarded to exiles of important status. Less significant than *isoteleia*, exemption from *metoikion* was an appropriate award for such persons: they were expected to return to their home cities when circumstances allowed but, while in Athens, could enjoy freedom from the tax obligations of metics, befitting their position as benefactors of Athens. It is unsurprising that awards of the privilege do not survive after (at the latest) the 310's: because of the Macedonian control and influence Athens' freedom in international politics was limited, and she was seldom in the position to admit political exiles.

There are only eight Hellenistic honorary decrees involving *isoteleia*. The finest example is IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 505, for Nikandros of Ilion and Polyzelos of Ephesos. They had lived in Athens for several decades, performed important and extensive financial and military services throughout the second half of the 4th century and in connection with both the Lamian and Four Years' War. They were rewarded at the end of the 4th century with hereditary *isoteleia*, *enktesis* of land and house, equal *eisphora* and military service obligations, *epimeleia* and *prosodos*. The decree is a "typical" case of extensive benefactions awarded with extensive privileges, military and financial benefactions in time of war and crisis. Three other *isoteleia* decrees display similar benefactions, though to a lesser scale, rewarded with a smaller combination of honours.

The latest honorary decree with *isoteleia*, IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 768+802 for Aischias of Pergamon (250's), is unfortunately restored in the lines that contain the privilege. However, SEG III 122, a decree of Macedonian *isoteleis* soldiers stationed in Rhamnous for their superiors (262/1–256/5), indicates that *isoteleia* did survive at least for some time during the satellite-state period. The Athenians had been obliged by Antigonos Gonatas to award *isoteleia* to these mercenary soldiers. The decree is an exceptional case where *isoteleia* did not have its usual significance due to exceptional circumstances, the identity of the grantees and Athens's situation at the time. In contrast to D. Whitehead's assumption, it does not prove a general trend in the development of the privilege – either the diminishing or disappearance of its significance – and is therefore valid evidence. The most obvious explanation for the lack of *isoteleia* awards after this period is that the foreign residents no longer paid *metoikion*, which in turn rendered the *isoteleia* privilege unnecessary. The disappearance of the metic tax was part of the general development which by 229/8 had led to a situation where the *metoikia* system was no longer in existence. The grave *stelai* of *isoteleis*, found until the 1st century, which represent hereditary *isoteleia* awards, do not contradict this conclusion. The post-229/8 examples are few, and there are only two examples from the 1st century. The title of *isoteles* was a great public honour, an important concept for the ancient Greeks. The 1st century grave *stelai* can thus be viewed as cases where the title had been in the family for an exceptionally long time, for several generations, making it a matter of great pride.

The civic status of the foreign residents had some influence on the awarding of *isoteleia* in the sense that if the Athenians wanted to reward an individual foreigner who lived in Athens with significant privileges, he was more likely to receive *isoteleia* than *proxenia* or citizenship, precisely because this award was reserved for metics. Residency in Athens is significant in the sense that the areas of benefaction displayed in the decrees were the ones most readily available to foreign residents. Theoretically, there were plenty of opportunities for military and financial contributions in the first

hundred years of the Hellenistic period, with the Lamian, Four Years and Chremonidean Wars, and the storming of the Mouseion garrison. Nevertheless, even if some of the fragmentary inscriptions originally involved *isoteleia*, the privilege was not common in 322–250's. As an important state privilege it was not awarded lightly, and in reality only a minority of Athenian foreign residents were capable of making benefactions of any significant value. Another important factor is the purposes of awarding honours and privileges in this period: alleviating and aiding the relations with the Macedonians and other powers of the time, and securing financial aid and food supplies, which resulted in honours being awarded to the Hellenistic monarchs, their aides and officials, and the leaders of the independent kingdoms and Greek states. The awarded privilege was usually citizenship at the cost of other privileges.

The latest evidence of the *eisphora* and military service privilege is IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 660, from 285/4, which reaffirms previously awarded honours and privileges for such Tenians in Athens who had already been granted *eisphora* and military service equality. Although a reaffirmation, it is still valid evidence: it is unlikely that the decree would have mentioned the *eisphora* and military service privilege if it was not understood to be valid at the time when the decree was passed. The decree for Apollas, IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 835, seems to clearly indicate that the *eisphora* obligations of citizens and foreign residents had become standardized by 229/8: Apollas is shown paying *proeisphorai*, not *eisphorai*, which implies that foreigners now had access to the board of *proeispherontes*, formerly open to citizens only. If the obligations were now automatically identical, the privilege obviously was no longer needed. Similar evidence does not exist for the military service part of the privilege, but it is logical to assume that the entire privilege was affected. There is no evidence of equal military service being awarded alone after the last appearance of the entire privilege in honorary decrees. More importantly, Athens did not have the resources for military expeditions in the Hellenistic period. This rendered the traditional division into different military units, and thus the privilege that gave foreign residents access to citizen units, unnecessary, and even impossible. The most likely time in which this occurred is the satellite-state period, 262/1–229/8, when Athens' freedom was particularly limited in military affairs. This affected not only the function of the troops but also the levying of *eisphorai*, since they were closely connected to military issues, being primarily used for war preparations and defence works.

#### *Naturalized foreign residents a rarity in Hellenistic period*

In the Classical period, the normal route to full citizen rights was *astos* parentage on both sides. Otherwise, at least in principle, naturalization was only awarded for the most extensive benefactions. The citizenship awards granted primarily for political reasons, made to foreign monarchs and members of royal houses in the Classical period, do not contradict with this. Although some of these eminent persons may have rendered practical aid to Athens, the primary motivation certainly was securing their alliance or political support, which would certainly have been highly advantageous to the *polis*. Furthermore, such persons usually had no interest in coming to Athens and implementing the grant, so the Athenians were aware of the purely honorary nature of the citizenship award in these cases. The data compiled by M. J. Osborne covers 22 naturalization decrees and 82 cases of naturalization known from other sources from

the entire Classical period. This is not a large number, even when we consider the possibility that a certain amount of citizenship decrees from this period have not been preserved.

Few naturalization decrees for foreign resident grantees are known from either the Classical or Hellenistic period, since individual foreign residents were seldom capable of sufficiently important benefactions, and when they did receive privileges, these were more likely to be specific metic privileges or some other lesser honours. Political aspects and the need for large-scale financial aid and help with the grain supply were emphasized in the Hellenistic period. As a result the naturalized persons were usually monarchs, their aides and officials, and other influential individuals. As private individuals, foreign residents hardly ever were in the position to be of service in these areas.

Only two naturalization decrees proper for foreign residents are known from the Hellenistic period, D50 for Euenor of Akarnania, and D78 for Strombichos. Four other cases are known from other sources: Diodoros of Sinope (T93), Philokrates of Sikyon (T97), Chrysippos of Soloi (T99), and Karneades (T116). Euenor's benefactions were his financial contribution and his work with patients. Strombichos' award was for the typical and traditional reason: military achievements. He changed to Athenian side in 287/6 and in the 260's played a prominent role in the Chremonidean War. Diodoros and Chrysippos represent the naturalization of men of arts and sciences, witnessed in both the Classical and Hellenistic periods. In the case of Karneades, I think it very likely that there was a connection to his leadership of the philosophers' embassy to Rome in the 150's and its success in having the huge fine put on Athens by the senate reduced.

Naturalization practices altered significantly in the later-2nd century when it became possible to purchase citizenship. This change affected all possible recipients of citizenship, but in practice would have been especially advantageous for foreign residents because they lived in the *polis* and could as citizens have participated in all areas of its life. Generally speaking, however, foreign residents did not have a special position in the development of the naturalization practices either due to their official status as metics (prior to 229/8) or their residency in Athens. Since citizenship was not a metic privilege but (theoretically) available to all foreigners, foreign residents were affected by the changes and developments as one group among the potential recipients of Athenian citizenship.

### *Enktesis*

As land ownership was monopolized by citizens, foreigners could in principle gain access to it only through receiving *enktesis*. Since it was theoretically available to all foreign benefactors, there was no separate set of rules for foreign resident grantees, and the circumstances affecting the awarding of the privilege in any period applied to them as well as to any other grantees. If a particular foreign resident grantee's identity had influence on an award it was due to the fact that he lived and was present in Athens, and perhaps had established a family there. He was "rooted" in Athens and could be trusted with land ownership.

*Enktesis* became rarer in the Hellenistic period: from 30–31 awards in ca. 420–322 to 22–23 in 322–229/8 and to a mere six in 229/8–120. The trend was similar in grants

to foreign residents: nine cases in 420–322, seven in 322–229/8, and only one after 229/8. There are many extremely fragmentary decrees from after 229/8 that could have contained *enktesis*. Nevertheless it is unlikely that the data for 229/8–120 would be significantly greater if more decrees had been discovered intact. All the six awards of the period are in *proxenia* decrees, and these became rarer as well. It is unlikely that the fragmentary decrees would have included several awards of *enktesis* to resident foreigners, because apart from the fact that they were seldom awarded *enktesis* in any era, very few of the grantees of any honours or privileges after 229/8 were residents in Athens. A significant reason, again, for the greater rarity of *enktesis* in 322–229/8 was the predominance of monarchs, their aides and officials, and other influential persons among the grantees and the preference for naturalization at the cost of other honours and privileges, which was due to political motivations and the need for large-scale aid. Also the uncertainty in agriculture caused by the recurring threat of devastation of the countryside by enemy troops most likely discouraged the awarding of *enktesis*: the Athenians may have wanted to concentrate on protecting the existing landholdings. In the 2nd century Athens was no longer under foreign control, and its territory was rarely threatened by hostile military action. This century also brought a new period of prosperity. These circumstances, however, provided fewer opportunities for benefactions that might be rewarded with important privileges.

Although rarer, *enktesis* was more often hereditary in 322–229/8. Of the surviving 30–31 Classical *enktesis* awards only six are hereditary, the grantees in two of these identifiable as metics. In 322–229/8 the proportion of hereditary *enktesis* awards increased slightly, to eight out of the total of 22–23. Out of these the majority were to foreign residents. In the case of metic benefactors, the choice between hereditary and non-hereditary *enktesis*, both in the Classical and Hellenistic periods, depended above all on the value of the benefactions. In the Hellenistic period, the three wars, the storming of the Mouseion garrison and the subsequent securing of grain supply and restoration of defences, were all critical occasions that affected Athens directly and locally, and provided opportunities for extensive benefactions. Thus, in the rare awards of *enktesis* the recipients had a greater chance of getting a hereditary privilege. This also explains where there is a majority of foreign residents among the grantees of hereditary *enktesis*. Since in the three cases of military action a great deal of fighting took place in Attica and large resources were required, foreigners who lived in Athens might have been able to participate in a significant way in aiding the *polis*. When other privileges were preferred in the case of the great foreign benefactors, *enktesis* was left for local benefactors.

The only significant change in *enktesis* during the Hellenistic period was the introduction of maximum values sometime before the mid-3rd century, which were subsequently seen for the following ca. hundred years. Again, this was not a development specific to the status of foreign residents because the size of the maximum values would have depended primarily on the grantee's benefactions. Even so, the maximum values did affect foreign resident grantees, since the addition of value limits seems to have been a norm during the period when it is seen. A possible reason for the introduction of the new specification was the desire to clarify the conditions of foreign land ownership. Documentation regarding how much land a grantee was allowed to buy and own would have made it easier to keep track of estates owned by non-Athenians.

The Athenians may also have been worried that foreign land ownership had become, or was in danger of becoming, too extensive: although *enktesis* was rarer, a greater proportion of the awards were made hereditary. This might have gradually led to more and more of the land of Attica being owned by families of non-Athenian origin. The new specification may have been designed to curb this development.

The evidence for *enktesis* after 229/8 is very scarce: six decrees, three or four of these from the last three decades of the 3rd century. Only one decree, passed soon after 229/8, awards a hereditary *enktesis*. Another two, dated shortly after 229/8 and from the end of the 3rd or beginning of the 2nd century respectively, have non-hereditary *enktesis* attached to hereditary *proxenia*. The six awards of *enktesis* are all attached to *proxenia*. The entire number of *proxenia* awards in the 2nd century is eight, all non-hereditary. Citizenship grants were automatically hereditary after ca. 229/8, so it would be tempting to believe that a similar step was taken with *proxenia* grants some decades later. Naturalization and *proxenia* were often used for similar purposes, as tools of politics and diplomacy, so it is possible that the Athenians eventually began to view the co-existence of hereditary and non-hereditary form of the privilege unnecessary also in regard to *proxenia*. Although the data for *proxenia* in the 2nd century is not extensive, it extends to ca. mid-century. Since *enktesis* was so often attached to *proxenia*, it could be thought that grants of *enktesis* would have been made automatically hereditary at the same time. However, the scarcity of evidence forces the theory to remain an attractive, if unverifiable, hypothesis.



## IV. Conclusions

As I noted in the introduction, my study seeks to address a significant omission in the research of ancient Athens: until now, there has not been any comprehensive study on the official status of the foreign residents of Athens after the Classical period. Where the *metoikia* system has received considerable attention since the late-19th century, the development of the official status of foreign residents after that, in the Hellenistic period, has rarely warranted more than short footnotes. Practically the only academic who has tried to suggest anything about the issue is D. Whitehead in a short article in 1986 where he readdressed some of the points he had made in his *The Ideology of the Athenian Metic*. Whitehead opined that the *metoikia* system may have survived well into the Hellenistic period and suggested the wholly unconvincing theory that Antigonos Gonatas would have abolished the institution to humiliate Athens after the Athenian defeat in the Chremonidean War in 262/1. Whitehead did not venture into a systematic examination of the available sources. His intention may well have been to encourage further research but if so, the challenge was not taken up.

The foreign residents of Hellenistic Athens are far from an insignificant subject of research. Even if Athens was no longer the political and economical power that it had been in the past, it developed into one of the most important centres of culture and learning in the Hellenistic world. Foreigners were at the forefront of this development. For example, a huge majority of the known representatives of the four major philosophical schools were non-Athenian. Generally speaking, the large number of non-Athenian names, originating from everywhere in the Greek world and beyond, witnessed in grave inscriptions and other epigraphical sources, indicate that Athens continued to have a large and cosmopolitan foreign population.

The epigraphic and archaeological research in Hellenistic Athens has been fairly active from the late-19th century to the present day, but the amount of historical research is minimal compared to the huge volume of studies on Classical Athens. Only in the last two decades has there been a significant volume of historical research concentrating specifically on Hellenistic Athens. For this development we have to thank, above all, Ch. Habicht and publications such as *Early Hellenistic Athens: symptoms of a change*, by the Finnish group of researchers headed by J. Frösén (1997), and *The Macedonians in Athens, 322–229 B.C.: Proceedings of an International Conference held at the University of Athens, May 24–26, 2001*, edited by O. Palagia and S. V. Tracy (2003).

The scarcity of historical research in earlier decades is partly made explicable by the general attitudes towards the Hellenistic period in Athens. The Classical period, and more specifically the 5th century, was seen as the golden age of Athens. The Hellenistic period on the other hand was commonly viewed as a period of decline, and therefore not as valuable a subject of study. The title of C. Mossé's 1973 study is representative: *Athens in decline, 404–84 BC*. The other reason is connected to the sources. For the Classical period the preserved speeches of Demosthenes and other orators, the works of Aristotle and Plato and the historical works, to name just some examples, offer ample evidence of the various aspects of Athenian society, administration, legal system, economy, culture and so on. While a large number of local histories and other works

were written in Athens in the Hellenistic period, these have survived only as fragments and citations. While some of the fragments and citations provide important pieces of information, the primary sources are epigraphical. On the one hand, many researchers may have felt this kind of source material to be not as easily approachable as literary sources. On the other hand, I am certain that many will have viewed the available sources to be insufficient for consistent research into Hellenistic Athens, especially of a specialised subject such as the official status of the foreign residents. Indeed, I suspect that a significant reason for the fact that the official status of the foreign residents of Athens in the Hellenistic period has not been taken up as a subject of serious study is simply that the required effort has been considered too great in relation to what would have been considered the achievable results.

The subject I chose for my study indeed has not been the easiest possible. However, it has been fruitful and worth the effort, not only for the fact that it has not been researched consistently before but also in terms of the results I attained. I have in the course of my study shown that the sources are sufficient for this kind of a study. If the definition of 'sufficient' was sources that would allow the scholar to pinpoint a specific date when a specific law was passed which changed a specific aspect of the official status of the foreign residents, then the available sources could be said to be insufficient. However, the direct and indirect evidence from the surviving sources is quite comprehensive enough to establish lines of development, important changes and the reasons behind these changes and developments with a great degree of reliability. Direct evidence of the survival of the *metoikia* system, in the form of the presence of the metic formula, mentions of *metoikos* and *metoikion*, and metic privileges in assembly decrees, is not plentiful. Even so, this evidence, supplemented with other references in sources, allow us to specify a relatively precise timeline for the survival of the *metoikia* system.

According to my findings, the year when Athens won back independence, 229/8, represents a turning point in the development: after this date *metoikia* was no longer in existence. The specific items of evidence, provided directly from the sources, follow. Many of these pieces of evidence have been noted by earlier scholars, but since the official status of the foreign residents of Athens in the Hellenistic period has not been studied in any systematic way before, the evidence has not been examined in light of what they imply in regard to foreign residents.

1) The lack of awards of metic privileges (*isoteleia*, *eisphora* and military service privilege) in honorary decrees after the satellite-state period (262/1–229/8). A large number of honorary decrees survive after 229/8. Thus, even taking into account the fact that a number of honorary decrees of the period are too fragmentary to allow any conclusion as to their content, at least some scattered awards of metic privileges should have been preserved if these privileges continued to be awarded. The disappearance of *isoteleia* itself is evidence of the disappearance of *metoikion*, the special metic tax, which was its central content.

2) The standardization of the *eisphora* and military service obligations of citizens and foreign residents, indicated by the disappearance of the *eisphora* and military service privilege and the fact that in *IG II/III<sup>2</sup> 835* Apollas is seen paying not *eisphorai* but *proeisphorai*, which had formerly been paid only by citizens.

3) The disappearance of the stipulation from naturalization decrees which defined that the descendants of the naturalized persons shall also be citizens, noted by M. J.

Osborne, who correctly concluded that this indicates that after 229/8 the descendants of naturalized citizens were automatically considered citizens.

4) The small number of surviving cases of citizen offspring of mixed marriage and the significant increase of mixed marriages encountered in grave inscriptions from the late-3rd century. The conclusion from this is that henceforth children of mixed marriages were citizens with full rights – a significant change because ever since the law of Perikles (451/0) access to citizenry had required *astos* parentage on both sides. From the late-3rd century this ruling was no longer in force. The secondary result of this development was that mixed marriage became formally legitimate, in other words unions of Athenians and foreigners began to be accepted as lawful Athenian marriages, which had not been possible in the 4th century.

In conclusion, these enumerated changes altered the official status of the foreigners who lived in Athens to such a great degree that they can no longer be said to have been *metoikoi* after 229/8. The foreigners remained foreigners, that is to say, non-citizens, but the special civic status of *metoikos* had ceased to be in existence.

The essential period for the development that eventually led to the disappearance of *metoikia* was the ca. three decades when Athens was a satellite-state of Macedon. Until the mid-250's Athens was under direct Macedonian control, the *polis* subjected to a royal governor, the authority of the administrative organs limited to routine matters, and Athenian armed forces reserved for the King's own usage. In the mid-250's Macedonian troops were withdrawn from the city and Athens got back some of its freedom. However, Macedonian military control persisted, with the important fortresses remaining in Macedonian possession and Athens' freedom in international politics still restricted. As noted by S. V. Tracy, some elements of the democratic constitution continued to be suppressed, as evidenced by some indications that the normal tribal rotation of council secretaries did function at all times and by the appearance of an individual serving thrice in the council, for the first time in Athenian history. Such a long, continuous period of foreign control was extremely disruptive to the normal *polis* life.

One of the things greatly affected would have been the foreign residents' military service. Whilst under Macedonian military control, the Athenians were not able to decide on military issues, much less embark on expeditions. Traditionally citizens and foreign residents were divided into different units, with the units of the foreign residents being reserved as territorial troops and not taken on expeditions. Macedonian control of military matters naturally would have rendered the division into different units purposeless or altogether impossible. The same fate most likely befell the *eisphorai* because their usage was limited for military purposes such as war preparations and defence projects. There is no evidence of *eisphorai* during the satellite-state period whereas such evidence exists for both before and after. Also, there is evidence of the privilege which awarded equal military service and *eisphora* payment obligations, therefore of differentiated obligations between citizens and foreign residents, before the satellite-state period, but not during it. As stated, the decree for Apollas indicates that by 229/8 the *eisphora* obligations had become standardized. Also there is evidence of *epidoseis* from the early 240's (Agora XVI 213). Unlike *eisphorai*, these donations were used for civil purposes, so it is likely that the Macedonians considered it safe to allow the Athenians to use that form of financing.

The latest indication of *isoteleia* and thus *metoikion* comes from the 250's. *SEG* III 122 features Macedonian mercenary soldiers to whom Antigonos Gonatas had obliged the Athenians to grant *isoteleia*. The privilege did not have any significance for the recipients in this case, but it is valid evidence of the survival of *isoteleia* and *metoikion*: this was an exceptional case that occurred due to special circumstances, not an indication of a general development that diminished or eradicated the importance of *isoteleia*, as D. Whitehead suggested in 1986. *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 768+802, grants *isoteleia* to a Pergamenian, but the essential lines are restored and need to be approached with caution. Some scattered *isoteleis* appear in grave inscriptions later, until the 1st century B.C., but this does not necessarily contradict the conclusion of the disappearance of *isoteleia* and *metoikion*. They represent hereditary titles which may have been in the family for several generations. Public honour was an important concept in the ancient Athenian and Greek society, so the possession of an honorary title like *isoteles* would have been a matter of exceptional pride for the family even if it no longer had practical significance. It is uncertain whether *metoikion* and *isoteleia* disappeared immediately after the 250's or survived until later. It is possible that the collection of the tax was left to simply decay because Athens' freedom was otherwise so limited. It is also possible that the tax survived but no *isoteleia* grants survive as evidence because the satellite-state period would have offered few opportunities for sufficiently important services – military service achievements or financial contributions – to be awarded with such an important privilege.

D. Whitehead suggested in 1986 that Antigonos Gonatas abolished *metoikia* to humiliate Athens. This hypothesis is not credible. Whilst it is apparent that he wanted to make it absolutely clear that he was in full control of Athens – as indicated by the fact that he interfered in the Athenian practice of granting important privileges – abolishing *metoikia* would not have served this purpose. Since foreign residents did not have political rights, the *metoikia* system did not have any connection to how freely or restrictedly citizens could function in the public and political sphere which they monopolized. The harsh restriction on Athenian authority in administration, military matters and international politics was humiliating enough. Neither was the disappearance of *metoikia* the result of abolition by decision of the Athenian assembly. It was simply the result of the full operation of the system being prevented for several decades due to the prevailing circumstances.

The year 229/8 was not a turning point in the sense that everything changed in one, sudden stroke. Rather, it was a turning point in the sense that although the Athenians with their new independence theoretically could have restored the full operation of the *metoikia* system, they did not do so. This can partly be explained in that the Athenians had become used to the state of affairs, and simply did not find it necessary to restore the system. More importantly, Athens had other priorities. Although the entire Attica was now free from foreign control, the new independence was far from certain. It was reached through negotiation, and through taking the advantage of the uncertain situation with the inheritance of power in Macedon. However, order was soon restored by Philip V, who proved to be an energetic and effective monarch. The Athenian leaders chose a policy of neutrality and avoided anything that could have offended the Macedonians. Despite this, the limited resources and capabilities needed to be directed at securing the defence of Attica. This was especially important until the alliance with Rome in 200,

because the Athenians could not rely on anyone else for assistance. Epigraphic sources indeed display hectic military activity in the Attic fortresses in the last three decades of the 3rd century. Finally, although there is no direct evidence of this, the three decades of Macedonian control must have had an effect on the Athenians' attitudes towards the strict division of the different groups of population into (unequal) civic classes. When the *metoikia* system was in operation, (theoretically) every foreigner who remained in Athens beyond a defined time was required to register as a metic. Under Macedonian control there were continuously large numbers of foreigners in Attica, especially in the form of troops stationed in the fortresses of Attica, Piraeus and (regularly) the city, who were not under Athenian jurisdiction. Athenians may well have become used to this and begun to view strict division into civic statuses unnecessary.

What was the official status of foreign residents after 229/8 then? Although the *metoikia* system was no longer in existence, it appears that the citizen/non-citizen division remained clear. It is evident that foreigners did not gain political rights, much less full citizenship. Not a single case of a foreigner in a regular office selected by lot or election is known either before or after 229/8, and foreign *ethnika* do not disappear from grave inscriptions. Some surviving grants of *enktesis* indicate that foreigners did not gain access to land ownership. On the other hand, *enktesis* did not become more common. In fact there are fewer *enktesis* grants from the 2nd century than from the preceding hundred years, although this is more likely due to the fact that there were few opportunities for significant benefactions that might be awarded with important privileges than any stricter attitudes towards land ownership by foreigners. The evidence of public cults is grievously meager, but what evidence there is – victor lists of festival competitions, references to cults in other inscriptions and so on – speak for the continuity of traditions, something that is easy to understand as the major cults had a long history in Athens and their continuity was essential for the Athenian identity, particularly during the often uncertain times of the Hellenistic period. In this light it could be assumed that foreign residents' right of participation did not undergo significant changes; that is to say, they were mostly excluded from sacrifices but allowed to take part in the processions and some, but not all, events in the festival competitions.

It is equally evident that the *metoikia* system was not replaced with a new, equally comprehensive system. The *paroikoi* seen in the military inscriptions from the *demos* and fortress of Rhamnous in North-east Attica in the last decades of the 3rd century, are not evidence of this, although *paroikos* was used as a synonym of *metoikos* in many regions of the Hellenistic world. The *paroikoi* of Rhamnous should rather be seen as evidence of a temporary measure in the uncertain times of 229/8–200: experienced mercenaries who were awarded certain privileges to make it attractive for them to stay in Rhamnous. Rhamnous was a crucial point in the defence of Attica since it faced the island of Euboia which was a Macedonian stronghold, but it was a remote location far from the city centre. It is likely that the military service of foreign residents continued. There is ample evidence of citizen soldiers in the epigraphic sources of the last three decades of the 3rd century, which speaks for the continued military service requirement of Athenian citizens. If this was so, there is no reason why foreigners who lived in Athens would have been exempted. In practice, however, this was of little importance

since in the 2nd century Athens' resources were limited to home defence and furthermore Attica was seldom threatened by enemy military action.

The second turning point came in the latter half of the 2nd century. Naturalization ceased to be solely a reward for extensive benefactions, becoming available to individuals who had sufficient wealth and desire to become citizens. Secondly, the sons of foreign families gained access to the *ephebeia* institution. The ephobic training involved participation in the sacrifices and other proceedings of several public cults, so foreigners' access to *ephebeia* also meant access to sacrifices, thus removing one barrier between citizens and non-citizens. The second, higher barrier was removed by the fact that the foreign youths received full citizen rights after completing the training. The developments in naturalization practices and *ephebeia* effectively meant the eradication of the practical significance of Athenian citizenship. Formally citizens and foreigners did not disappear, as is indicated by the survival of Athenian *demotika* and non-Athenian *ethnika* in the grave inscriptions well into the imperial period. In practice, however, the essential division in Athenian society was no longer that between citizens and non-citizens but between the wealthy and the non-wealthy.

As important a subject of study that the official status of the foreign residents is, it does not give a comprehensive picture of what kind of significance the foreign population of Athens had for the *polis* in the Hellenistic period. This is because it leaves out the entirety of their lives beyond the sphere of laws, regulations and official practices. Human beings are not entities that exist solely in the political sphere. Originally my intention was to include this 'unofficial status of the foreign residents of Athens' in my doctoral study. However, it turned out to be such an extensive and varied subject that the best solution was to concentrate on the official status and leave the unofficial side for later research. My intention is indeed to concentrate on this in the future.

The unofficial status of the foreign residents of Athens in the Hellenistic period is a rewarding but also challenging subject of study, firstly because of its scope, secondly because its premises are completely different to those of my PhD thesis. 'Unofficial status' is best defined through the definition of the term 'foreign resident'. In the sphere of official status 'foreign resident' means a particular civic status as determined by regulations, assembly decisions and official practices. In the sphere of unofficial status it refers to a free person who was not Athenian citizen and who lived in the *polis* either permanently or for a long time. It is impossible to define with absolute precision who was a foreign resident in this sense and who was not, but as an example a person who came to Athens to study in one of the philosophic schools and stayed for some years would be included whereas a diplomat or a merchant visiting Athens would not. Some of the central questions are the following. What kind of social statuses and roles did foreign residents have in Athenian life? What kind of issues affected these statuses and roles as well as foreign residents' opportunities to function in the Athenian society? Which areas of the *polis* life were foreign residents prominent in and why were they especially prominent in those areas? What kind of an influence did the foreignness of foreign residents have on their life in Athens? Some of the major sub-sections of the research project I am going to concentrate on can be enumerated here.

The constitution of the Athenian foreign population. The primary sources are grave inscriptions and the primary data the *ethnika* of the deceased persons. Although they

cannot be directly converted into statistics, they are valid evidence. If there are a large number of names from a particular city or region, it can be said with certainty that people from that city/region were a prominent part of the wider Athenian foreign population. Of interest are cities/regions from which there were always exceptionally large numbers of people in Athens. A prominent example is Miletos. Equally interesting are cities/regions that could be thought to have been prominently represented among the Athenian foreign population due to considerations of geographic proximity or connections but from which relatively few names survive among the *ethnika* of the grave inscriptions. A case in point is Sparta. A large number of the ethnics are represented by one or two cases only, and are of cities and regions that are known only from some scattered short references in some of the ancient authors. Obviously, these cities and regions cannot be examined in detail. However, when a considerable amount is known about a city or region and it is well represented in Athens, one may look for explanations as to why people came to Athens from this city/region. The *ethnika* of the grave inscriptions also reveal to some extent the changes in the Athenian foreign population. If names from a particular place disappear entirely or their number diminishes significantly at some stage, it is clear that something significant happened. The same applies to new names appearing among the *ethnika*.

Foreign residents of Greek origin. Freeborn persons from elsewhere in the Greek world constituted the majority of the foreign population of Athens. Although Greek and Greek-speaking, it is possible that there were issues that were either advantageous or hindrances to their lives in Athens. Some of these issues were the relations between Athens and individual states; different dialects and cultural features in the different parts of the Greek world and attitudes towards these; and prejudices and stereotypes, for instance the image of the people of certain remote areas of the Greek mainland as boorish.

Non-Greek foreigners. How did their position and treatment differ from those of Greek foreigners? Possible factors are linguistic differences, different cultural features and habits (also in a positive sense: for example items of clothing that became fashionable), prejudices and stereotypes. Also the influence of slavery is an important theme to study: the majority of Athenian slaves came from “barbaric” regions, the various peoples of Asia Minor being especially well represented. This affected attitudes towards these peoples. Many of the non-Greek foreign residents would have been freed slaves, and this might have had an influence on their treatment and their possibilities to conduct their lives in Athenian society. The sources are, in a sense, a research problem in their own right. For example, there is plenty of evidence of stereotyping of and negative attitudes towards different “barbaric” peoples in Athenian literary sources from historical works to comedy. However, the authors as a rule were representatives of the elites. To what extent can these writings be taken to represent the views of the so-called ordinary Athenians?

The foreign philosophers as foreigners. The philosophers of Hellenistic Athens have been studied in the past and their non-Athenian origins has been discussed in several works, largely because of the fact that such a large majority were non-Athenian. However, to my knowledge very few of the studies have examined the philosophers specifically as foreigners in Athens. What, if any, influence did their foreignness have on their position and influence in Athens?

Foreign residents in public/political roles and the connection and influence of their foreignness on this. Officially the foreign residents did not have political rights but there are some well-known cases where foreigners did have a political or public role. For instance the Corinthian orator Deinarchos was influential in the oligarchic circles after the Lamian War. The most famous example is perhaps the embassy of the three foreign leaders of the Athenian philosophic schools in Rome in the mid-2nd century.

Each of these themes deserves detailed and dedicated study. These are not entirely uncharted waters. For instance in the last ca. 20 years several studies connected to ethnicity in Greek antiquity have been published, to mention some examples: J. M. Hall's *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity* (1997) and T. Long's *Barbarians in Greek Comedy* (1986). However, the studies published so far have not, generally speaking, concentrated on Athens nor specifically on the foreign residents of Athens. Thus I am convinced that my research project on the unofficial status of the foreign residents of Athens will be fruitful and will bring to light plenty of new findings.



## Appendix 1: The *paroikoi* of Rhamnous

By the 220's the official status of the foreign residents of Athens had changed to such a degree that they were no longer *metoikoi* in the earlier, official sense. Their *eisphora* paying and military service obligations had become identical to those of the citizens. At some point after the 220's the *eisphorai* disappeared entirely. It is likely that the foreign residents did not pay the metic tax anymore either. Furthermore, the development in the naturalization practices, noted by M. J. Osborne, meant that the descendants of naturalized persons were, from 229 onwards, automatically Athenian citizens. This change also concerned the offspring of mixed marriages, who were similarly citizens with full rights after 229. Judging by some expressions appearing in the sources, in practice the Athenians still recognized the presence of freeborn persons who lived within the territory but were not citizens. However, it seems a reasonable conclusion that in terms of the official practices and regulations there was no longer any official definition of a foreign resident which clearly differed from a foreigner who merely visited Athens. In other words, there was no longer a specific civic status of *metoikos* with clearly defined rights and obligations, as there had been earlier.

If these conclusions are correct, it is quite surprising to find the substantive *πάροιχος* appearing in Athenian sources in the 220's. The word is found in 12 inscriptions, 11 of them from the last two decades of the 3rd century, one from the late-2nd-early-1st century. All these documents are related to military affairs and were discovered in Rhamnous, a coastal *demos* in the north-east corner of Attica. The *paroikoi* in the inscriptions are foreign soldiers.<sup>1</sup> The basic meanings of the term are 'neighbour', 'an alien, foreigner who dwells in the land', 'a sojourner'. *Paroikoi* are known from several places around the Hellenistic world, mostly in Asia Minor and the Aegean islands. In these places the word appears as a technical term, denoting a certain group of people present within the borders of the particular *polis*. In some of these places *paroikoi* seems to have been the equivalent of *metoikoi*. The related adjective (*πάροιχος, ον*) and verbs (*παροικέω, παροικίζω*) were used in the general sense in the Attic dialect and are found in the works of the Classical authors. The 220's are the first time in Athens that *πάροιχος* appears as a clearly technical term, referring to a certain group of people. It is also the first term used with some consistency for foreigners in Athens after the end of the 4th century.

What does the appearance of a technical term referring exclusively to foreigners, used widely elsewhere but unknown in Athens, mean? Are my conclusions regarding the disappearance of *metoikia* incorrect after all? Does the appearance of *paroikoi* in Athens mean that the system regulating the official status of the foreign residents was re-established in full force but with new title, or that an entirely new *paroikia* system was created; or does it mean that there were at least some new laws concerning the status of the non-citizen residents of Athens? Or was the significance of the term *paroikos* different in Athens, and perhaps restricted to military sphere with no actual connection to the official status of foreign residents?

---

<sup>1</sup> Petrakos 1999, nos. 23, 27, 30, 38, 40–42, 43, 47, 50, 51, 151. Some of these inscriptions have been published earlier, either by Petrakos himself or someone else. For information on earlier editions, see Petrakos 1999. Unless otherwise stated, the numbers I will refer to in the text are those of Petrakos.

### The Attic *paroikos* documents

Ten of the known 12 documents where *paroikoi* appear are honorary decrees of *paroikoi* stationed in Rhamnous for the *strategos* and (sometimes) their other superiors. One inscription, no. 50, is an honorary decree of soldiers where the honorand is mentioned having served as a commander of *paroikoi* earlier in his career. Only one of these decrees has survived in entirety. In three cases, only the postscript remains. The others have survived in varying lengths. All the 10 documents are dated to the last three decades of the 3rd century, and to after the liberation of 229. In terms of the time of discovery of the *stelai*, the earliest of these documents is no. 50. A section of it was first published in the early-20<sup>th</sup> century as *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 1309, edited by J. Kirchner. In 1934 W. Peek published the lower-half of one of the 10 decrees which are now known. The first complete decree of *paroikoi* was published in 1953 by S. Kougeas. The rest of the twelve *paroikos* documents we now possess came to light in the excavations conducted by B. Ch. Petrakos in Rhamnous from the 1970's onwards. Petrakos also discovered the upper-half of the *stèle* originally discovered by Peek and was thus able to complete the inscription.

The honorary decrees of *paroikoi* are similar in form to the state honorary decrees, the lack of *archon* dating being the only major exception: they begin with information on who made the decisions and name the person who made the motion. This is followed by the presentation of the honorand and the motivations for the honours. Next is the specification of the honours. At the end are the clauses regarding how the honours are to be carried out and financed. Apart from the main honorand *strategos*, the *paroikoi* in many cases honour the official in charge of the fortress (*epimeletes*), the garrison secretary (*grammateus*) and the closest commander of the *paroikoi*, simply called ἐπὶ τῶν παροίκων, 'over the *paroikoi*'. The motivation clauses praise the recipients of benevolence towards the *paroikoi* as well as for performing their duties in compliance with the laws and the decisions of the assembly, both generally and towards the *paroikoi* specifically. This is by expression typical of the Athenian honorary decrees. In two of the decrees the *strategos* is also praised for protecting the gathering of the harvest (38, 40). The commendations consist of golden (usually for the *strategos*) and ivy crowns (for the other officials) and the setting up of the *stèle* in a public place.

Thirteen *paroikoi* are mentioned by name in the documents, either as proposers or among the persons chosen to carry out the honours. They come from various places: Aitolia, Argos, Karyneia (Arkadia), Demetrias (Magnesia) and Oropos (Boiotia) in continental Greece, Eretria and Karystos on the island of Euboia, Kassandreia on Chalkidike and Miletos in Asia Minor. Astakos, appearing in one name, might be a city in Asia Minor or in Akarnania in Greece proper. Several cities are known with the name of two cities represented: Apollonia and Herakleia. At least 15 cities with the name Apollonia have been located, perhaps the most important of these in Illyria. Over 10 cities with the name Herakleia are known.

Some names appear more than once. Kteson of Herakleia was among the persons elected to carry out the honours in nos. 23 and 30, both approximately dated to after 229/8. In no. 38, from the year 218/7, he is both the proposer of honours and among those selected to carry out the decisions. Additionally, Kteson appears in a fragment of a decree, from the same era, where he and the other persons mentioned by name are

called στρατιῶται.<sup>2</sup> Dorotheos of Eretria appears twice, in nos. 30 and 38. The third person seen more than once is Nikomachos, son of Nikon, of Aitolia. He proposed a decree in 212/11 (no. 47), and appeared again in the same role in 207/6 (no. 50).<sup>3</sup> Nikon of Astakos, appearing in no. 23 (dated after 229/8), is seen among the members of an *eranos*, cult association of Amphiaraus in Rhamnous.<sup>4</sup>

The decrees give a sense of locality and some degree of permanence. The *paroikoi* could decide on honours themselves, as was first noted by Launey and then much later by Ph. Gauthier and F. Papazoglou.<sup>5</sup> They had their own *koinon* where they decided upon matters of common concern.<sup>6</sup> We find a *koinon* in the decrees of citizen soldiers stationed in the fortresses, of *demos* members of Rhamnous and/or other Athenian citizens who lived in Rhamnous, and of cult associations.<sup>7</sup> Since it is not possible to date many of the *paroikos* inscriptions precisely, it is impossible to determine how long the persons mentioned in the documents served in Rhamnous. However, the case of Nikomachos of Aitolia suggests that it could have been several years: he was in Rhamnous for at least three years, perhaps longer if Osborne's dating is preferred.

The 12<sup>th</sup> document, no. 151, was first published by B. Ch. Petrakos in his 1999 monograph, and has not been examined in detail before. This inscription is clearly different to the other documents. Firstly, it is dated ca. 100 years later, to the end of the 2nd–beginning of the 1st century, or perhaps more precisely to ca. 100.<sup>8</sup> Secondly, it is not a decree of *paroikoi* but a dedication of a *strategos* to Zeus Soter, Athena Sotera, Themis and Nemesis. Three other persons, apparently winners at two different festivals, participated in the dedication. These were a citizen, a citizen soldier (both of them winners at the Diogeneia festival),<sup>9</sup> and a *paroikos* who had won a contest in the Ptolemaia festival.<sup>10</sup> The main dedicant had been at the time of the dedication elected *strategos* of the coastal defence zone (παράλια χώρα), including Rhamnous. Of the other dedicants, the *paroikos* and a citizen soldier were obviously in service under this particular *strategos*. The third, simply entitled 'citizen' (*polites*), was probably a civilian, who either was a member of the *demos* of Rhamnous or who lived in the area.<sup>11</sup> As this document dates from the end of the 2nd century at earliest, it falls outside the chronological limits of my study. However, due to the fact that it involves a *paroikos* it might be important for resolving the question of the nature of the *paroikoi* of Rhamnous, and I will discuss it in some length. However, because of the large chronological gap and the difference of contexts between this and the other documents extreme caution is required in making conclusions based on it.

<sup>2</sup> Petrakos 1999, no. 25.

<sup>3</sup> Osborne 1994 gives a date of ca. 202–196 for the former, and the early-2nd century for the latter.

<sup>4</sup> *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 1322 (end of 3rd century), l. 30.

<sup>5</sup> Launey 1950, 1047. Gauthier 1988, 36. Papazoglou 1997, 191.

<sup>6</sup> Mentioned in nos. 23 (l. 20), 30 (ll. 8, 10).

<sup>7</sup> *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 1302 (citizen soldiers in Sounion); Petrakos 1999, nos. 28, 31 (deme members and/or other citizens in Rhamnous); Petrakos 1999, no. 59; *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 1263, 1273, 1291, 1322, 1323 (cult associations)

<sup>8</sup> The former dating in Petrakos, the latter in *SEG XLIX* 200.

<sup>9</sup> A festival established in honour of Diogenes, the commander of the Macedonian forces in Athens who was persuaded by the Athenians to give up Piraeus and the fortresses of Athens in 229.

<sup>10</sup> Established in honour of Ptolemy III Euergetes in the 220's.

<sup>11</sup> See also *SEG XLIX* 200.

### The etymology and meanings of *πάροιχος*

The substantive *πάροιχος*, ὁ, ἡ, as well as the related words *πάροιχος*, ον (adj.), *παροιμία* (subst.), *παροικέω*, *παροικίζω* (verbs), are all derivatives of the word *οἶκος* ('house'), formed with the prefix *παρ-*. This method of forming words is common in old Greek. Other derivatives of the same word are for instance *μέτοιχος*, *κάτοιχος* and *ἔνοιχος* with the corresponding verbs in *-έω* and *-ίζω*.

When trying to determine the significance of *πάροιχος* in the inscriptions discovered in Rhamnous, it is important to first determine whether it appears in a general sense or as a technical term, used to denote a part of the population of a certain *polis* who had a specific status defined by laws (compare *μέτοιχος* in Classical Athens). In the latter sense, as a technical term, it is known throughout the Hellenistic period in many places outside Athens. In Athens, on the contrary, the technical usage appears only after 229. However, in general usage *πάροιχος* and related terms were known in Attic dialect and appear in the Attic authors of the Classical period.

*παροικέω*, 'live beside', 'live near', 'dwell among'. In these senses the verb is used by Thucydides, Isokrates and Xenophon.<sup>12</sup>

*πάροιχος*, ὁ, ἡ. *πάροιχος*, ον. *Paroikos* as substantive and adjective has the same general meanings: '(someone) who has home near', '(someone) who lives near', 'a dweller near', 'neighbour'.<sup>13</sup> In the first sense, it appears in the tragedians Sophocles and Aischylos and the historian Thucydides, absolutely, with the genitive and with the dative.<sup>14</sup> The second meaning, 'neighbour', appears in Herodotos metaphorically, in the expression *πάροιχος πόλεμος*, 'war with a neighbour'.<sup>15</sup> Aristotle uses the proverb Ἀττικὸς *πάροιχος*, meaning a restless neighbour.<sup>16</sup>

The terms *μέτοιχος* and *πάροιχος* have a difference of sense which can be seen in the Latin equivalents *incola/accola*. *Incola* corresponds with the former Greek term and means 'resident in a place'. *Accola*, corresponding to the latter word, means 'a dweller near', 'neighbour'.<sup>17</sup> A *metoikos* would be someone who lives among a people, whereas a *paroikos* does not live among but near, separated.

### Attestations of *paroikoi* outside Athens

Too rash and careless conclusions concerning the connection between the *paroikoi* of Rhamnous and the attestations of *paroikoi* elsewhere should be avoided because the constitutions, systems of administration, social structures and various other aspects of the *poleis* differed from each other. However, it is essential to discuss the attestations of *paroikoi* outside Athens in this context: since *paroikos* was not known in Athens as a technical term before 229, it is possible that the Athenians adopted it from elsewhere.

<sup>12</sup> Th. 1.71.2 ('live near', with dat.); 3.93 ('dwell among', with dat.); 6.82 (absol.). Isoc. 4.162 ('live beside/along', with acc.). X. *Vect.* 1.5.

<sup>13</sup> Demetrakos 1951. *TGL*, VII, 533. Liddell & Scott 1996.

<sup>14</sup> Absolute: S. *Fr.* 503, ἡ *πάροιχος* πηλαμύς. With genitive: S. *Ant.* 1155, Κάδμον *πάροιχοι* καὶ δόμων Ἀμφίονος. A. *Pers.* 869, [πόλεις] π. Θρηκίων ἐπαύλων. With dative: Th. 3.113, μὴ οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι ... χαλεπώτεροι σφίσι *πάροιχοι* ὦσιν.

<sup>15</sup> Hdt. 7.235: *παροίκου* δὲ πολέμου σφι ἐόντος οἰκηίου.

<sup>16</sup> Arist. *Rh.* 1395.a.18.

<sup>17</sup> *TGL* VII, 533.

Asia Minor and the Aegean islands dominate the list. Only two attestations are from Greece proper, from Thespieae in Boiotia and Pagai in Megaris, but these are beyond the chronological limits of my study, ca. 100 and 1st century respectively.<sup>18</sup>

Among the attestations that do fall within the chronological limits of my study, the most important are those dated either before 229, or around the same time. One of these is an inscription discovered in Ilion, in the north-west corner of Asia Minor. It is a decree in honour of Antiochos I, which has been dated to soon after 280. *Paroikoi* appear associated with citizens in a formula concerning the celebration of festivals and sacrifices, and this occurred regularly in the Hellenistic period. The prevailing view takes these *paroikoi* to be synonymous with *metoikoi*.<sup>19</sup> F. Papazoglou does not accept L. Robert's restoration of the essential lines which justify the identification of *paroikoi* as foreign residents, and instead prefers to see them as all the free residents who did not have political rights.<sup>20</sup> Telmessos, a city in Lycia, has produced one inscription where *paroikoi* appear, and similarly to the document of Ilion, it is associated with citizens in the context of sacrifices. The document is a decree in honour of Ptolemy, son of Lysimachos and brother of Ptolemy III Euergetes, dated to ca. 240. The studies dealing with the question unanimously agree that here the *paroikoi* are identical with *metoikoi*.<sup>21</sup>

A few inscriptions from different places are broadly dated to the 3rd century, or to the end of the same century. One is from the island of Chios, from the end of the 3rd century. Here three *paroikoi* are seen among a long list of contributors. The prevailing view is that these *paroikoi* are synonymous with *metoikoi*.<sup>22</sup> An attestation from the Ionian coastal city Teos, dated to the latter years of the century, features *paroikoi* in a series of decrees of various states granting *asylia* to Teos and its territory. In F. Papazoglou's opinion the *paroikoi* here include the foreign residents and the free, indigenous population.<sup>23</sup> A naturalization inscription from Karthaia, a *polis* on the Cycladic island of Keos (3rd century), bestows citizenship on a citizen of Kythnos who had lived as *paroikos* in the *polis*. In this case *paroikos* has possibly, but not unequivocally, the sense of *metoikos*.<sup>24</sup>

For the second century, we have attestations of *paroikoi* from Kildara in Karia, Kyme in the Aiolis, Pergamon, Aigiale on the island of Amorgos and the island of Karpathos. The Kildara inscription, a fragment of a letter written in the name of Antiochos III the Great, is from the beginning of the century. The editors do not comment on the meaning of *paroikoi* here, and F. Papazoglou finds the meaning impossible to determine.<sup>25</sup> In the case of Kyme (2nd-half of the century), Ph. Gauthier considered the *paroikoi* equivalent of *metoikoi* but Papazoglou suspects the term encompassed other groups of people as well. In this case *paroikoi* are seen in honorary

<sup>18</sup> IG VII 190, 1862.

<sup>19</sup> OGI 219, Robert 1966, 175–211. *Inscr. Ilion* 32. Gauthier 1988, n. 12. The latter bases his view on the contemporary law of Ilion against tyranny and oligarchy which mentions *metoikoi*: *Inscr. Ilion* 25, ll. 57–59.

<sup>20</sup> Papazoglou 1997, P1.

<sup>21</sup> OGI 55. Flacelière, Robert, Robert 1972, 504–505, no. 380. Segre 1938, 184. Wörle 1978, 242.

<sup>22</sup> Zolotas 1908, 200–204, no. ζ'. Picard, Plassart 1913, 212–214, no. 27. Papazoglou 1997, P4.

<sup>23</sup> *Inscr. Cret.* VIII 8 (Knossos); XXVI 1 (Sybris). Papazoglou 1997, P5b. The noun παροικία and verb παροικίζω appear in two letters of Antigonos Monophthalmos concerning the synoecism of Teos and Lebedus, *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 344 (ca. 303), but apparently in a general rather than a technical sense. Papazoglou 1997, P5a.

<sup>24</sup> IG XII 5, 534. Papazoglou 1997, P12.

<sup>25</sup> *Fouilles Am. I*, 186–187. Papazoglou 1997, P8.

decrees for a citizen. The honorand had made large benefactions for sacrifices and banquets, among others for *paroikoi*.<sup>26</sup> The inscription of Pergamon which mentions *paroikoi* is a decree passed in 133 at the time of the death of Attalos III, granting citizenship to, among others, *paroikoi*, and the status of *paroikos* to other groups of people as well. The famous decree is related to the testament of Attalos III by which he bestowed his territories to Rome, and has been examined by countless of scholars. Many have considered them foreign residents (*IGRom*, M. Launey, K. M. T. Atkinson, E. V. Hansen, J. Hopp, C. Delplace), others an indigenous, non-citizen population (for instance Papazoglou).<sup>27</sup> Turning to the islands, in Gauthier's opinion the *paroikoi* of Aigiale (2nd century) should be equated with *metoikoi*. He, however, admits that the restoration of the inscription is in many places conjectural.<sup>28</sup> The attestation of *paroikoi* on Karpathos (153) is somewhat different compared to the other cases: in those *paroikoi* are seen in the context of the entire *polis* but here they appear together with citizens in a decree of a *ktoina* (subdivision) of Potidaia, a *demos* of Karpathos. Papazoglou notes that as the context is so limited, *paroikos* undoubtedly designates indigenous non-citizens rather than foreigners.<sup>29</sup>

A document originating from Kedreai, from the early-2nd century,<sup>30</sup> is especially noteworthy, because it seems to be the only attestation of *paroikoi* outside Athens which is similar in context to the *paroikos* decrees of Rhamninos – *paroikoi* appearing in a limited geographic area (*demos*) awarding honours to other person/persons. Kedreai was a *demos* of Rhodes, situated on the mainland opposite the island itself.<sup>31</sup> The inscription in question is a dedication of family members to an eminent Rhodian citizen. Enumerating the magistracies and offices the person had held during his career, the dedication tells that *paroikoi* of Kedreai, along with his army comrades (citizens), had awarded him a golden crown.<sup>32</sup> D. Morelli considered the *paroikoi* identical with *metoikoi*,<sup>33</sup> and J. Pouilloux considers them colonist soldiers.<sup>34</sup> According to Ph. Gauthier, on the other hand, these *paroikoi* could not be metics, because they collectively award a crown to a magistrate whereas *metoikoi* usually appear individually. His conclusion is that the *paroikoi* were a small community of inhabitants of the *polis* of Rhodes who had a special status.<sup>35</sup> However, A. Bresson does not accept Gauthier's conclusion. Instead, he tends towards the view that at least in Rhodes, but certainly also in many other cities, the title *paroikos* was used for foreign residents of

<sup>26</sup> *Inscr.Kyme* 13. Gauthier 1978/1979, 325. Papazoglou 1997, P3a.

<sup>27</sup> *OGI* 338. *IGRom* IV 289. Launey 1950, 667. Atkinson 1968, 38. Hansen 1971, 152. Hopp 1977, 132. Delplace 1978, 23. Papazoglou 1997, P2b. The verb παρourkeō appears in an earlier inscription of Pergamon from ca. 260, but the meaning of the verb cannot be determined with certainty. It might not have a technical sense (Welles 1934, no. 16; see also Papazoglou 1997, P2a). A third Pergamenean inscription has the word *paroikoi*, but the inscription is dated to end of the 2nd–beginning of the 1st century (KoPapazoglou 1997, P2c).

<sup>28</sup> *IG XII* 7, 390. Gauthier 1980, 219. Another inscription of Aigiale (*IG XII* 7, 515; Papazoglou 1997, P14a) falls beyond the time limits of my study (ca. 100).

<sup>29</sup> *IG XII* 1, 1033. Papazoglou P16a.

<sup>30</sup> Fraser, Bean 1954, 45 ff., no. 42.

<sup>31</sup> Fraser, Bean 1954, 67, 81. Papazoglou 1997, 189.

<sup>32</sup> Papazoglou 1997, 189.

<sup>33</sup> Morelli 1956, 132–133.

<sup>34</sup> Pouilloux 1971, 163.

<sup>35</sup> Gauthier 1988, 36. See also Papazoglou 1997, 189.

various different statuses, including metics, freedmen and other categories with a particular status, for instance mercenaries.<sup>36</sup>

### Earlier research

When the first *paroikos* documents were discovered, they were dated to the first decade of the satellite-state period, 262/1–229/8. This naturally affected their interpretation. Some scholars considered *paroikoi* identical with, or in any case holding approximately the same meaning as, *metoikoi*. In H. Hommel's view, *paroikos* replaced *metoikos* in the Hellenistic period as the general term used of resident foreigners with specific rights.<sup>37</sup> S. Kougeas, the first editor of another *paroikos* document (no. 43 in B. Ch. Petrakos) reviewed the earlier arguments on the subject and came to the conclusion that on the basis of the epigraphic testimony the most credible suggestion is that the term was a new name for the old Athenian *metoikia*. Thus in his opinion the *paroikoi* seen in Rhamnous were metics performing their military service duties.<sup>38</sup>

On the other hand, due to the then-prevailing dating of the *paroikos* documents in the early satellite-state period, many scholars drew a connection to SEG III 122, securely dated to 250's. As seen earlier,<sup>39</sup> this is a case of Macedonian mercenary soldiers awarded with the status of *isoteles* at the insistence of Antigonos Gonatas. The scholars who saw a connection between *paroikoi* and these *isoteleis*, viewed the *paroikoi* as similar privileged Macedonian mercenaries. W. Peek saw no difference between the *isoteleis* and *paroikoi*, discarding the two different terms as an accidental terminological variation.<sup>40</sup> In the late 1940's, M. Launey supported the view of identifying the *paroikoi* as privileged Macedonian mercenaries, but considered *paroikoi* identical with *metoikoi*, suggesting that the privilege awarded to mercenaries would have been the status of *metoikos*.<sup>41</sup> A. Schäfer, the author of the entry on *paroikoi* in RE, envisaged the political rights of *paroikia*, which were not equally favourable as *isoteleia* and on the other hand not identical with *metoikia*. He did not, however, go so far as to suggest what the exact difference between *metoikia* and *paroikia* would have been. In Schäfer's view Antigonos Gonatas' motivation for obtaining privileges for his soldiers was the desire to care for their welfare, rather than a specific attempt at humiliating the Athenians.<sup>42</sup> J. Pouilloux examined the relationship of Antigonos Gonatas and Athens after the Chremonidean War in an article which appeared in 1946. He came to the same conclusion as Schäfer: the title of *paroikos* was specially selected for the occasion. Pouilloux in addition suggested that it was borrowed from the home cities of the Macedonian mercenaries, where the term was used to define local metics. In Athens *paroikos* was limited to soldiers but was not identical in meaning with *metoikos*: the Athenians wanted to make a difference between the mercenaries to whom they were forced to give a privilege, and the foreigners who were freely accepted as residents in Athens.<sup>43</sup>

<sup>36</sup> Bresson 1991, 45.

<sup>37</sup> Hommel 1932, 1420.

<sup>38</sup> Kougeas 1953–1954, 126–127, no. 2.

<sup>39</sup> See pp. 39 ff. above.

<sup>40</sup> Peek 1934, 41–42, no. 3.

<sup>41</sup> Launey 1950, 652–653.

<sup>42</sup> Schäfer 1949, 1705.

<sup>43</sup> Pouilloux 1946, 491–495.

A similar view to J. Pouilloux was adopted by D. Whitehead about three decades later. On the *isoteleis* stationed in Rhamnous, *SEG* III 122 and the *paroikoi* he stated:

... the mid-century honorific decree (*SEG* III 122) 'of those of the *isoteleis* stationed in Rhamnous': a category of mercenary troops upon whom, it is reckoned, Antigonos Gonatas had obliged the Athenians to confer this title. Somewhat later – after 229/8, it would seem – such troops on duty both at Rhamnous and at Sounion (and perhaps elsewhere) are accorded the designation of *paroikoi*.<sup>44</sup>

The implication is that D. Whitehead believed the *paroikoi* were Macedonian mercenaries upon whom Antigonos had obliged the Athenians to confer the title of *isoteleia*, or in any case privileges, but a new term had been devised for them.

The early 1950's brought to light a new *paroikos* inscription (no. 43 in Petrakos), published in 1953 by S. Kougeas. It was dated to 215/14 and offered prosopographic evidence for dating the other two *paroikos* documents known so far<sup>45</sup> correctly to after 229/8. The new discovery made J. Pouilloux reconsider his earlier conclusions. He retained his argument that the *paroikoi* were mercenary soldiers who were given a privileged status, but now suggested that they were former Macedonian mercenaries who had come to the service of Athens after the departure of the Macedonian troops in 229 and who were rewarded for this.<sup>46</sup> On the other hand, Pouilloux presented an alternative hypothesis, according to which the presence of *paroikoi* in Athens might have been a result of the political machinations of Philip V, which caused people to become exiled from their home cities. To some of these people Athens might have offered an asylum, a means of living as mercenaries and gaining some privileges, but not full citizenship.<sup>47</sup>

Almost all the scholars who have examined the question of the *paroikoi* of Rhamnous after J. Pouilloux have come to the view that they were neither ordinary mercenaries nor *metoikoi*. The only exception is D. Whitehead, who, curiously, seems to base his arguments on Pouilloux's earliest views, which the latter subsequently abandoned. Ph. Gauthier made note of factors that dismiss the possibility of the *paroikoi* being identical with *metoikoi*. Firstly, the *paroikoi* only appear designated with a collective title. Secondly, the fact that they appear solely in connection with garrisons indicates that they were restricted to a garrison and to the locality where it was situated. Thus, according to Gauthier, they had nothing in common with the metics/resident foreigners, who had an individual title, could move about freely and generally speaking carried out their activities in the city.<sup>48</sup> Gauthier, in accordance with most scholars, noted the military origin of the *paroikoi*, seeing them as the remains of the garrisons established by Antigonos Gonatas in Athens before 229.<sup>49</sup> The excavations conducted

<sup>44</sup> Whitehead 1986, 152.

<sup>45</sup> Nos. 38 and 50 in Petrakos. The inscription edited by Peek in 1934 included the last 12 lines of Petrakos' edition. The first half of the inscription was discovered by Petrakos in the excavations of Rhamnous. The first edition of no. 50 is *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 1309. It was originally placed to Sounion, which led scholars to conclude that *paroikoi* were in service there as well. Later Petrakos showed, by recognizing the material as local marble from Rhamnous, that it, too, originated from Rhamnous.

<sup>46</sup> Pouilloux 1956, 72–73.

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid.* 73, no. 2.

<sup>48</sup> Gauthier 1978/79, 328.

<sup>49</sup> *Idem* 1988, 36–37.



by B. Ch. Petrakos from the 1970's onwards in Rhamnous brought to light several new *paroikos* documents. However, in his commentary on the decrees he does not add anything significant to the theories of Pouilloux and Gauthier.<sup>50</sup> The same applies to F. Papazoglou. Her book, published in 1997, encompasses testimony from everywhere around the Hellenistic world where there is evidence of *paroikoi*. Concerning Athens, she simply recited Gauthier's research on the subject: the *paroikoi* were persons of mercenary origin who had been awarded a specific status but without political rights.<sup>51</sup>

### *Paroikoi* in Rhamnous: privileged mercenaries stationed at a critical point in the defence system

The earlier discussions on the *paroikoi* of Rhamnous can be divided broadly speaking into two ways: 1) theories which identify *paroikoi* with *metoikoi*, and thus consider the *paroikoi* to be foreign residents performing military service duties; 2) theories according to which the *paroikoi* were neither ordinary mercenary soldiers nor *metoikoi* but mercenary soldiers who had been awarded with a special privilege or status.

### *Not Macedonian mercenaries of the satellite-state period*

In the early stages of the debate the conclusions reached were based on the dating of the documents known at the time to be from the first decade of the satellite-state period. This erroneous dating allowed a connection with SEG III 122 and the identification of the *paroikoi* as Macedonian mercenary soldiers to whom Antigonos Gonatas had obliged the Athenians to award a privilege. The new inscription published by S. Kougeas provided evidence for dating the *paroikos* documents to after Athens' liberation in 229, and therefore the early views should be discounted. Indeed, the new dating of the documents made J. Pouilloux discard his earlier views. Yet much later, in the 1986, D. Whitehead still believed there to be a connection between SEG III 122 and the *paroikos* documents. Since he, too, dates the documents to after 229, he seems to suggest that the original award of the privileges took place in the satellite-state period, but that the Macedonian mercenaries remained in the service of Athens and were allowed to keep their privilege. This hypothesis is not convincing. The King obliging the Athenians to grant his mercenaries an important privilege must have been extremely humiliating. There are indications that immediately after 229 the Athenians removed expressions of allegiance to the Macedonian royal family, for instance, from state decrees, so it is likely that they would have revoked the privileges they had been forced to grant.

### *Paroikoi = metoikoi? In theory possible, in practice not*

Certain scholars were convinced that the *paroikoi* encountered in Rhamnous were metics. S. Kougeas, who brought about the development in the dating of the *paroikos* inscriptions, believed the same. This is not a contradiction, since this view was not based on the dating of the inscriptions. It is in theory possible that the Athenians would have reorganized *metoikia* and renamed it *paroikia*, and thus *paroikos* could be equated with *metoikos*. As Athens was again independent after 229, and the entire territory was

<sup>50</sup> Petrakos 1991, 28–30.

<sup>51</sup> Papazoglou 1997, 191, 211.

united under one government, the Athenians would have been free to do so. Furthermore, the *paroikos* decrees have a strong sense of locality. The *paroikoi* formed a community and voted on decrees in assemblies. It is noticeable that the *paroikos* documents are the only case where foreign soldiers appear alone, unaccompanied by citizens, in autonomous decision-making units. In some decrees the *paroikoi* praise the honorand for protecting the harvest. One might think that they would have had to have had close ties with the local community to care about this kind of a thing. However, this line of thought has to be discarded. If these *paroikoi* had indeed been metics, why would it have been necessary to adopt a new title which had never appeared in Athens before – even if *metoikia* had been reorganised after 229, after a long period of decline? *Metoikia* had long traditions in Athens, so it would have been simplest to go on with the old system, and keep using the same terminology. It is hardly a coincidence that the word *paroikos* appears only in military context. If there had been a system called *paroikia*, it would certainly appear in contexts that would indicate at least something of the status of the *paroikoi*. Examples of this are the inscriptions that contain a mention of *metoikoi* together with some of their obligations, *metoikion* etc.<sup>52</sup> If there were only a couple of documents, it could be argued that this is merely a coincidence and documents that would have displayed *paroikoi* in other contexts have simply not survived. The fact that there are twelve examples makes the argument less valid. Ph. Gauthier's notion was that the *paroikoi* were restricted to the location of the garrison where they were stationed and were always referred to with the collective title, thus different to *metoikoi* who were free to move and who had an individual title. To this must be added the other evidence which seems to indicate that *metoikia* was no longer in existence after 229: the standardization of the *eisphora* paying and military service obligations of citizens and foreign residents; the likely abolition of *metoikion*; the development of regulations concerning both the offspring of mixed marriages and the naturalization practices which made the offspring of mixed marriage citizens with full rights, and the descendants of naturalized citizens automatically citizens. It would therefore appear that the appearance of *paroikoi* after 229 is not a sign of the continued existence of the *metoikia* system with a different name.

#### *Privileged mercenaries in the service of Athens*

The fact that all the *paroikoi* seen in the Athenian documents appear in the military context is not in doubt: in the actual decrees the expression 'stationed in' (τεταγμένοι ἐν) reveals that they are in active military service. What of the exact military role of these *paroikoi*, then? It is obvious that they were not ordinary mercenary soldiers, *xenoi*. The term *paroikos* appears often enough for it to be more than just terminological variation, used coincidentally instead of *xenos*.

It is to be concluded, then, that the *paroikoi* were somehow privileged, above the simple *xenoi*. Of the arguments presented by different scholars, the suggestion that they were former mercenaries who came to the service of Athens and were rewarded for this loyalty seems the most credible. The *paroikos* status was created after 229 as an emergency measure. After the liberation, the whole of Athens – the city, Piraeus and the countryside – was free and under the same government. This newly-won independence

<sup>52</sup> For instance *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 545, 554.

was, however, not secure. The return of Macedonian control was an acute threat. Inscriptions like the honorary decree for Apollas (*IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 835) show that the repair of the defences of the city, the ports and the countryside fortresses was begun immediately after the liberation. The leading politicians in Athens, Eurykeides and Mikion, adopted a policy of neutrality, which included establishing and maintaining a good relationship with as many powers as possible, and avoiding anything that might anger the Macedonian King. Nonetheless, the defence system still needed to be enhanced as much as possible. The number of the decrees of soldiers for their commanders from 229–200 show heightened military activity: whereas between the last decade of the 4th century and 229 there are some 17 decrees of soldiers stationed in different fortresses,<sup>53</sup> from the much shorter period of the last three decades of the 3rd century there are 35, including the *paroikos* decrees.<sup>54</sup> After 229, the need to organize and strengthen the defence of Athens and Attica efficiently and effectively was emphasized by two factors: resources were limited, as evidenced by the fact that the Long Walls were left unrepaired, and Athens could not rely on military aid from others. Experienced professional soldiers were an important asset in these circumstances. The mercenaries who had been in Macedonian service were certainly more skilled and experienced than the average Athenian citizen could be expected to be. With the two-year obligatory ephebic training in the 4th century every male citizen had some basic education in military skills and the use of weapons. In the Hellenistic period the training was shortened to one year and participants made to pay for their equipment themselves, and at that point the *ephebeia* developed into a tradition of the rich families. This kind of development necessarily meant that by 229 the majority of Athenian citizens did not have any kind of formal military training. Considering these circumstances, it is understandable that a new privilege was created to persuade Macedonian mercenaries, who had served under the Kings in Athens, to stay in the service of Athens and/or attract other experienced soldiers.

#### *The special position of Rhamnous in the defence system*

It is interesting to note that while in most of the *paroikos* attestations outside Athens the *paroikoi* appear in contexts of the entire *polis*, in Athens they are only known from the area of one *demos*, Rhamnous. Furthermore, if we look at all the decrees of soldiers stationed in fortresses known from 229–200, 28 of them are of soldiers stationed at Rhamnous or at least cases where the *stèle* was set up in Rhamnous,<sup>55</sup> only seven of them decrees of soldiers stationed elsewhere.<sup>56</sup> It would seem that Rhamnous had special importance in the defence system after 229 and that the fact that *paroikoi* are not known elsewhere in Attica is not a coincidence. There would also seem to be a connection between the geographic location of Rhamnous and the fact that *paroikos*

<sup>53</sup> *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 1260, 1270, 1272, 1274, 1280, 1285–1288, 1299, 1330, 1958. Garland 1965, 339–344. Petrakos 1999, nos. 8, 10, 18, 20. *SEG* XXII 122.

<sup>54</sup> *IG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 1281, 1302–1308, 1313. Petrakos 1999, nos. 19, 21–27, 30, 32, 34–35, 38, 40–51, 55, 57.

<sup>55</sup> In a couple of cases the decree is of soldiers stationed in Aphidna, an inland *demos* some way from Rhamnous, but the *stèle* was set up in Rhamnous (Petrakos 1999, nos. 32 and 34). One document is of *hypaiethroi*, set up in Rhamnous, but these were not necessarily tied to a specific fortress (see pp. 53–54 above). Presumably the reason for setting these *stelai* up in Rhamnous was that it was the closest place to the soldiers in question where the decrees would have achieved a remarkable visibility.

<sup>56</sup> Sounion, Eleusis, Panakton and Phyle.

instead of some other term was selected as a title for the privilege. Rhamnous was a coastal *demos* in the north-east corner of Attica, very distant from the centre, the city of Athens. *Paroikos*, as seen above (p. 156), has the general meanings 'dweller near/beside', 'neighbour'.

Despite the distance from the city of Athens, Rhamnous was indeed central for its location. In earlier times it controlled Euripos, an important sea route, and was thus important for trade. Specifically in the situation after 229, the significant factor seems to have been that the part of the Attic coast where Rhamnous was situated faced the island of Euboia. After 229 the island was firmly under Macedonian control, and the most important city, Chalkis, on Euripos, was a strongly armed base of the Macedonian fleet. In fact, during the rule of Philip V, it formed one of the "bounds of Greece" along with the Acrocorinth (in Corinth) and Demetrias (in Magnesia, one of the residences of the Antigonids).<sup>57</sup> As the return of Macedonian control was a constant threat after 229, it is likely that an attack could have been expected specifically from Euboia, via Euripos. Thus Rhamnous would have been a key point in the defence system, and placing the most experienced and skilled soldiers there would have been natural. However, it was not enough to place experienced soldiers in Rhamnous, one needed to make them stay there as well. Being far away from the centre, the *demos* did not offer much for a soldier who was garrisoned there. It is likely, therefore, that the new *paroikos* privilege was specifically defined so that it made it attractive for a professional soldier to remain in Rhamnous or perhaps even tied him there. A new title for the privilege was needed because the titles used in Athens earlier were not fitting for this particular circumstance. *Metoikos* was a person who came to a *polis* to live there as resident. The status of *isoteles* was about tax equality with citizens. *Proxenos* was an honorary title primarily connected to diplomatic contacts. *Xenos* was the appellation of ordinary mercenary soldiers. *Paroikos*, on the other hand, was ideal for the purpose because the sense of separation or isolation manifested in the geographic distance of Rhamnous from the centre was contained in the general meanings of the word itself.

#### *The origin of the paroikos status*

Explained in the above way, the appearance of *paroikoi* in Athens would not, after all, have been surprising. However, did the Athenians adopt the term from elsewhere or simply use a word in the Attic dialect to serve as an appellation of a particular group of people, thereby making it a technical term? Both options need to be investigated, since *παροικος* was known outside Athens in a technical sense but in Athens only in a non-technical sense before 229.

J. Pouilloux originally suggested – albeit at that time identifying the *paroikoi* with Macedonian mercenaries of the satellite-state period – that the Athenians would have adopted the title from the home cities of the mercenaries, where it had previously been in use.<sup>58</sup> I find it unlikely that the Athenians would have specifically thought about the home cities of some individual mercenaries, but it is possible that they would have adopted the technical usage of the term from somewhere where it was known in this respect. To determine if this is the case it is necessary to study the attestations of

<sup>57</sup> NP 2 (1997) 1090–1091; 4 (1998) 207–210, 289; 6 (1999) 312. Importance of Rhamnous in the defence system: see also Kralli 2003, 64.

<sup>58</sup> Pouilloux 1946, 494–495.

*paroikoi* outside Athens. A comparison of the individual *paroikoi* in Rhamnous with these attestations reveals that there are no city names that appear in both groups. There are some connecting points if we consider larger geographic areas: for instance Asia Minor is represented in both cases. However, these sort of geographic entities are too large to provide a basis for any conclusions. Additionally, the 13 *paroikoi* known by name represent only a fraction of the whole number and of course cannot be used as evidence that there were no *paroikoi* from any other regions in Rhamnous. Still, the *paroikos* title might have been adopted by the Athenians from a place that had dynamic relations with Athens on various levels: political, cultural, economic, personal. Another factor is time. The contacts between Athens and another city should be slightly earlier or approximately contemporary with the attestations of *paroikoi* in Rhamnous, and the attestations of *paroikoi* in both places should have a similar relationship. In addition to these points, we should consider the context of the attestations outside Athens. Are there any similarities in the usage of the term?

Firstly, there is nothing to directly link any of the cities with attestations of *paroikoi* to Rhamnous, even in the form of the grave stones of private individuals from these cities. Thus we must consider the possible connections with Athens as whole. The attestations from Kos are from the early-3rd, late-3rd and early-2nd centuries, which would indicate that *paroikos* was in use as a technical term on Kos through the 3rd century and beyond, at the same time as when *paroikoi* first appeared in Rhamnous. However, the evidence of contacts between Kos and Athens in the Hellenistic period is meagre, consisting of a Koan mercenary in Athens, two honorary decrees for Athenians on Kos, a Koan victor in the Panathenaia and an Athenian victor in a Koan festival.<sup>59</sup> Continuing with the islands, there is one 3rd-century attestation of *paroikoi* from Karthaia on Keos. In the 4th century the contacts between Athens and the island seem to have been close, at least on the political level,<sup>60</sup> but the evidence of Hellenistic connections is limited to an honorary decree for an Athenian in Karthaia, a Karthaian soldier in Athens and some individual names on grave stones.<sup>61</sup> A further problem is caused by the fact that the dating of the Karthaian attestation is very imprecise. In Asia Minor, the one attestation of Ilion is dated to a little after 280. However, nothing proves that the *paroikos* title was in use there ca. 50 years later. The evidence of connections between Athens and Ilion is even more meagre than with the places mentioned before. As for the other places in Asia Minor that have provided evidence of *paroikoi* before 229 (for instance Telmessos, 240), there is no evidence of contacts with Athens. On the other hand, if evidence of contacts does exist for a certain place, the attestations of *paroikoi* do not fit chronologically. The 3rd-century attestation of Teos is dated – too imprecisely for our purposes – to the latter years of the century. An earlier attestation of related words (303) exists, but here they do not appear as technical terms. The relations

<sup>59</sup> Some Koan mercenaries in Athens: *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 1956, ll. 57–58 (ca. 300). *Proxenia* and other honours for Athenians in Kos: *Ischr. Cos* ED9 (3rd century), ED80 (3rd–2nd century). A Koan victor in the Panathenaia: *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 2313, l. 32 (194/3 and 190/89). Athenian victors in the Asklepieia festival of Kos: Sherwin-White 1978, 114.

<sup>60</sup> Member of the 2nd Athenian Sea League in 378/7: *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 43, ll. 23, 25. Alliance of Athens with the Kean *poleis* before 350 (363/2?): *SEG XXXIX* 73.

<sup>61</sup> *IG XII* 5, 538+Suppl. p. 321 (end of 3rd century): honours for an Athenian in Karthaia. *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 1958 (210's), l. 15: a Kean soldier in Athens. *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 9005–9008 (end of 5th, 4th, 3rd century, later): Keans in Attic grave stones. *SEG XXXIX* 872 (3rd century): an Athenian in a Karthaian grave stone.

between Pergamon and Athens were lively on various levels in the Hellenistic period,<sup>62</sup> but the earliest secure attestation of *paroikos* as a technical term is from 133. There is evidence of the use of related terms from the first half of the 3rd century, but not in the technical sense.

In terms of dating and contacts there is no evidence to conclusively attribute the origins of the *paroikos* title in Rhamnous to any location outside of Athens. The case of Kedreai is remotely similar in that it seems to be about *paroikoi* of a limited area, a *demos*, honouring an official. It is, however, slightly later than any of the Rhamnousian *paroikos* documents, dating from the beginning of the 2nd century. It appears that in Athens the status of *paroikos* was specifically created for foreign mercenaries, to make it an attractive option for them to stay in the service of Athens, and to more specifically remain stationed in a remote place such as Rhamnous. Thus it seems likely that if the Athenians had adopted the status from somewhere else they would have adopted not only the title but also, and more importantly, the idea of the content of the status. However, Rhamnous is the only place where *paroikos* appears in a military context, as a title reserved for foreign soldiers. The Athenians could not have received the idea for this kind of a status elsewhere. It is more credible to think that the creation of the new status was a matter of using a word of the Attic dialect as a title; specifically selected for its meaning.

#### *The content of the status*

What remains, finally, is to define the content of the *paroikos* status. It is evident that it had to be something that professional soldiers found appealing enough to ensure their commitment to Athens. It needed to hold more attractions than enlistment in the armies of the Hellenistic monarchs, which was regular mercenary wages plus, perhaps, opportunities for looting on expeditions. The Athenian state could offer the former but had neither sufficient resources nor opportunities for military expeditions beyond the borders of Athens.<sup>63</sup> More specifically, the advantages offered by the *paroikos* status needed to be sufficient to make the mercenaries committed enough to remain stationed in Rhamnous, which offered little in comparison with the city.

M. Launey suggested that the status would have consisted of the soldiers being allowed to become metics, but as seen above,<sup>64</sup> the idea of equating *paroikoi* with *metoikoi* has to be discarded. Still, we may continue to pursue Launey's train of thought. The status of *metoikos* was never something that was given as a reward in Athens. Foreigners were free to come to Athens and were required to register as metics

<sup>62</sup> Honours for the Attalids and individual Pergamenians from ca. 250 to the first half of the 2nd century: *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 768+802, 885, 886, 905, 945, 946. The *phyle* of Attalis founded in Athens: *Plb.* 16.25.8–9. *Liv.* 31.15.6. Habicht 1982a, 107. *Agora XV* 232 (131/0). Attalus I in Athens ca. 200: *Plb.* 16.26. *Liv.* 31.15. Hansen 1971, 57–59. Attalids in the Panathenaic victor catalogues, 178: *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 2314, ll. 84–90. The Attalids supporting the Athenian philosophic schools from ca. mid-3rd century onwards: *D.L.* 4.38, 60. Hansen 1971, 396–397. *NP* 9 (2000) 557. Three Pergamenians as leaders of the Academy, 210's onwards: *Cic. Acad.* 2.6, 16. *D.L.* 4.3. Hansen 1971, 396. Public buildings in Athens financed by the Attalids: Hansen 1971, 286, 295–298.

<sup>63</sup> Rome gained decisive authority in Greece after the end of the third Macedonian war and the abolition of the Macedonian empire in 146. Particularly after this the Athenians could not possibly have taken up military undertakings which the Romans would have considered to be contrary to their interests. There were some local skirmishes in which Athenian troops were involved, such as the Athenian troops taking over their neighbour Oropos in the 150's. For accounts of this incident, see Paus. 7.11.4–7 and Habicht 1995, 264–269.

<sup>64</sup> See pp. 161–162 above.

if they stayed beyond a specific length of time. Furthermore, becoming a metic would have meant, for instance, that the mercenaries would have become liable to pay taxes and in any case would not have had the right to own land, the traditional and most important basis of an individual's wealth. This would hardly have been an attractive offer for a professional soldier.

On the other hand, the status of *paroikos* could not have been identical with that of *isoteles*, as W. Peek believed. If *isoteleia* had still been existence, why give the status of *isoteles* but call it *paroikos*? I am sure that Peek would have come to a different conclusion had he had more *paroikos* documents in his use.

The translations of the substantive *πάροικος*, as well as the related adjective *πάροικος*, *ον* and the verbs *παροικέω* and *παροικίζω* all carry the sense of residency: (in the order of mention) 'sojourner, alien', 'dwelling beside or near, a neighbour', 'to dwell beside/among, to lie near, to live, sojourn', 'to place near, *pass.* settle near, dwell among'. The fact that the *paroikos* documents display a strong sense of locality, points in the same direction: they form a community, have the right to vote for honours independently – unlike any other foreign soldiers that appear in the sources – which they do in an assembly. These two facts would indicate some type of a residential status. This is by no means a new suggestion. A. Schäfer envisaged a status which consisted of the right of residency and the protection of Athenian laws. In his scenario, the *paroikoi* would have had the same obligations as citizens but without the additional obligations of metics.<sup>65</sup> The protection of Athenian law would have been self-evident, since even the non-resident foreigners had the right to appeal to Athenian courts from the mid-4th century onwards.<sup>66</sup> But apart from this, could it be that by receiving the *paroikos* status these mercenary soldiers gained the right to purchase land in the area of the garrison they were stationed in – the *demos* of Rhamnous in the case of our documents – but not freely anywhere in Athens, like in the *enktesis* privilege? The right to vote for honours on their own, unlike any other foreign soldiers, might have been part of the advantages brought by the status. Perhaps the privileges had something to do with tax obligations as well, though not identically with *isoteleia* since it is probable that the foreigners who lived in Athens no longer paid *metoikion*. Since exemption from *metoikion* had been the central content of *isoteleia*, the status of *paroikos* could not have included the same.

The surviving *paroikos* documents unfortunately do not reveal anything about the content of the *paroikos* status. The appearance of a *paroikos* as winner in the Ptolemaia festival is not an indication of privileges particular to the status: in some festivals, such as the Great Panathenaia, foreigners were free to participate in most events. In some others there were events specifically reserved for soldiers. However, I believe that the kind of residential rights suggested above would have been appealing enough for professional soldiers to choose remaining in Athens, and more specifically in Rhamnous, over enlisting in an army elsewhere. The advantages would have been a permanent place of settlement, regular wages as soldier, the income brought by land ownership, and the right to appeal in the Athenian courts when needed. However, despite the plausibility of some of these suggestions, the fact remains that as things

<sup>65</sup> Schäfer 1949, 1705.

<sup>66</sup> See e.g. MacDowell 1978, 231–234.

currently stand in relation to the availability of sources the theories about the specific content of the status of *paroikos* in Athens must remain unsolved.

### A hypothetical suggestion based on the *paroikos* document no. 151

It is very likely that the *paroikos* privilege was an emergency measure, created to attract experienced mercenaries into Athenian service and make them stay in Rhamnous, a key point in the defence system. This explains all 10 known decrees of *paroikoi* for their commanders. However, the 12<sup>th</sup> document, no. 151, does not fit to this theory. It is the chronologically latest of our documents, dated to ca. 100, over a hundred years later than the *paroikos* decrees of the last three decades of the 3rd century. Why, then, does the term not appear in Rhamnous until over a hundred years later? A few explanations suggest themselves.

The last decades of the 3rd century were a precarious time for Athens, despite its independence. The return of Macedonian control was a constant threat, so the defences had to be as strong as possible in these circumstances. This naturally included obtaining experienced armed forces. In 200, Athens entered an alliance with Rome against Philip V. On the same side were already Pergamon and Rhodes. Athens' situation became remarkably more easy as it could to some extent henceforth rely on the military aid of Rome and its other allies.<sup>67</sup> There was perhaps no need to attract mercenaries into Athenian service by special means, and the *paroikos* privilege fell out of use. Perhaps a similarly precarious situation came only at the end of the 2nd or the beginning of the 1st century, and the privilege was reinstated. The problem is that we have no knowledge of such a situation at that time. The 2nd century was relatively peaceful for Athens, as the wars between Rome and the Hellenistic monarchs and other powers for the most part did not affect Athens.<sup>68</sup> Only in the summer of 88 did the Athenians make the decision to break their alliance with Rome, joining King Mithridates VI of Pontus in the war against Rome in Asia Minor.<sup>69</sup> Reinstating the *paroikos* privilege as a means of attracting experienced mercenary soldiers could not be attributed to preparations for this change of sides: open, extensive military preparations could not have taken place before 88, because the state maintained the official line of loyalty towards Rome until 89/88.<sup>70</sup> In any case, reinstating the *paroikos* privilege at some point around the turn of the century, after a century of disuse, would have demonstrated an exceptionally long memory.

Another hypothesis that might explain the problem could be the disappearance of citizenship as the primary qualification of an individual's status in the latter-half of the 2nd century. By 120 important services to the state had been replaced by wealth and the individual's own desire to gain citizenship as qualifications for naturalization in the naturalization decrees. Around the same time, sons of wealthy foreigners gained access to ephebic training. This is a strong indication that wealth had replaced citizenship as

<sup>67</sup> Roman forces were present at least in Piraeus, and are known to have helped the Athenians in the few times Athens was threatened by enemy forces in the 2nd century.

<sup>68</sup> See Habicht 1995, 223 ff., in particular 223–246 and 288–296.

<sup>69</sup> *Ibid.* 88.

<sup>70</sup> Though there seem to have been some animosity towards the Romans in a portion of the Athenian population in the 90's, in *IG II/III*<sup>2</sup> 1029 and 1030, from 96/5 and 94/3(?) respectively, the Romans are called 'benefactors of the people'. The silver coinage of 90/89 and 89/8 have the symbol of Rome. Habicht 1995, 300–301.



the main qualification of an individual's status.<sup>71</sup> It might be that as a result of this development the use of terms referring to people of different civic status became coincidental. Thus the use of the term *paroikos* could have been just a terminological variation, one word summarily selected instead of another. However, I do not find this scheme any more convincing than the previous one. There might indeed have been considerable variation and inconsistency in the use of terms at this time. Yet how could anyone have even coincidentally thought to use this specific term, *paroikos*, instead of something else, if nobody had used it for generations, for a century or perhaps even longer?

Neither of the above-mentioned explanations really stand up. It seems preferable to think that the *paroikos* privilege indeed began as a sort of an emergency measure but in time gained a permanent stature, becoming added to the category of honours and privileges awarded for various sorts of services to the state. In this way it represented new regulations concerning foreigners, if not foreign residents *per se*. The gap of a century in the sources might be simply because in the 2nd century there were no occasions which gave rise to decrees of *paroikoi* for *strategoi* and other officials. The century was largely a time of peace, so extraordinary efforts would not have been required of the *strategoi* or other military officials. The majority of the military inscriptions known from after the liberation of 229 come from the last decades of the 3rd century, which indicates heightened activity in the garrisons during that time. This, in turn, can be connected to the precariousness of Athens' situation in these decades. It is safe to say that the fact that 11 of the 12 *paroikos* documents known today are from the same time can be explained within the same context, not only in terms of mercenary soldiers having been awarded the status of *paroikos* but also in terms of the *paroikoi* themselves wanting to honour their superiors for their efforts. Of course, it is possible that *paroikoi* appeared in connections that had nothing to do with the military, and a trace of these occasions was preserved in inscriptions in the form of the names of the *paroikoi* in question. However, on these occasions the use of their title might not have been necessary. Such is the case with Nikon of Astakos who appears in one of the *paroikos* decrees and as member of an *eranos*, a private cult association, without his title.<sup>72</sup> In any case I find it more believable that the *paroikos* privilege remained in use throughout the 2nd century than that it, or only the term, would have come back into use either intentionally or coincidentally a hundred years after it first appeared.

I would posit a new theory brought about specifically by the testimony of no. 151. It is noticeable that, judging by the testimony of this inscription, *paroikos* was still a term used for foreign soliders at the turn of the 2nd and 1st centuries. This would have been a new kind of a privilege in Athens – something that was in regular use but restricted to foreigners of one specific profession. A solution to the question as to why this type of a privilege came into being might be found in the following hypothesis: in the last decades of the 3rd century, after the liberation of 229, *paroikos* was a status which was created in order to more efficiently attract experienced mercenaries into the service of Athens by offering them more than the basic wages. When Athens entered an alliance with Rome in 200, such an emergency measure was not needed anymore.

<sup>71</sup> See p. 20 above.

<sup>72</sup> Petrakos 1999, no. 23. *JG* II/III<sup>2</sup> 1322, l. 30.

Despite this, the *paroikos* status remained in use, becoming something used to reward experienced foreign soldiers who proved themselves especially skilled during their service in Athens. Or, perhaps more likely, it might have been given as a reward after a specific number of years in military service. In this way, the *paroikoi* would have eventually formed a kind of a veteran elite corps. This change would not have been such a big leap in the sphere of usage of the status. The original intention with the creation of the status was to make the mercenaries who had served in the garrisons before the departure of the Macedonian troops to remain in the service of Athens. In other words, to make them realise that staying in Athens offered greater advantages than enlisting in the armies of some Hellenistic monarch. If the *paroikos* status then became a regular reward for experienced soldiers, the intention of the Athenian authorities in using it might well have been similar: to enhance loyalty and stability in the armed forces. Retaining in service soldiers who stayed a long time would surely have been more advantageous to the function of the armed forces than having a soldier base that changed all the time, even in times of peace. Perhaps the intention might even have been the formation of permanent professional troops?

The sources do not offer proof for my theory, But what I posit might help to explain why a status which was originally used as a reward to mercenaries who stayed in Athens when there was a dire need of experienced soldiers, appeared again over a hundred years later, still apparently restricted to soldiers and at a time when no such precarious situation existed. Unfortunately, precisely because there are no sources to prove it, my theory must necessarily remain hypothetical. The great chronological gap and the fact that there are no decrees of *paroikoi* similar to those of 229–220 remain a problem. Another problem is that the document containing the word *paroikos* from ca. 100 is very different in nature to the decrees of the last three decades of the 3rd century. It might simply not have any connection to the earlier inscriptions.

Could something in the content of no. 151 be used in determining if there really is a connection? It would seem that *paroikos* here is a technical term like in the documents of 229–200: the general meanings ‘dwelling near’, ‘neighbour’ do not fit the context since the other two co-dedicants have a specific appellation. The way in which the title of the *paroikos* is expressed is the same here as in the other documents – not an individual but a group title, genitive partitive τῶν παροίκων (‘of the *paroikoi*’). The main dedicant was a *strategos* of the coastal defence zone which included Rhamnous, just like the main honourees of the *paroikos* decrees. The citizen soldier appearing among the three co-dedicants is called στρατευόμενος, the term used for citizens in military service in 229–200. So, there are similarities between our dedication and the *paroikos* decrees. However, none of them prove that this *paroikos* is identical with those appearing in the inscriptions a hundred years earlier – that is, a mercenary soldier in active service granted a special privilege.

Along with the similarities, there are differences, apart from the obvious fact that the documents in question are of two different types. The text does not say that the *paroikos* was stationed, τεταγμένος, in Rhamnous. Therefore we cannot prove that he was a soldier in active service. He might have been a civilian like one of the other co-dedicants, a *polites*, seems to have been. No. 151 is the only occasion where a *paroikos* appears in connection with a festival. The two festivals mentioned in the dedication, Diogeneia and Ptolemaia, were state festivals. The former was part of the cult founded

in honour of Diogenes, the commander of Macedonian forces in Athens who agreed to give Piraeus and the fortresses of the countryside back to the Athenians. The cult was centred on the ephobic corps and never attained the status of a major festival.<sup>73</sup> J.D. Mikalson says that it may have been limited to *epheboi*,<sup>74</sup> but the dedication, with two of the three co-dedicants victors in this particular festival, was not available to him. Like the citizen victors, the *paroikos* won a torch race but at the Ptolemaia. This agonistic<sup>75</sup> festival was founded in 224 in honour of Ptolemy III Euergetes. Unlike Diogeneia, it quickly attained an important stature, comparable with that of the old, great festivals City Dionysia, Panathenaia and Eleusinia.<sup>76</sup> The fact that we have here a foreigner winning a torch race is not exceptional. The torch races were closely connected to sacrifices which generally speaking were restricted to citizens, and, at least in the Theseia still in the mid-2nd century, only citizens seem to have been allowed to participate. However, the sons of wealthy foreign families had gained access to the *ephebeia* by ca. 120, and were thereby allowed to participate in sacrifices. As no. 151 is from ca. 20 years later, it might be that the old rules about access to the torch races were no longer adhered to. On the other hand, Ptolemaia was founded for political reasons and did not have long traditions like the old festivals. It might not have had restrictions concerning the participation of foreigners. If the *paroikos* was a soldier, a soldier participating (and winning) a festival competition is not exceptional either, because many games had events reserved for soldiers.

The comparison of no. 151 and the other *paroikos* documents neither proves nor disproves my hypothesis. It can be said with relative confidence that in 229–200 the *paroikos* status was a device used to strengthen the defence of Athens by attracting experienced professional soldiers to the service of Athens. The primary location for these soldiers was Rhamnous, because of the view it provided on Euripos and the island of Euboea, a strong Macedonian possession. As to what was the fate of the *paroikos* status after 200, there simply is not evidence to determine it conclusively.

---

<sup>73</sup> Mikalson 1998, 172, 246, 248, 254.

<sup>74</sup> *Ibid.* 172.

<sup>75</sup> Festivals that included dramatic and choir competitions and were thus part of the responsibilities of the *agonothetes*.

<sup>76</sup> Mikalson 1998, 179.



## Appendix 2: terminology<sup>1</sup>

*Ateleia*, ἀτέλεια. Exemption from public burdens. In the case of foreign residents, especially ἀτέλεια τοῦ μετοικίου/τῶν μετοικίων, exemption from *metoikion*, metic tax (see below).

*Eisphora*, εἰσφορά. Emergency taxes, directed at property, levied by a decision of the assembly primarily for exceptional military-related needs, the sum depending on the situation.

*Enktesis*, ἔγκτησις. Generally, possession of property in a foreign country. Specifically in Athens a privilege awarded by the assembly, granting the recipient the right to purchase and own land and houses (γῆς καὶ οἰκίας) or houses alone (οἰκίας).

*Isoteleia*, ἰσοτέλεια. Equality of taxation. A privilege available to metics that made the recipient's tax obligations equal to those of citizens, and above all exempting the recipient from *metoikion* (see below).

*Isoteles*, ἰσοτελής. Literally 'paying alike, paying the same taxes'. A metic who had been awarded the *isoteleia* privilege (see above).

*Leitourgia*, λειτουργία. Public service. In Athens wealthy citizens (and metics) were expected to perform *liturgies*, compulsory public services, which they were to pay with their own money. The most important of these were *trierarchia*, the furnishing and command of a trireme, and *choregia*, the financing and training of a choir for a festival. Other *leitourgiai* were for example *gymnasiarchia*, responsibility for a team competing in an athletic festival; *hestiasis* ('feasting'), the provision of a banquet; and *architheoria*, the leadership of a public delegation to a foreign festival.

*Metoikia*, μετοικία. Generally a change of abode, migration; a settling as μέτοικος, the condition of a μέτοικος; in the context of Athens the system that regulated and constituted the official status of metics.

*Metoikion*, μετοίκιον. Metic tax, paid annually by metics in Athens. Men paid 12 drachmae, independent women (those without a guardian) 6 drachmae. *Metoikion* was an exceptional form of taxation in Athens because it was the only regular tax directed at the person. All the taxes paid by citizens were irregular (such as *eisphorai*) and directed at property. The punishment for the avoidance of *metoikion* was enslavement.

*Metoikos*, μέτοικος. Generally, changing one's abode, settling elsewhere; specifically a foreign settler. In Athens every person who settled in the *polis* permanently or (in the 4th century) beyond a defined time was required to register as metic. Through the registration the person became liable to pay taxes and perform military service.

---

<sup>1</sup> All definitions derived from: Liddell-Scott, Oxford Classical Dictionary.



## Bibliography

### Epigraphic sources: corpora and monographs

- Agora XV* = Meritt, B. D.; Traill, J. S. *The Athenian Agora. Results of excavations conducted by the American School of Classical Studies at Athens*, 15: *Inscriptions. The councillors*. Princeton 1974.
- Agora XVI* = Woodhead, A. G. *The Athenian Agora: results of excavations conducted by the American School of Classical Studies at Athens*, 16: *Inscriptions: the decrees*. Princeton 1997.
- Agora XVII* = Bradeen, D. W. *The Athenian Agora. Results of excavations conducted by the American School of Classical Studies at Athens*, 17: *Inscriptions. The funerary monuments*. Princeton 1974.
- Bresson, A. *Recueil des inscriptions de la Pérée rhodienne (Pérée intégrée)*. Annales littéraires de l'Université de Besançon, 445. Paris 1991.
- Flacelière, R; Robert, J; Robert, L. *Bulletin Épigraphique*. Tome 1: 1938–1939. Paris 1972.
- Fouilles Am. I = Fouilles d'Amizon en Carie, I: Exploration, histoire, monnaies et inscriptions*. Par J. Robert, L. Robert. Paris 1983.
- Inscr. Cret. = Inscriptiones Creticae*. I: *Tituli Cretae mediae praeter Gortynios*. II: *Tituli Cretae occidentalis*. Cur. M. Guarducci. Roma 1935, 1939.
- Inscr. Ilion = Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien, III: Die Inschriften von Ilion*. Hrsg. von P. Frisch. Bonn 1975.
- Inscr. Kyme = Inschriften von Erythrai und Klazomenai, V: Die Inschriften von Kyme*. Hrsg. von H. Engelmann. Bonn 1976.
- IG I<sup>3</sup> = Inscriptiones Graecae*. Vol. I editio tertia, fasc. I: *Inscriptiones Atticae Euclidis anno anteriores*. Ed. D. M. Lewis. Berlin 1981.
- IG II/III<sup>2</sup> = Inscriptiones Graecae*. Vol. II et III editio minor: *Inscriptiones Atticae Euclidis anno posteriores*. Ed. J. Kirchner. Berolini 1913–1935.
- IG VII = Inscriptiones Graecae*. Vol. VII. Ed. W. Dittenberger.
- IG IX<sup>2</sup> = Inscriptiones Graecae*. Voluminis IX partis I editio minor, fasc. I: *Inscriptiones Aitoliae*. Ed. G. Klaffenbach. Berolini 1932.
- IG XII = Inscriptiones Graecae*. Vol. XII: *Inscriptiones insularum maris Aegaei praeter Delum*. Fasc. I: *Inscriptiones Rhodi, Chalces, Carpathi cum Saro, Casi*. Ed. F.H. von Gärtringen. Berolini 1977.
- IG XII = Inscriptiones Graecae*. Vol. XII: *Inscriptiones insularum maris Aegaei praeter Delum*. Fasc. V: *Inscriptiones Cycladum*. Ed. F. H. von Gärtringen. Berolini 1961
- IG XII = Inscriptiones Graecae*. Vol. XII: *Inscriptiones insularum maris Aegaei praeter Delum*. Fasc. VII: *Inscriptiones Amorgi et insularum vicinarum*. Ed. J. Delamarre. Berolini 1966.
- IGRom = Inscriptiones Graecae ad Res Romanas pertinentes* Vol. IV. Ed. G. Lafay. Paris 1927.
- Iscr. Cos = Iscrizioni di Cos*. A cura di M. Segre. Monografie della Scuola archeologica di Atene e delle missioni italiane in oriente, 6.1: Testo. Roma 1993.
- OGI = Orientis Graeci inscriptiones selectae. Supplementum sylloges inscriptionum*

- Graecarum*. Ed. Wilhelm Dittenberger. Lipsiae 1903.  
*PA = Prosopographia Attica*. I–II. Ed. J. Kirchner. Berolini 1901–1903.  
 Petrakos, B. Ch. *Ο δήμος του Ραμνούντος. Σύνοψη των ανασκαφών και των ερευνών (1813–1998). II: Οι επιγραφές*. Βιβλιοθήκη της εν Αθήναις Αρχαιολογικής Εταιρείας, 182. Αθήναι 1999.  
*SEG = Supplementum epigraphicum Graecum*. Lugduni Batavorum 1923–.  
*Sylloge inscriptionum Graecorum*. Ed. W. Dittenberger. Lipsiae 1915–1924.

## Literary sources

Authors cited in the text are abbreviated according to Liddell and Scott's *Greek-English Lexicon* (see below). Where possible, Loeb editions have been used.

## Research literature

- Adak, M. *Metöken als Wohltäter Athens: Untersuchungen zum sozialen Austausch zwischen ortsansässigen Fremden und der Bürgergemeinde in klassischer und hellenistischer Zeit (ca. 500–150 v. Chr.)*. Quellen und Forschungen zur antiken Welt, 40. München 2003.
- Aleshire, S. B. 'Towards a definition of "state cult" for ancient Athens'. In: *Ancient Greek cult practice from the epigraphical evidence. Proceedings of the second international seminar on Ancient Greek cult, organised by the Swedish Institute at Athens, 22.–24. Nov. 1991*. Skrifter utgivna av Svenska institutet i Athens, #8, 13. Ed. Robin Hägg. Stockholm 1994. 9–16.
- Arnim, V. 'Chrysippos'. *RE* 8, 2 (1899) 2502–2509.
- Atkinson, K. M. T. 'The Seleucids and the Greek cities of Western Asia Minor'. *Antichthon* 2 (1968) 32–57.
- Bekker, I. (ed.). *Anecdota graece*. Vol. I. Berolini 1814.
- Beloch, J. *Griechische Geschichte*. 4. Bd., 2. Abt. 2. Berlin 1927.
- Boegehold, A. L. *The Athenian Agora: results of excavations conducted by the American School of Classical Studies at Athens*, 28: *The Lawcourts at Athens. Sites, buildings, equipment, procedure and testimonia*. Princeton 1995.
- Bugh, G. R. *The Horsemen of Athens*. Princeton 1988.
- Bultrighini, U. 'Pausania 1.26.3 et la liberazione del Pireo'. *RFIC* 112 (1984) 54–72.
- Carey, Ch. (ed., transl.). *Greek orators, VI: Apollodoros, Against Neaira: 59*. Warminster 1992.
- Carlton, E. *Ideology and Social Order*. London, Henley, Boston 1977.
- Clinton, K. 'A law in the city Eleusinion concerning the mysteries'. *Hesperia* 49 (1980) 258–288.
- Crosby, M. 'Greek inscriptions'. *Hesperia* 6 (1937) 442–468.
- Delplace, C. 'Le contenu social et économique du soulèvement d'Aristonikos: opposition entre riches et pauvres?' *Athenaeum* 56 (1978) 20–53.
- Demetrakos, D. *Δημητράκου Μέγα λεξικόν ελληνικῆς γλώσσας*. Αθήναι 1958.
- Dow, S. 'The list of *archontes*, I.G.<sup>2</sup> II 1706'. *Hesperia* 2 (1933) 418–446.
- Ferguson, W.S. *Hellenistic Athens. An Historical Essay*. 2nd ed. Chicago 1974.
- Finley, M. I. *Studies in Land and Credit in Ancient Athens, 500–200 B.C. The Horos*



- Inscriptions*. New Brunswick 1951.
- Finley, M. I. 'Aristotle and economic analysis'. In: *Studies in ancient society*. Ed. M. I. Finley. London, Henley, Boston 1974. 26–52.
- Finley, M. I. *The Ancient economy*. Sather Classical Lectures, 43. Berkeley 1973, reprinted with corrections, London 1975.
- Fraser, P. M.; Bean, G. M. *The Rhodian Peraea and Islands*. Oxford Classical & Philosophical Monographs. London 1954.
- Garlan, Y. 'Études d'histoire militaire et diplomatique'. *BCH* 89 (1965) 332–348.
- Gauthier, Ph. *Symbola. Les étrangers et la justice dans les cités grecques*. Annales de l'Est publ. par l'Univ. de Nancy, 2. Nancy 1972.
- Gauthier, Ph. 'La réunification d'Athènes en 281 et les deux archontes Nicias'. *REG* 92 (1979) 348–399.
- Gauthier, Ph. 'Études sur des inscriptions d'Amorgos' *BCH* 104 (1980) 197–220.
- Gauthier, Ph. 'Citoyens et étrangers dans les inscriptions hellénistiques.' *Annuaire de l'École Pratique des Hautes Études* 1978/79 (1982) 321–328.
- Gauthier, Ph. 'Metèques, périèques et paroikoi: Bilan et points d'interrogation.' In: *L'Étranger dans le monde grec. Actes du colloque organisé par l'Institut d'Études Anciennes, Nancy, mai 1987*. Trav. & mém. de l'Univ. de Nancy, 2. Nancy 1988. 23–46.
- Ghiron-Bistagne, P. *Recherches sur les acteurs dans la Grèce antique*. Paris 1976.
- Gottschalk, H. B. 'Notes on the wills of the Peripatetic scholars'. *Hermes* 100 (1972) 314–342.
- Habicht, Ch. *Untersuchungen zur politischen Geschichte Athens im 3. Jahrhundert v. Chr.* Vestigia, 30. München 1979.
- Habicht, Ch. *Studien zur Geschichte Athens in hellenistischer Zeit*. Hypomnemata, 73. Göttingen 1982 (1982a).
- Habicht, Ch. 'Eine Liste von Hieropoioi aus dem Jahre des Archons Andreas'. *MDAI(A)* 97 (1982) 171–184 (1982b).
- Habicht, Ch. *Athen in hellenistischer Zeit. Gesammelte Aufsätze*. München 1994.
- Habicht, Ch. *Athen. Die Geschichte der Stadt in hellenistischer Zeit*. München 1995.
- Habicht, Ch. 'Athens after the Chremonidean War: some second thoughts.' In: *The Macedonians in Athens 322–229 B.C. Proceedings of an International Conference held at the University of Athens, May 24–26, 2001*. Ed. O. Palagia, S. V. Tracy. Oxford 2003. 52–55.
- Hakkarainen, M. 'Private wealth in the Athenian public sphere during the late Classical and the early Hellenistic period.' In: *Early Hellenistic Athens. Symptoms of a Change*. Papers and Monographs of the Finnish Institute at Athens, 6. Ed. J. Frösén. Helsinki 1997. 1–32.
- Hamel, D. L. *Trying Neaira: the true story of a courtesan's scandalous life in ancient Greece*. New Haven 2003.
- Hammond, N. G. L. *The Macedonian State. Origins, institutions, and history*. Oxford 1989.
- Hansen, E. V. *The Attalids of Pergamon*. 2nd ed. rev. & expanded. Ithaca 1971.
- Harrison, A. R. W. *The Law of Athens. The Family and Property*. Oxford 1968.
- Harrison, A. R. W. *The Law of Athens. Procedure*. Oxford 1971.
- Henry, A. S. 'Polis/acropolis, Paymasters and the Ten Talent Fund'. *Chiron* 12 (1982)

- 91–118.
- Henry, A. S. *Honours and privileges in Athenian decrees. The principal formulae of Athenian honorary decrees*. Subsidia Epigraphica, 10. Hildesheim, Zürich, New York 1983.
- Hommel, R. 'Metoikoi'. *RE* 15, 2 (1932) 1413–1458.
- Hopp, J. *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der letzten Attaliden*. Vestigia, 25. München 1977.
- Kapparis, K. A. (ed.). *Demosthenes. Apollodoros 'Against Neaira' [D.59]*. Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte, Band 53. Berlin, New York 1999.
- Kent, J. H. 'A garrison inscription from Rhamnous'. *Hesperia* 10 (1941) 423–50.
- Knoepfler, D. 'Les *kryptoi* du stratège Epicharès à Rhamnonte et le début de la Guerre de Chrémonidès'. *BCH* 117 (1993) 327–341.
- Kralli, I. 'The date and context of divine honours for Antigonos Gonatas – a suggestion.' In: *The Macedonians in Athens 322–229 B.C. Proceedings of an international conference held at the University of Athens, May 24–26, 2001*. Ed. O. Palagia, S. V. Tracy. Oxford 2003. 61–66.
- Kougeas, S. V. 'Τρία ψηφίσματα Ραμνοῦντος'. *AEph* 1953–1954, A, 121–136.
- Kroll, J. H. *The Athenian Agora. Results of excavations conducted by the American School of Classical Studies at Athens*, 26: *The Greek Coins*. Princeton 1993.
- Kyle, D. G. *Athletics in ancient Athens*. Mnemosyne Supplementa, 95. Leiden 1987.
- Lauenstein, D. *Die Mysterien von Eleusis*. Stuttgart 1987.
- Launey, M. *Recherches sur les armées hellénistiques*. Tome II. Bibliothèque des écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, Fascicule cent soixante-neuvième. Paris 1950.
- Leiwo, M. 'Religion, or other Reasons? Private associations in Athens'. In: *Early Hellenistic Athens. Symptoms of a Change*. Papers and Monographs of the Finnish Institute at Athens, 6. Ed. J. Frösén. Helsinki 1997. 103–112.
- Leiwo, M.; Remes, P. 'Partnership of citizens and metics: the will of Epicurus'. *CQ* 49 (1999) 161–166.
- Lewis, D. M. 'Attic manumissions'. *Hesperia* 28 (1959) 208–238.
- Lewis, D. M. 'Dedications of phialai at Athens'. *Hesperia* 37 (1968) 368–380.
- Liddell-Scott = Liddell, H. G.; Scott, R. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. With a revised supplement. 9th ed., revised and augmented throughout by H. S. Jones. Ed. P. G. W. Glare. Oxford 1996.
- MacDowell, D. M. *The Law in Classical Athens*. London 1978.
- Mastrokostas, E. 'Ἀνασκαφή τάφων εν Ραμούντι'. *PAAH* 1958, 28–37.
- Maiuri, A. 'Viaggio di esplorazione in Caria. Parte III: Iscrizioni'. *ASAA* 4–5 (1921–1922) 461–488.
- Mattingly, H. B. 'Some problems in second century Attic prosopography.' *Historia* 20 (1971) 26–46.
- Meritt, B. D. 'Greek inscriptions'. *Hesperia* 7 (1938) 77–160.
- Meritt, B. D. 'Greek inscriptions'. *Hesperia* 11 (1942) 275–303.
- Meritt, B. D. *The Athenian Year*. Sather Classical Lectures, 32. Berkeley 1961.
- Meritt, B. D. 'Ransom of the Athenians by Epikerdes'. *Hesperia* 39 (1970) 111–114.
- Mikalson, J. D. *Religion in Hellenistic Athens*. Hellenistic culture and society, 29. Berkeley 1998.

- Morelli, D. 'Gli stranieri in Rodi', *SCO* 5 (1956) 132–133.
- Mylonas, G. E. *Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries*. Princeton 1961.
- NP = *Der Neue Pauly. Enzyklopädie der Antike* Ed. H. Cancik, H. Schneider. Stuttgart, Weimar 1996–2003.
- OCD = *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*. Ed. S. Hornblower, A. Spawforth. 3rd rev. ed. New York 2003.
- Oehler, J. 'Ἱεροποιοί'. *RE* 8, 2 (1913) 1583–1588.
- Ogden, D. *Greek bastardy in the Classical and Hellenistic periods*. Oxford Classical Monographs. Oxford, New York 1996.
- Olson, S. D. (ed.). *Aristophanes, Acharnians*. Oxford 2002.
- Osborne, M. J. 'The Last Athenian'. *AncSoc* 5 (1974) 83–104.
- Osborne, M. J. *Naturalization in Athens*, I–IV. *Verhandelingen van de koninklijke Academie voor Wetenschappen, Letteren en schone Kunsten van België. Letteren*, 98, 101, 109. Brussel 1981, 1982, 1983.
- Osborne, M. J. 'The Archonship of Nikias Hysteros and the secretary cycles in the third century'. *ZPE* 58 (1985) 275–295.
- Osborne, M. J. 'Shadowland: Athens under Antigonos Gonatas and his successor'. In: *The Macedonians in Athens 322–229 B.C. Proceedings of an international conference held at the University of Athens, May 24–26, 2001*. Ed. O. Palagia, S. V. Tracy. Oxford 2003. 67–75.
- Osborne, M. J.; Byrne, S. G. *The foreign residents of Athens. An annex to the "Lexicon of Greek personal names. Attica"*. *Studia Hellenistica*, 33. Leuven 1996.
- Pakkanen, P. *Interpreting Early Hellenistic Religion. A Study Based on the mystery cult of Demeter and the cult of Isis*. Papers and monographs of the Finnish Institute at Athens, 3. Helsinki 1995.
- Papazoglou, F. "Λαοί" et "paroikoi. *Recherches sur la structure de la société hellénistique*. Études d'histoire ancienne, 1. Beograd 1997.
- Parke, H. W. *Festivals of the Athenians*. Aspects of Greek & Roman life. London 1977.
- Pečírka, J. *The formula for the grant of enktesis in Attic inscriptions*. Acta Universitatis Carolinae, Philosophica et historica. Monographiae, 15. Praha 1966.
- Peek, W. 'Griechische Inschriften'. *MDAI(A)* 59 (1934) 35–80.
- Petrakos, B. Ch. 'Νέαι πηγαι περί τοῦ Χρημωνιδείων πολέμου'. *AD* 22 (1967) A, 38–52.
- Petrakos, B. Ch. 'Νέες ἐρευνῆς στὸν Ραμνοῦντα'. *AEph* 1979, 1–81.
- Petrakos, B. Ch. 'Ἀνασκαφή Ραμνοῦντος'. *PAAH* 134 (1979) 1–25.
- Petrakos, B. Ch. 'Ἀνασκαφή Ραμνοῦντος'. *PAAH* 139 (1984) 146–209.
- Petrakos, B. Ch. 'Ἀνασκαφή Ραμνοῦντος'. *PAAH* 140 (1985) 1–26.
- Petrakos, B. Ch. 'Ἀνασκαφή Ραμνοῦντος'. *PAAH* 141 (1986) 1–52.
- Petrakos, B. Ch. 'Ἀνασκαφή Ραμνοῦντος'. *PAAH* 144 (1989) 1–37.
- Petrakos, B. Ch. 'Ἀνασκαφή Ραμνοῦντος'. *PAAH* 145 (1990) 1–39.
- Petrakos, B. Ch. 'Ἀνασκαφή Ραμνοῦντος'. *PAAH* 146 (1991) 1–63.
- Picard, Ch. & Plassart, A. 'Inscriptions d'Eolide et d'Ionie'. *BCH* 37 (1913) 155–246.
- Pouilloux, J. 'Antigone Gonatas et Athènes après la guerre de Chrémonides'. *BCH* 70 (1946) 488–496.
- Pouilloux, J. *La forteresse de Rhamnonte: Étude de topographie et d'histoire*. Écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, Sér. 1:179. Paris 1954.

- Pouilloux, J. 'Trois décrets de Rhamnonte'. *BCH* 80 (1956) 57–75.
- Pritchett, W. K.; Meritt, B. D. *The Chronology of Hellenistic Athens*. Cambridge, Massachusetts 1940.
- RE* = *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*. Neue Bearbeitung. Stuttgart 1893–.
- Reger, G. 'Athens and Tenos in the early Hellenistic age'. *CQ* 42 (1992) 365–383.
- Rhodes, P. J. *A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia*. 2nd rev. ed. Oxford 1993.
- Robert, L. 'Sur un décret d'Ilion et sur un papyrus concernant les cultes royaux'. *AmStP* 1 (1966) 175–211.
- Roussel, P. 'Un nouveau document relatif à la guerre Démétrique'. *BCH* 54 (1930) 268–282.
- Schäfer, H. 'Paroikoi'. *RE* 18, 4 (1949) 1695–1707.
- Segre, M. 'Iscrizioni di Licia, I Tolomeo di Telmesso'. *Clara Rhodes* 9 (1938) 181–208.
- Shear Jr., T. L. *Kallias of Sphettos and the revolt of Athens in 286*. Hesperia Suppl., 17. Princeton 1978.
- Sherwin-White, S. M. *Ancient Kos. An historical study from the Dorian settlement to the Imperial period*. Hypomnemata, 51. Göttingen 1978.
- Smyth, H. W. *Greek Grammar*. Rev. by G.M. Messing. Cambridge 1956.
- Starkie, W. J. M. (ed.). *Aristophanes. The Acharnians of Aristophanes*. London 1909.
- Ste. Croix, G. M. E. de. *The Class Struggle in the Ancient Greek World*. London 1983.
- TGL* = Estienne, H. le Grand. *Thesaurus Graecae linguae*. Ed. C.B. Hase, W. Dindorf, L. Dindorf. A reprint of the edition of 1831–1865. Graz 1954.
- Thomsen, R. *Eisphora. A study of direct taxation in ancient Athens*. Humanitas, 3. København 1964.
- Todd, S. C. 'Status and contract in fourth-century Athens'. In: *SYMPOSION 1993. Vorträge zur griechischen und hellenistischen Geschichtsgeschichte (Graz-Andritz 12.–16. September 1993)*. Köln, Weimar, Wien 1994. 125–140.
- Todd, S. C. 'Status and gender in Athenian public records'. In: *SYMPOSION 1995. Vorträge zur Griechischen und hellenistischen Rechtsgeschichte (Korfu, 1.–5. September 1995)*. Köln, Weimar, Wien 1997. 113–124.
- Tracy, S. V. 'Two Attic letter cutters of the third century. 286/5–235/4 B.C.' *Hesperia* 57 (1988) 303–322.
- Tracy, S. V. *Attic Letter-Cutters of 229 to 86 B.C.* Berkeley 1990.
- Tracy, S. V. 'The Panathenaic festival and games: an epigraphic inquiry'. *Nikephoros* 4 (1991) 133–153.
- Tracy, S. V. 'Antigonos Gonatas, King of Athens'. In: *The Macedonians in Athens 322–229 B.C. Proceedings of an International Conference held at the University of Athens, May 24–26, 2001*. Ed. O. Palagia, S. V. Tracy. Oxford 2003. 56–61 (Tracy 2003a).
- Tracy, S. V. *Athens and Macedon: Attic letter-Cutters of 300 to 299 B.C.* Hellenistic Culture and Society, 38. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London 2003 (Tracy 2003b).
- Tracy, S. V.; Habicht, C. 'New and old Panathenaic victor lists'. *Hesperia* 60 (1991) 187–236.
- Vatin, C. *Recherches sur le mariage et la condition de la femme mariée à l'époque*

- hellénistique*. Bibliothèque des Ecoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, 216. Paris 1970.
- Walbank, M. B. *Athenian proxenies of the fifth century B.C.* Toronto, Sarasota 1978.
- Walbank, M. B. 'Proxenia for Euenor son of Euepios of Argos in Akarnania'. *ZPE* 86 (1991) 199–202.
- Walters, K. R. 'Perikles' citizenship law'. *ClAnt* 2 (1983) 314–336.
- Welles, C. B. *Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period. A Study of Greek Epigraphy*. New Haven 1934.
- Whitehead, D. *The Ideology of the Athenian Metic*. The Cambridge Philological Society Supplementary Volume 4. Cambridge 1977.
- Whitehead, D. 'Competitive outlay and community profit: *philotimia* in democratic Athens'. *Classica et Mediaevalia* 34 (1983) 55–74.
- Whitehead, D. 'The ideology of the Athenian metic: some pendants and a reappraisal.' *PCPhS* 212 (1986) 145–158.
- Wilhelm, A. "Επιγραφαὶ ἐξ Εὐβοίας (μετὰ Σ Ζυγκογραφημάτων)". *Aeph* 3 (1892) 119–179.
- Wörle, M. 'Epigraphische Forschungen zur Geschichte Lykiens II'. *Chiron* 8 (1978) 201–246.
- Zolotas, G. "Επιγραφαὶ Χίου καὶ Ἐρυθρῶν ἀνέκδοτοι". *Ἀθηνᾶ* 20 (1908) 119–302.



# Concordance of used inscriptions with dates

The concordances are arranged in alphabetical order and according to the primary edition used: the primary edition used is displayed in the leftmost column, and the other editions consulted in the columns to the right. All datings are B.C. unless otherwise indicated. Full details on the publications can be found in the bibliography. Henry, Pečirka and *Hesperia* 57 (1988) do not print the entire inscriptions but suggest new/alternate restorations or comment on the existing restorations. Papazoglou prints only the parts of the inscriptions relevant to her study. The following abbreviations are used:

Roman numerals = centuries

aft. = after

b. = beginning of

bef. = before

d. = decade

e. = end of

f. = first half of

l. = last

m. = middle of

s. = second half of

s. aft. = shortly after

s. bef. = shortly before

F, R, R = Flacèliere, Robert, Robert 1972

F, B = Fraser, Bean 1954

Henry = Henry 1983

Maiuri = Maiuri 1921–1922

Osborne = Osborne 1981–1983, I

Pap. = Papazoglou 1997

Pečirka = Pečirka 1966

Petr. = Petrakos 1999

Tracy = Tracy 2003b

1. <i>Agora</i>	<i>IG</i>	<i>Hesperia</i>	<i>SEG</i>	DATE
XV 61		35 (1966) 205–240		304/3
XV 232	II/III <sup>2</sup> 921			131/0
XVI 111	II/III <sup>2</sup> 564	29 (1960) 81–82, no. 157		307/6–302/1
XVI 164		13 (1944) 242–243, no. 7		300/299–295/4
XVI 166		37 (1968) 268–269, no. 4		295/4 or s. aft.

XVI 213	II/III <sup>2</sup> 791	29 (1960) 85, no. 163	XXXI 118	248/7
XVII 384	II/III <sup>2</sup> 7870			III
XVII 385				III/II
XVII 515	II/III <sup>2</sup> 8993			III/II
XVII 566	II/III <sup>2</sup> 9531			II

2. <i>BCH</i>	<i>IG</i>	DATE
89 (1965) 339–344	II/III <sup>2</sup> 1279	259/8

3. <i>IG</i> P, II/III <sup>2</sup>	<i>Agora</i>	Henry	<i>Hesperia</i>	Osb.	Pečirka	<i>SEG</i>	Tracy	DATE
P <sup>3</sup> 102; P <sup>2</sup> 110+ <i>Add.</i> p. 303		244	39 (1970) 111–114		18–19			410/9
P <sup>3</sup> 106; II/III <sup>2</sup> 48+ <i>Add.</i> p. 657					17–18			409/8
P <sup>3</sup> 125; II/III <sup>2</sup> 174					39–41			405/4
II/III <sup>2</sup> 43								377
II/III <sup>2</sup> 53					26–28			390–70 or bef. 387/6
II/III <sup>2</sup> 61		244						bef. 378/7
II/III <sup>2</sup> 80					29–31			bef. 378/7
II/III <sup>2</sup> 83					31–33			s. bef. 370?
II/III <sup>2</sup> 86					33–35			bef. 378/7
II/III <sup>2</sup> 109b		212, 242						363/2
II/III <sup>2</sup> 130					35–36			355/4
II/III <sup>2</sup> 132					37–38			355/4
II/III <sup>2</sup> 162(bc)					38–39			bef. 353/2
II/III <sup>2</sup> 180					42			ca. 375–350
II/III <sup>2</sup> 206					46			349/8
II/III <sup>2</sup> 211								348/7
II/III <sup>2</sup> 218								346/5
II/III <sup>2</sup> 237								338/7
II/III <sup>2</sup> 242, 373		206		D16	49–51	XL 74		337/6; 322/1 or 318
II/III <sup>2</sup> 245					72–74			s. aft. 383/2?
II/III <sup>2</sup> 276								342 or bef. 336/5



II/III <sup>2</sup> 279 II/III <sup>2</sup> 285 II/III <sup>2</sup> 287 II/III <sup>2</sup> 288 II/III <sup>2</sup> 334 II/III <sup>2</sup> 337 II/III <sup>2</sup> 343+ <i>Add.</i> p. 659 II/III <sup>2</sup> 351+624 II/III <sup>2</sup> 360 II/III <sup>2</sup> 396 II/III <sup>2</sup> 421 II/III <sup>2</sup> 422 II/III <sup>2</sup> 425 II/III <sup>2</sup> 466 II/III <sup>2</sup> 479 II/III <sup>2</sup> 480 II/III <sup>2</sup> 483 II/III <sup>2</sup> 492 II/III <sup>2</sup> 505 II/III <sup>2</sup> 516 II/III <sup>2</sup> 545 II/III <sup>2</sup> 551 II/III <sup>2</sup> 554 II/III <sup>2</sup> 582 II/III <sup>2</sup> 583 II/III <sup>2</sup> 645 II/III <sup>2</sup> 651 II/III <sup>2</sup> 653 II/III <sup>2</sup> 655 II/III <sup>2</sup> 657 II/III <sup>2</sup> 660	XVI 75		
		259–260	23 (1954) 314

	53-54 54-56			m. IV or s. aft. ca. 360-340 ca. m. IV 352-336 335/4-330/29 333/2 323/2? 330/29 325/4 321/0-319/18 bef. 318/17 336-318? ca. 350-325 307/6 305/4 ca. 305/4 304/3 303/2 302/1 e. IV 321/0 or 318/17 (s.?) bef. 307/6 307-304 e. IV e. IV 296/5 286/5 285/4 285/4 283/2 l. d. IV (a), 285/4 (b)
	63-67 68-70	XVIII 13  XXIV 103		
	74-75			
	81-84 84-85			
	91-92			
	93-95			



<p> II/III<sup>2</sup> 948  II/III<sup>2</sup> 956–965  II/III<sup>2</sup> 984  II/III<sup>2</sup> 1006  II/III<sup>2</sup> 1008  II/III<sup>2</sup> 1011  II/III<sup>2</sup> 1024  II/III<sup>2</sup> 1029  II/III<sup>2</sup> 1030  II/III<sup>2</sup> 1260  II/III<sup>2</sup> 1263  II/III<sup>2</sup> 1270  II/III<sup>2</sup> 1272  II/III<sup>2</sup> 1273  II/III<sup>2</sup> 1274  II/III<sup>2</sup> 1280  II/III<sup>2</sup> 1281, 1302–1308, 1313  II/III<sup>2</sup> 1285  II/III<sup>2</sup> 1287–1288  II/III<sup>2</sup> 1291  II/III<sup>2</sup> 1299  II/III<sup>2</sup> 1322  II/III<sup>2</sup> 1323  II/III<sup>2</sup> 1330  II/III<sup>2</sup> 1534B  II/III<sup>2</sup> 1553–1578  II/III<sup>2</sup> 1714, 1717–1719, 1721  –1722  II/III<sup>2</sup> 1937  II/III<sup>2</sup> 1938  II/III<sup>2</sup> 1954 </p>			57 (1988) 320–321
--	--	--	-------------------

		XXXVIII 114	ca. 190 161/0–109/8 m. II 122/1 119/8 106/5 ca. 205 96/5 ca. 105 late IV 300/299 298/7 267/6 III b. II 245–243 ca. 229/8–203 after 242/1 m. III m. III 235/4 aft. 229 ca. 200 aft. 163 248/7 320's I B.C., early I A.D.  157/6 ca. 150 306/5
		XXXVIII 131	

II/III <sup>2</sup> 1956.			
II/III <sup>2</sup> 1958			
II/III <sup>2</sup> 2313–2317			
II/III <sup>2</sup> 2318			
II/III <sup>2</sup> 2319			
II/III <sup>2</sup> 2323			
II/III <sup>2</sup> 2332			
II/III <sup>2</sup> 2334			
II/III <sup>2</sup> 2859			
II/III <sup>2</sup> 3038			
II/III <sup>2</sup> 3052			
II/III <sup>2</sup> 3055–3066			
II/III <sup>2</sup> 3063			
II/III <sup>2</sup> 3064			
II/III <sup>2</sup> 3068–3069			
II/III <sup>2</sup> 3071			
II/III <sup>2</sup> 3073			
II/III <sup>2</sup> 3078			
II/III <sup>2</sup> 3079–3083			
II/III <sup>2</sup> 3085, 3093			
II/III <sup>2</sup> 3781			
II/III <sup>2</sup> 6720			
II/III <sup>2</sup> 7721			
II/III <sup>2</sup> 7726, 7862			
II/III <sup>2</sup> 7863			
II/III <sup>2</sup> 7866			
II/III <sup>2</sup> 7867			
II/III <sup>2</sup> 7871			
II/III <sup>2</sup> 7872			
II/III <sup>2</sup> 7874			
II/III <sup>2</sup> 7876			28 (1959) 208–238

		XXXVIII 162	ca. 300 ca. 210 f. II late IV III/III 188–182/1 183/2 m. II III 364/3 328/7 320/19 e. V 384/3 344/3 ca. m. IV 307/6 b. III ca. 290–260 b. III ca. 150 II/I I II ca. 317/16 I II/I III II III II
		XXIX 219	

II/III <sup>2</sup> 7878 II/III <sup>2</sup> 8092, 8377, 8581, 8693 II/III <sup>2</sup> 9005 II/III <sup>2</sup> 9006 II/III <sup>2</sup> 9007 II/III <sup>2</sup> 9008, 9027 II/III <sup>2</sup> 9052 II/III <sup>2</sup> 9054 II/III <sup>2</sup> 9152 II/III <sup>2</sup> 9975 II/III <sup>2</sup> 9198, 9217 II/III <sup>2</sup> 9662 II/III <sup>2</sup> 9679, 9805, 9895, 9968 II/III <sup>2</sup> 9975 II/III <sup>2</sup> 10097 II/III <sup>2</sup> 10204, 10206, 10304 II/III <sup>2</sup> 10321 II/III <sup>2</sup> 10452			
--	--	--	--

<b>4. <i>IG</i> others</b>	<b><i>SEG</i></b>	<b>Pap.</b>	<b>DATE</b>
VII 190	XXXII 499	P25	I
VII 1862		P26	ca. 100
IX <sup>2</sup> 1, 25			ca. 238
XII 1, 1033		P16a	ca. 153
XII 5, 534		P12	III
XII 7, 390		P14b	II
XII 7, 515		P14a	ca. 100

<b>5. <i>Hesperia</i>, <i>Hesperia</i> Suppl.</b>	<b><i>IG</i></b>	<b>DATE</b>
2 (1933) 418–446	II/III <sup>2</sup> 1706	213/12
7 (1938) 100–109, no. 18		282/1



				I II I A.D. e. V aft. e. IV III bef. 250 III/II II II II III/II II m. II III/II II 295/4 or later
--	--	--	--	---

11 (1942) 281, no. 54 60 (1991) 188–189 <i>Suppl.</i> 17, pp. 2–4	296/5 f. II 270–269
---	---------------------------

6. Osb.	IG	<i>Hesperia</i>	SEG	DATE
D2	I <sup>3</sup> 102	9 (1940) 352 ff., no. 48	XII 84 XV 84, XVI 42	410/09
D4, D5	I <sup>3</sup> 127; II/III <sup>2</sup> 1			405/4, 403/2
D6	II/III <sup>2</sup> 10, 2403			401/0
D8	II/III <sup>2</sup> 17			394/3
D10	II/III <sup>2</sup> 103			369/8
D14	II/III <sup>2</sup> 226+ <i>Add.</i> p. 659			ca. 342
D25	II/III <sup>2</sup> 369+414 (b)+(c)		XXI 298	323/2
D42	II/III <sup>2</sup> 450			314/13
D44	II/III <sup>2</sup> 553			(?)304/3
D45	II/III <sup>2</sup> 486			304/3
D47	II/III <sup>2</sup> 558			ca. 303/2
D50	II/III <sup>2</sup> 374			319/8–318/7 or ca. 307–301
D51				ca. 306/5–302/1
D60	II/III <sup>2</sup> 495			303/2
D61	II/III <sup>2</sup> 496+507+ <i>Add.</i> p. 661			303/2
D66			XVI 59	ca. 307–302/1
D68	II/III <sup>2</sup> 646			295/4
D74	II/III <sup>2</sup> 662, 663+ <i>Add.</i> p. 663		XVI 62	286/5
D75	II/III <sup>2</sup> 652			just aft. 286/5
D76	II/III <sup>2</sup> 654			285/4
D77				ca. 286 or s. aft.
D78	II/III <sup>2</sup> 666, 667+ <i>Add.</i> p. 663			266/5
D79	II/III <sup>2</sup> 712			ca. 273–262
D80	II/III <sup>2</sup> 718+804			ca. 273–262
D81	II/III <sup>2</sup> 710+ <i>Add.</i> p. 665			286–262
D82			XXI 359	ca. 286–262

D83	II/III <sup>2</sup> 717+ <i>Add.</i> p. 666			286–262
D88	II/III <sup>2</sup> 707			262–239
D89	II/III <sup>2</sup> 570			(?)262–229
D90	II/III <sup>2</sup> 850+ <i>Add.</i> p. 668			198/7
D102	II/III <sup>2</sup> 979+ <i>Add.</i> p. 670			m. II
D103	II/III <sup>2</sup> 855			ca. 190–174/3
D104	II/III <sup>2</sup> 925+ <i>Add.</i> p. 668			ca. 190–166/5
D106	II/III <sup>2</sup> 922+ <i>Add.</i> p. 668			ca. 190–165
D107	II/III <sup>2</sup> 853+ <i>Add.</i> p. 668			148/7–135/4
D108	II/III <sup>2</sup> 981			ca. 148/7–135/4
D112	II/III <sup>2</sup> 980			ca. 150
D113	II/III <sup>2</sup> 982+ <i>Add.</i> p. 670			ca. 150

7. Pečírka	IG	SEG	DATE
pp. 43–45	II/III <sup>2</sup> 184	XXIV 92	350–325
pp. 47–49	II/III <sup>2</sup> 214		ca. m. IV

8. Petr.	IG	Hesperia	MDAI(A)	SEG	AEph, PAAH	DATE
No. 3	II/III <sup>2</sup> 1312 II/III <sup>2</sup> 1311	10 (1941) 342–350		III 125	<i>PAAH</i> 140 (1985) 13, no. 10	268/7
No. 12						239–229
No. 13						230's
No. 19				XLI 87		230's
No. 20					<i>PAAH</i> 144 (1989) 28–31, no. 14	235–229
No. 21				XLI 88	<i>PAAH</i> 145 (1990) 24, no. 2	aft. 235/4?
No. 22				XV 111		229
No. 23				XLIII 35	<i>PAAH</i> 146 (1991) 28, no. 3	aft. 229
No. 24				XL 136	<i>PAAH</i> 141 (1986) 14, no. 2	ca. 230–200
No. 25				XLI 89	<i>PAAH</i> 144 (1989) 27, no. 13	ca. 230–200
No. 26				XXII 128	<i>PAAH</i> 1958, 35–36	240–235
No. 27				XLIII 32	<i>PAAH</i> 146 (1991) 36, no. 11	ca. 250–200
No. 28				XXXVIII 126	<i>PAAH</i> 139 (1984) 203–205	ca. 225

No. 30	II/III <sup>2</sup> 1309		59 (1934) 41–42, no. 3	XLIII 36	<i>PAAH</i> 146 (1991) 30, no. 4	aft. 229
No. 31				XLI 90	<i>AEph</i> 1953 - 1954, A, 130–131, no. 3	225/4
No. 32				XLIII 38	<i>PAAH</i> 145 (1990) 21–24, no. 1	222/1
No. 34				XLI 91	<i>PAAH</i> 146 (1991) 32, no. 6	222/1
No. 35				XLI 92	<i>PAAH</i> 145 (1990) 27, no. 6	ca. 222/1
No. 38				XXXI 119	<i>PAAH</i> 145 (1990) 33–36, no. 19	218/17
No. 40				XXXVIII 132	<i>PAAH</i> 134 (1979) 25, no. 2	after 229/8?
No. 41				XL 138	<i>PAAH</i> 139 (1984) 200–201, no. 131	after 229/8?
No. 42				XV 113	<i>PAAH</i> 141 (1986) 16, no. 5	ca. 229
No. 43				XLIII 41	<i>AEph</i> 1953 - 1954, A, 126 no. 2	215/14
No. 44				XLIII 34	<i>PAAH</i> 146 (1991) 33, no. 7	aft. 216/15
No. 45				XLIII 40	<i>PAAH</i> 147 (1992) 31, no. 1	ca. 229?
No. 46				XL 141	<i>PAAH</i> 146 (1991) 34, no. 8	214/13
No. 47				XLIII 42	<i>PAAH</i> 141 (1986) 13, no. 1	212/11
No. 48					<i>PAAH</i> 141 (1991) 35, no. 9	210/09?
No. 49					<i>PAAH</i> 134 (1979) 24 no. 2	207/6
No. 50					<i>PAAH</i> 145 (1990) 39–41, no. 14	after 207/6
No. 51				XXII 130	<i>PAAH</i> 1958, 29–30	209/8 or 208/7?
No. 55				XXII 129	<i>PAAH</i> 1958, 36–37	s. III
No. 57				XXXI 112	<i>AEph</i> 1979, 72 no. 28	e. III
No. 59					<i>PAAH</i> 145 (1990) 31–32, no. 15	III
No. 151						e. II–b. I

9. SEG	IG	Petr.	DATE
III 122	289 + 372	No. 8	m. 250's
III 160, 167, 175, 185			II
III 194			III
XV 104			127/6
XIX 279			II?
XXI 300			322/1
XXII 122			e. IV (aft. 316/15)

XXIV 114			IV or s. aft.
XXIV 117			e. IV
XXIV 225			133/2 or s. aft.
XXV 84			295/4 or s. aft.
XXV 106			226/5
XXXII 10	I <sup>3</sup> 227 + II/III <sup>2</sup> 65		425/3 and 399/8
XXXII 218	II/III <sup>2</sup> 2336		103/2–97/6
XXXV 84	II/III <sup>2</sup> 644		296/5
XXXVI 142	II/III <sup>2</sup> 265		early IV
XXXIX 73	II/III <sup>2</sup> 404		bef. 350 (363/2?)
XLI 107			332/1
XLIX 200			ca. 100

10. Other inscriptions	BCH	Maiuri	OGI	SEG	Pap.	DATE
'Αθήνα 20 (1908) 200–204, no. ζ' F, R, R 1972, 504–505, no. 380 F, B 1954, 45 ff., no. 42 <i>Fouilles.Am.</i> I, 186–187 <i>Inscr.Cret.</i> VIII 8; XXVI 1 <i>IGRom</i> IV 289 <i>Inscr.Ilion</i> 32 <i>Inscr.Kyme</i> 13 <i>MDAI(A)</i> 32 (1907) 423 <i>Syll.</i> <sup>3</sup> 344 Welles 1934, no. 16	37 (1913) 212–214, no. 27	479, no. 22	55  338 219	XXXIII 1036–7	P4  P8 P5b P2b P1 P3a P2c P5a P2a	e. III ca. 240 early II b. II lat. years of III 133 s. aft. 280 s. II e. II–I ca. 303 ca. 260













## Papers and Monographs of the Finnish Institute at Athens

- I Paavo Castrén (ed.), POST-HERULIAN ATHENS. ASPECTS OF LIFE AND CULTURE IN ATHENS A.D. 267-529. Helsinki 1994. ISBN 951-95295-2-7. xi + 192 pp. + 34 figs. (Out of Print)
- II Björn Forsén and Greg Stanton (eds.), THE PNYX IN THE HISTORY OF ATHENS. PROCEEDINGS OF AN INTERNATIONAL COLLOQUIUM ORGANISED BY THE FINNISH INSTITUTE AT ATHENS, 7-9 OCTOBER 1994. Helsinki 1996. ISBN 951-95295-3-5. vi + 142 pp. + 2 pls. + 68
- III Petra Pakkanen, INTERPRETING EARLY HELLENISTIC RELIGION. A STUDY BASED ON THE MYSTERY CULT OF DEMETER AND THE CULT OF ISIS. Helsinki 1996. ISBN 951-95295-175 pp. + app.
- IV Björn Forsén, GRIECHISCHE GLIEDERWEIHUNGEN. EINE UNTERSUCHUNG ZU IHRER TYPOLOGIE UND IHRER RELIGIONS- UND SOZIALGESCHICHTLICHEN BEDEUTUNG. Helsinki 1996. ISBN 951-95295-5-1. ii + 225 S. + 115 Abb.
- V Arja Karivieri, THE ATHENIAN LAMP INDUSTRY IN LATE ANTIQUITY. Helsinki 1996. ISBN 951-95295-6-X. ii + 328 pp. + 39 figs. + 56 pls.
- VI Jaakko Frösén (ed.), EARLY HELLENISTIC ATHENS. SYMPTOMS OF A CHANGE. Helsinki 1997. ISBN 951-95295-7-8. iv + 226 pp. + 16 pls.
- VII Olli Salomies (ed.), THE GREEK EAST IN THE ROMAN CONTEXT. PROCEEDINGS OF AN INTERNATIONAL COLLOQUIUM ORGANIZED BY THE FINNISH INSTITUTE AT ATHENS, MAY 21 AND 22, 1999. Helsinki 2001. ISBN 951-98806-0-7. ii + 217 pp. + 2 figs. + 9 pls. + 3 maps.
- VIII Leena Pietilä-Castrén and Marjaana Vesterinen (eds.), GRAPTA POIKILA I. Helsinki 2003. ISBN 951-98806-1-5. 133 pp. + 16 figs.
- IX Maria Gourdouba, Leena Pietilä-Castrén and Esko Tikkala (eds.), THE EASTERN MEDITERRANEAN IN THE LATE ANTIQUE AND EARLY BYZANTINE PERIODS. Helsinki 2004. ISBN 951-98806-3-1. 98 pp. + 49 figs.
- X Petra Pakkanen, AUGUST MYHRBERG AND NORTH-EUROPEAN PHILHELLENISM. BUILDING THE MYTH OF A HERO. Helsinki 2006. ISBN 951-98806-5-8. ix + 260 pp. + 21 figs.
- XI Leena Pietilä-Castrén, THE GRAECO-ROMAN TERRACOTTA FIGURINES OF FINLAND AND THEIR COLLECTORS. Helsinki 2007. ISBN 978-951-98806-6-2. 100 pp. + 76 figs.
- XII Maria Niku, THE OFFICIAL STATUS OF THE FOREIGN RESIDENTS IN ATHENS 322-120 B.C. Helsinki 2007. ISBN 978-951-98806-7-9. ii + 181 pp. + app.

### Distribution:

Bookstore Tiedekirja, Kirkkokatu 14 - FIN-00170 Helsinki, Finland  
(fax: + 358-9-635 017, e-mail: tiedekirja@tsv.fi)



FINNISH INSTITUTE AT ATHENS

ISSN 1237-2684  
ISBN 978-951-98806-7-9