

City University of New York (CUNY)

## CUNY Academic Works

---

Dissertations, Theses, and Capstone Projects

CUNY Graduate Center

---

6-2017

### A Survey of Athenian Block Grants of Citizenship

Mary Jean E. McNamara

*The Graduate Center, City University of New York*

[How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!](#)

More information about this work at: [https://academicworks.cuny.edu/gc\\_etds/2142](https://academicworks.cuny.edu/gc_etds/2142)

Discover additional works at: <https://academicworks.cuny.edu>

---

This work is made publicly available by the City University of New York (CUNY).

Contact: [AcademicWorks@cuny.edu](mailto:AcademicWorks@cuny.edu)

A SURVEY OF ATHENIAN BLOCK GRANTS OF CITIZENSHIP

by

Mary Jean E. McNamara

A master's thesis submitted to the Graduate Faculty in Classics in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts, The City University of New York

2017

© 2017

MARY JEAN E. MCNAMARA

All Rights Reserved

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the Graduate Faculty in Classics in satisfaction  
of the thesis requirement for the degree of Master of Arts.

---

Date

---

Jennifer Tolbert Roberts

Thesis Advisor

---

Date

---

Dee L. Clayman

Executive Officer

THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

ABSTRACT

A Survey of Athenian Block Grants of Citizenship

by

Mary Jean E. McNamara

Advisor: Jennifer Tolbert Roberts

During the fifth and fourth centuries BCE, the Athenians awarded block grants of citizenship to several groups of allies who had served to protect and defend Athenian democracy. This paper examines some examples of these block grants and the degree to which foreigners were afforded the same protections and privileges awarded to native-born Athenian citizens.

## Acknowledgments

I would like to thank Professors Jennifer Roberts, Dee Clayman, and Peter Simpson for their encouragement and support in helping me trudge the many miles it took to obtain this long-awaited Master's degree in Classics. In addition, I would like to thank Professors Joy Connolly, Danielle Kellogg, Hardy Hansen, Michèle Lowrie, Sarah Peirce, and David Sider for serving as great examples of what dedication and discipline looks like.

## Table of Contents

Chapter One	1
Chapter Two	32
Chapter Three	44
Bibliography	47

A SELECTED SURVEY OF INDIVIDUAL AND BLOCK GRANTS OF CITIZENSHIP  
IN ATHENS c. 427–352 BCE

CHAPTER ONE

BLOCK GRANTS OF CITIZENSHIP

Between 427 and 335 BCE, Athens issued at least five block grants of citizenship to citizens from Plataea (427); Samos (403/2); and Olynthus (348). In addition, a group of *metics* who participated in the overthrow of the Thirty in 403 were awarded a grant of *isoteleia*. Each decree was based on a particular set of historical and political circumstances which influenced the degree of access to the privileges and obligations that characterized citizenship grants to non-Athenians. An examination of what at first might appear to be a relatively open immigration policy reveals a complex set of provisions and restrictions that casts doubt on the idea that these block grants awarded a type of citizenship equivalent to that of the native Athenian citizen.

According to MacDowell in *The Law in Classical Athens*, “[a] person who was not entitled by birth to be a citizen could not normally become one. There was no regular procedure of naturalization. However, there were exceptional cases in which citizenship was conferred on aliens.”<sup>1</sup> MacDowell cites Plutarch’s *Life of Solon* for evidence of the historical precedent of admitting non-Athenians into the city. According to Plutarch’s account, non-Athenian tradesmen and their families were invited to Athens in the seventh century in order to increase commercial production in the pottery trade in order to surpass Corinth. In addition to offering citizenship for

---

<sup>1</sup> D. M. MacDowell 1978: 70-71.

economic reasons, Solon was motivated by humanitarian concerns and afforded citizenship to those seeking political asylum after being expelled from their homeland.<sup>2</sup>

The central question that this thesis aims to look at is the degree to which non-Athenians were admitted into the Athenian democracy. The evidence is limited and sometimes contradictory. Much of what we know comes from references to the block grants in testimony recorded by Demosthenes and Isocrates. In addition, there are fragments from inscriptions which appeared on *stelai* in Athens. While there is evidence that the Plataeans, for example, were the recipients of a citizenship grant, scholars continue to question the degree to which this foreign-born group achieved full citizenship status. Another consideration is the time period during which the block grants were issued, seventy-five years, between the first example cited below, 427 BCE, and the last example, 352 BCE. This period was a turbulent one in Athenian history, characterized by enormous fluctuation in the constitution and organization of Athenian politics, which inhibits one's ability to draw any hard and fast conclusions. In the absence of a complete record of the time period, our evidence is limited to inscriptions and references contained in our surviving literary sources. In my attempt to understand the nature of the evidence, I have relied on David Whitehead's advice concerning the surviving evidence and what it can tell us about the extent to which non-Athenians were admitted into the city and the extent of rights that they enjoyed as naturalized citizens. In *The Ideology of the Athenian Metic*, Whitehead writes:

---

<sup>2</sup> Plut. 24.4.1-5: Παρέχει δ' ἀπορίαν καὶ ὁ τῶν δημοποιήτων νόμος, ὅτι γενέσθαι πολίτας οὐ δίδωσι πλὴν τοῖς φεύγουσιν ἀειφυγία τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἢ πανεστίους Ἀθήναζε μετοικισομένοις ἐπὶ τέχνῃ. τοῦτο δὲ ποιῆσαι φασιν αὐτὸν οὐχ οὕτως ἀπελαύνοντα τοὺς ἄλλους, ὡς κατακαλούμενον Ἀθήναζε τούτους ἐπὶ βεβαίῳ τῷ μεθέξειν τῆς πολιτείας, καὶ ἅμα πιστοὺς νομίζοντα τοὺς μὲν ἀποβεβληκότας τὴν ἑαυτῶν διὰ τὴν ἀνάγκην, τοὺς δ' ἀπολελοιπότας διὰ τὴν γνώμην.

Metic studies have been beset by claims of general applicability for certain data and the dismissal of others as foibles or aberrations. But no such subjective hierarchy of evidence is permissible – indeed it defeats the whole object of the exercise – and . . . it is the immense range and variety . . . and to a large extent each author is a law unto himself, and at times one suspects that the more consciously programmatic a statement purports to be, the less general applicability it has.<sup>3</sup>

According to Pericles' citizenship law of 451/0, Athenian citizens were those born in Athens to parents who were both Athenian. Pericles' law stipulated that an Athenian citizen needed to own property, a provision that remained in effect until 400 BCE. Slaves, metics, and boys under the age of 18 were not citizens. Women were considered citizens, denoted by feminine form of the Greek nouns, *aste* for *astos* and *politis* for *politēs*. Women shared in the construction and maintenance of citizen identity exclusively through their sexual and reproductive roles in the family as the guarantors of Athenian kinship. As citizens, they were not registered in the deme lists to which they belonged, since citizenship was proven through patrilineal descent.<sup>4</sup> This invisibility in the citizen rolls leads Loraux to dispute the idea that women could be considered "citizens," since women gained nothing in terms of legal protections and the right to participate in the democracy.<sup>5</sup> If a woman inherited her family's estate, she acted as a place-holder until she married and produced a male heir. After Pericles' citizenship law, the ethnic identity of women became more conspicuous as only those children born to both an Athenian mother and father were able to access full citizenship status. Male citizens could sue another citizen, serve on a jury, become a member of the Assembly and the Council, and could

---

<sup>3</sup> Whitehead 1977: 27.

<sup>4</sup> Sealey 1990: 13.

<sup>5</sup> Loraux 1993: 119.

participate in religious festivals as an officiant. Women were not able to bring a case to court nor were they allowed to sit as jurors.

In terms of the personal character traits that defined a citizen, scholars such as Arlene Saxonhouse, Josiah Ober, Jill Frank, and Vincent Farenga among others have studied the ways in which the political and the personal were linked. In *Citizen and Self in Ancient Greece*, Farenga predicates Athenian citizenship on personal honor. Personal honor affords the citizen the ability to protect and uphold his family interest without harming others. As a result of his personal conduct, the citizen had the right to participate in the city's affairs.<sup>6</sup>

If personal honor deemed an individual worthy of enjoying citizenship, how did Athens award block grants of citizenship to groups without vetting them individually? In the examples of block grants of citizenship discussed below, the recipients had defended the Athenian democracy and this act secured honor in the eyes of the Athenians. Nevertheless, despite acting honorably, the degree to which these non-Athenians were brought into the democracy as full participants is questionable. If we accept that the Plataeans, for instance, did receive a citizenship grant that afforded them something akin to full citizenship, how did the Athenians regard their descendants? This question and others forms the basis of the following discussion to determine what kind of citizenship rights foreign-born "Athenians" held.

---

<sup>6</sup> Farenga 2006: 85. Farenga views personal honor as the primary requirement of citizenship, stating that one must have, "an individual *timê* deserving recognition from others sufficient to maintain a positive public image; a qualified personal autonomy permitting one to exercise his will in individual and family interest without endangering community welfare; and deliberative freedoms that include participation with peers in assembling, speaking, and in the exchange of reason giving."

## Plataean Citizenship: Historical Context

A block grant of citizenship was awarded to the Plataeans who survived the siege of Plataea by Thebes from 429 to 427 and then escaped to Athens. During the sixth century and into the early fifth century, Plataea was traditionally aligned with the city-states of Boeotia, which was located north of Plataea and was separated from Plataea by the Asopus River. In the late sixth century, Athens became increasingly aggressive towards city-states aligned with the Boeotian League. This policy signified a re-ordering of the political and military ties in the region as Athens exposed itself to the risk of future military involvement.<sup>7</sup> At the time, Sparta was asserting itself by expanding the borders of her alliance with Megara.<sup>8</sup> The Athenian tyrant, Hippias, son of Peisistratus, became increasingly unpopular in Athens as he directed a campaign to antagonize city-states historically hostile to Athens while recruiting city-states like Plataea as Athenian allies.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> Herodotus describes the alleged refusal of the Spartans to come to the assistance of the Plataeans when the Plataeans sent an embassy to Cleomenes, who declined to help on account of the distance between Sparta and Plataea. Instead, the Spartans recommended that Plataea seek assistance from Athens, Hdt. 6108.18.

<sup>8</sup> See Sealey 1976: 88 for a description of Sparta's increased predominance on the Greek peninsula in the late sixth century.

<sup>9</sup> See Ehrenberg 1973: 88, for a summary of the deterioration of Athenian security as a result of Hippias' decision to come to the aid of Plataea, which strengthened Spartan influence as Thebes led the Boeotian League to seek an alliance with Sparta.

After Hippias intervened in the Plataeans' decision to leave the Boeotian League in 519, the Plataeans served as Athenian allies, most notably at the battle of Marathon in 490.<sup>10</sup> In 479, Athens and Plataea fought alongside the Spartans to repel the Persian attack led by Mardonius in the area surrounding Plataea, at the foot of Mt. Cithaeron.<sup>11</sup> During the fifth century, military and political alliances shifted as the city-states of the Greek peninsula struggled to maintain independence while the larger states of Persia, Sparta, and Athens attempted to establish control in the Peloponnese. In time, Plataea backed away from Athens as the Athenians became more aggressive in their effort to expand its commercial influence in the northern Aegean and the ports of Thrace in the 460's.

Thucydides recounts the escalating tension between Sparta and Athens that led to the first Peloponnesian War and describes Plataea's role in the larger conflict. According to Thucydides' account, when Plataea was facing pressure from Thebes to join the Boeotian League, Plataea sent an embassy to Athens seeking military support to defend itself against the anticipated attack from Thebes. According to Herodotus, the Plataeans pledged their "whole army" to the Athenians in recognition of the support the Athenians had provided.<sup>12</sup> Plataea received Athenian protection

---

<sup>10</sup> Ehrenberg 1973: 138 which describes the arrival of the Plataeans at Marathon where the Athenians were preparing to meet the Persians in battle. Ehrenberg perhaps goes too far in attributing this assistance to the nobility or altruism of the Plataeans. He writes, "The small Boeotian town (Plataea) had remembered the help Athens had given it against Thebes. Although the Plataeans had been given protection ever since and might expect to need it again in the future, their present action was much less a matter of politics than of genuine gratitude and friendship." This reading seems to overlook the fact that Plataea had effectively severed ties with the rest of Boeotia by soliciting help from the Athenians in their bid to remain outside of the Boeotian League when threatened by Thebes. Arguably, if Athens fell to the Persians, Plataea was more than likely to suffer the same fate. The assistance of the Plataeans was based on self-preservation.

<sup>11</sup> See Herodotus 9.28 for an account of the battle at Plataea which included 600 Plataean troops alongside 8,000 from Athens.

<sup>12</sup> Hdt. 6.108.3-6.

and avoided falling under Theban control. This alliance proved costly to Athens because Thebes became more aligned with Sparta in response to Athens' support of Plataea.

By 431, Plataea and Athens were allied against the increasing threat of the Spartan military alliance with Thebes. When a small force of 300 Thebans launched a surprise night-time assault on Plataea, the Plataeans sent a messenger to Athens to alert them of the attack. Athens sent back word to the Plataeans not to harm the Thebans, but the message arrived too late. The Plataeans captured and killed 180 Thebans. In response, Thebes besieged Plataea beginning in the autumn of 429 through to the summer of 427. To assist their allies, Athens shipped grain along with 80 soldiers to support the Plataeans while conveying most of the women, the children and the elderly out of Plataea to Athens.<sup>13</sup> As was seen in Athens' earlier involvement in Plataea, the alliance came at a high price for Athens. Thucydides describes the siege of Plataea as one of the smaller conflicts that led to what became the Peloponnesian War.

In the summer of 427, the Plataeans, who had survived the siege for nearly two years, finally ran out of supplies and surrendered to the Thebans.<sup>14</sup> This surrender ceded control of the city to the Thebans, effectively rendering any Plataean stateless. Sparta conducted a trial of the remaining Plataeans that resulted in putting the Plataeans to death.

---

<sup>13</sup> Some women (110) were retained in Plataea to serve as cooks according to Thucydides, see 2.78.3, αὐτοὶ δὲ ἐπολιορκοῦντο ἐγκαταλελειμμένοι τετρακόσιοι, Ἀθηναίων δὲ ὀγδοήκοντα, γυναῖκες δὲ δέκα καὶ ἑκατὸν σιτοποιοί.

<sup>14</sup> Thucydides 2.2-6 refers to the events of the siege in which the Plataeans, in violation of the truce between Athens and the Peloponnese, killed the surviving members of the Theban forces who occupied Plataea. This event took place before the Athenians managed to get a messenger to the Plataeans ordering them not to take any action until the Athenians arrived, according to Thucydides account: “. . . καὶ ἐς τὴν Πλάταιαν ἔπεμψαν κήρυκα, κελεύοντες εἰπεῖν μηδὲν”

## Plataean Citizenship Decree

Plataeans who escaped from the city before it was occupied by Spartan forces retreated to Athens where they requested and received citizenship. Thucydides explains that the Plataeans gained citizenship in recognition of their previous military service as an Athenian ally, dating back almost one hundred years to the time of Hippias.<sup>15</sup> The decree originally appeared on the Acropolis and memorialized the heroism of the Plataeans as Athenian allies.

Our knowledge of the decree comes from a speech attributed to Apollodorus in Demosthenes 59, *Against Neaera*.<sup>16</sup> Apollodorus distinguishes between resident aliens like Neaera, the former courtesan and wife of his rival, Stephanos, and naturalized citizens, like his father who was reportedly a naturalized citizen. Apollodorus recites from memory the decree proposed by Hippocrates that awards full citizenship to the Plataeans:<sup>17</sup>

“Hippocrates proposed that the Plataeans be Athenians from this day, fully enfranchised like the other Athenians, and they will have a share in everything that the Athenians have a share in, both sacred and secular, except for any priesthood or rite, . . . nor the nine archons, but their offspring . . . the Plataeans are to be distributed among the demes and the tribes. Once they have been distributed, no other Plataean is to become an Athenian unless this award is granted by the Athenian people.”<sup>18</sup>

Isocrates 12.94 also mentions the equality the Plataeans enjoyed as full members of the citizenry following the block citizenship grant and refers to the same decree that Apollodorus

---

<sup>15</sup> See Ehrenberg 1973: 88 for discussion of Athens’ emergence as a political power in Boeotia, which began when the Athenian tyrant, Hippias, agreed to offer military assistance to Plataea. Plataea sent an embassy to Athens to request assistance against the possibility of a Theban siege of their city. Hippias agreed to undertake this commitment, which represented an unprecedented expansion of Athenian military engagement in Boeotia at the time.

<sup>16</sup> The defense claimed that the children were from Stephanus’ previous marriage with an Athenian woman.

<sup>17</sup> See Dem. 59.104. For a detailed discussion of the decree and its reception among scholars, see Kapparis 1995: 373. Kapparis notes that Apollodorus’ testimony was most likely intentionally ambiguous in an attempt to cast doubt on the defendant’s claims of citizenship through the block grant issued to the Plataeans.

<sup>18</sup> Translation from A. Wolpert and K. Kapparis 2011: 220-1.

recites in *Against Neaera*. Isocrates' recollection of the decree matches Apollodorus', citing the decree's claim that the Plataeans would share all citizenship rights with Athenian-born citizens: "Πλαταίων δὲ τοὺς περιγενομένους πολίτας ἐποίησαντο καὶ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων αὐτοῖς ἀπάντων μετέδωσαν."<sup>19</sup>

Thucydides includes three references to Plataean assimilation into the Athenian citizenry. The Plataeans first appear in an imagined dialogue that Thucydides constructs between the leaders of Sparta and Plataea. In the dialogue, the Plataeans remind the Spartans of Sparta's refusal in 519 to assist Plataea militarily. At the time, Thebes threatened to attack the Plataeans for refusing to join forces in the Boeotian League. Because of Sparta's refusal to offer assistance, the Plataeans were forced to seek help from Athens, and thus became Athenian allies.<sup>20</sup> The imagined encounter continues as the Spartans respond to the Plataeans, stating that they had no right to attack Sparta, since they "became allies and citizens of Athens."<sup>21</sup>

Thucydides mentions the Plataeans again, this time referring to the period after Plataea was destroyed by Thebes in the two-year siege. Thucydides highlights the ninety-three year alliance between Plataea and Athens and calls the Plataeans, "ξύμμαχοι."<sup>22</sup> Later In book five, he mentions the Plataeans and their status as Athenian allies which entitles them to receive a grant of land that had been Scione.<sup>23</sup> The Plataeans were collectively relocated to Scione in 420 after the Athenians conquered the native population who were then either slaughtered or sold into

---

<sup>19</sup> Isocrates: 12.94

<sup>20</sup> Thuc. 3.55.3.

<sup>21</sup> Thuc. 3.63.2.

<sup>22</sup> Thuc. 3.68.5

<sup>23</sup> Thuc. 5.32.1

slavery. In his commentary on the *Athenaion Politeia*, Rhodes cites ( AP13.5) for evidence of the assimilation of this group into the Athenian citizenry.<sup>24</sup>

### **Plataean Citizenship: Forensic Evidence**

The law courts regularly considered the issue of determining an individual's claim to Athenian citizenship. Questions surrounding Plataean citizenship include the types of legal protections that were afforded and regulations that limited participation in Athenian religious festivals. Scholars continue to debate the degree to which Plataeans were admitted into Athenian society as independent citizens with property rights and an opportunity to establish financial security.

Lysias 3 provides one example where the question of Plataean citizenship is contested. The case, a *trauma ek pronoias*, or 'wounding with intent,' involved a male prostitute, Theodotos, who witnessed an assault. While the case centers on the claims of an unknown defendant, Theodotos was called as a witness for his client, Simon, who brought the case to trial. While Simon is recognized by the court as an Athenian citizen, Lysias' depiction of Theodotos' citizenship status has prompted scholars to review the case in an attempt to refute the citizenship claims of Theodotos. Some of this concern is motivated by the idea that Athenian males worked as prostitutes.<sup>25</sup>

---

<sup>24</sup> See P. J. Rhodes 1981: 188. Rhodes writes that individuals believed to have supported Peisistratus were deprived of citizenship while former resident aliens such as the descendants of craftsmen were awarded citizenship.

<sup>25</sup> See E. Cohen 2000: 169-170. Cohen refutes K. J. Dover's claim that Athenian citizens did not work as prostitutes found in Dover 1978: 32-3. Cohen asserts that Athenian men worked as prostitutes and therefore Dover's claim that Theodotos must be a foreigner living in Athens because of his occupation as a prostitute is invalid. Cohen essentially argues for two points, the first that Theodotos was a citizen by virtue of his absorption into the citizen body as a Plataean, and secondly, Cohen argues that not only did the *metics* worked as male prostitutes but so did Athenian men. For the argument that Theodotos' depiction refers to his Plataean identity as a recognizable sub-category of Athenian citizenship, see Fisher 1976: 54. Todd notes as an "extreme view" the idea that Lysias is simply lying, an argument that Todd attributes to Francken 1865: 31.

In Lysias 3, Theodotos is introduced at §5 as being from Plataea. This information does not suggest anything more than that the youth is recognized as part of the group of Plataeans who were granted citizenship and who enjoyed full citizenship status. However, Theodotos' identity as a Plataean litigant becomes more troublesome when at §33 he is referred to as a *paidion*, a term that typically relates to a child, presumably under the age of seven. According to Todd's commentary on the speech, Lysias' use of the term is intended to "play on ambiguities in Theodotos' status."<sup>26</sup> The significance of referring to Theodotos as a *paidion* becomes more problematic when the speaker claims at the end of §33 that if he had done anything illegal at Simon's house, his companion, Theodotos, would have been able to serve as a witness under torture, μηνῦσαι δὲ ἱκανὸν ἦν βασανιζόμενον. This reference to providing testimony under torture instantly signals to the audience, as well as to contemporary scholars, the practice of acquiring evidence from slaves, who were widely believed to be unreliable witnesses unless threatened with violence. Todd argues that Lysias' intention to obscure the exact nature of Theodotos' status is enhanced by his use of the word, μηνῦσαι, which he explains as, "the characteristic term to denote the provision of information by a slave who has not given this under torture, but has instead taken the initiative in bringing a serious offense to the knowledge of the authorities in the hope of freedom following a conviction."<sup>27</sup>

According to Todd's reading of Lysias 3, Lysias' portrayal of Theodotos' recruits the audience's sympathy for Theodotos, by referring to him as *neaniskos*, or *meirakion*, and later as a *paidion*. Taken together, these terms combine to form a picture of Theodotos as a young man,

---

<sup>26</sup> See Todd 2007: 334 for discussion of the term, *pais*, which "can be used to denote slaves as well as children." Todd dismisses the argument that Lysias is referring to the speaker's (an unnamed participant in the account) slave.

<sup>27</sup> Todd 2007: 333 cites Lysias 5.5 and 7.35 as other instances where the word operates similarly.

perhaps even a minor, engaged in homosexual relations, who is dependent on the older Simon for gifts and favors, as part of the *erastes/eromenos* relationship. According to Todd, Lysias' overall strategy "hints that Simon's use of money might constitute illegal procuring of a citizen minor with a putative citizen within a more respectable nexus of aristocratic homosexuality."<sup>28</sup> If we accept Todd's argument that Theodotos is a young man, then Theodotos' silence can be explained as a function of Athenian citizenship requirements, which stipulated an appearance before the *dokimasia* to verify that a young man had reached adulthood and was granted citizenship, typically around the age of eighteen.<sup>29</sup> The *dokimasia* marks the first time that the youth was addressed by the demarch in front of the other deme members. The significance of being approved by the deme for full membership afforded the young man full participation and was critical in determining one's future political and legal status.<sup>30</sup>

The argument advanced by Todd hinges on the premise that Theodotos is the only "boy" present in the courtroom during his testimony. Kapparis offers an explanation that introduces another witness to the event, the speaker's attendant who does not speak during the testimony but accompanies the unnamed speaker to court. Earlier in the speech, the speaker tells the court that he saw Theodotos being chased by Simon and three of Simon's friends. Kapparis notes that the

---

<sup>28</sup>Todd 207: 281.

<sup>29</sup> See D. Whitehead 1977: 15, for analysis of an argument advanced by H. Pope 1976: 44, who cites *IG ii<sup>2</sup>* 1569.63; and 1673.57-8 to argue that Troezenians and Plataeans occupy similar positions in fifth-century Athens, i.e. they are examples of ethnic groups present in the *polis* but lacking citizenship. On the ritual of the *dokimasia* and its emphasis on a youth's readiness to assume the role of citizen within the Athenian democracy, see Farenga 2006: 346-423. An important aspect of achieving full citizenship for the Athenian male, beyond validating that both of his parents were Athenians and that he was of age, was the fact that once the ritual was completed, the youth now had the ability to speak for himself legally. In other words, speech represents one of the final touchstones to full recognition by the city. Perhaps Farenga overstates it when he describes the significance as similar to going from 'non-citizen' to 'citizen' but it is important to recognize that if Theodotos does not speak, it does not necessarily mean that he is a slave; he may simply be restricted from speaking in court because he had not yet achieved adult citizenship status.

<sup>30</sup> See *Ath. Pol* 42.1-2 for reference to the *dokimasia* and the importance of determining that the youth is 'free,' i.e. not a slave.

speaker describes himself as walking “by himself,” ἐγὼ μόνος βαδίζων, when he comes upon Theodotos defending himself in a street fight with Simon and his three friends.<sup>31</sup> The significance of the speaker’s words, “by himself,” represents the common understanding that men of the speaker’s standing were typically accompanied by their slaves. If this is the case, then it follows that in the testimony at §33, the *paidion* referred to is the speaker’s slave and not Theodotos.

The *Defense against Simon* has prompted some readers to reject the idea that an Athenian citizen would be working as a prostitute, and Theodotos’ identity as a Plataean raises doubt on his claim to Athenian citizenship. K.J. Dover argues that Theodotos’ claim to Athenian citizenship is doubtful. Dover challenges the idea that Theodotos was entitled to claim the same rights as other Athenians since much time had passed since the original decree was passed in or around 427, and the trial is believed to have occurred around 394 but before Plataea’s re-founding in 386 BCE.<sup>32</sup>

According to Dover, the decree applied to the original group who had undergone the scrutiny of Athenian officials charged with admitting Plataeans into the citizenry but since approximately 30 years elapsed since the decree was conferred, Dover asserts, “it is quite possible that the young Plataean, Theodotos, did not possess Athenian status at all; and even if he did, he could never have been regarded by Athenians in the same light as a youth of pure Athenian ancestry.”<sup>33</sup> Dover’s argument hinges on two historical questions. First, did the

---

<sup>31</sup> See Kapparis 2011: 46-48.

<sup>32</sup> See Todd 2007: 280. Although Theodotos is identified in Lysias 3 as Plataean, Todd argues that his family “did not avail themselves of Athenian citizenship.”

<sup>33</sup> Dover 1978: 33.

Athenians recognize subsequent generations of Plataeans as full citizens? Secondly, were all Plataeans living in Athens the descendants of the recipients of the decree in 427? Cohen believes that the decree functioned much like the individual grants of citizenship, in which the decree applied to the honorands *and their descendants*. By the time the case was heard in court, the Plataeans had been in Athens for over sixty years.<sup>34</sup> If Cohen's argument is correct, then why is Theodotos identified as a "Plataean?" If all descendants were recognized as Athenian, then after two generations, the Plataeans would have been assimilated into the population either through inter-marriage with native Athenians or the ethnic distinction of being Plataean would not be relevant to a legal case focused on Theodotos' identity as a sex slave, if his citizenship status was equivalent to that of an Athenian. As Todd and Dover argue, it is unlikely that Theodotos was recognized as sharing fully in the protections and rights of full citizenship, which is why he is singled out as "Plataean." Referring to Theodotos as a Plataean, however, calls attention to the fact that the population of fourth-century Athens consisted of various classes of citizens including Athenian-born citizens, citizens of Plataean-descent who lived in Athens with less rights and privileges than an Athenian-born citizen, and metics, who not only paid a tax but did not enjoy the same protections as the first two classes. Lysias' reference to Theodotos as a "Plataean" suggests that Athenians regarded those of Plataean descent with fewer protections than a 'true' Athenian.

While the original decree of citizenship to Plataeans seeking asylum in Athens following the destruction of their city is not contested, there is speculation that Plataeans maintained a

---

<sup>34</sup> See Whitehead 1977: 24 fn 74. The inscriptions that refer to Plataeans as "Athenian" (IG ii<sup>2</sup> 345, 351, 1569 (47), *Hesp.* 13 (1944) 231-3 (no. 6)) are from the period following Philip's arrival in Athens. Whitehead suggests that Plataeans achieved recognition as an *ethnikon*, but not more than *ethnikon* status. Whitehead sides with Dover and views the citizenship grant as applying only to those initially admitted into Athens.

separate identity from native Athenian citizens. The Plataeans may have preferred to hold on to some of their religious customs and worship separately. In addition, from the year 420 many Plataeans were collectively relocated to Scione and lived apart from the rest of the population.<sup>35</sup> Cohen argues that the descendants of the original decree continued to be honored with full citizenship and reads Nicomenes' decree of 403 as a sign that Athenians wanted to protect the Plataean descendants and preserve their claims to citizenship. This would seem to run counter to the political mood which motivated Nicomenes' decree. The decree sought to address citizen identity following the admission of the *thetes* to the citizenship rolls and was an attempt to recapture the prerogative of Pericles' citizenship law that expressly limited claims to Athenian citizenship to those born to Athenian parents.

In addition to the limited evidence for the Plataean decree, M. J. Osborne's work on the Attic inscriptions leads him to conclude that, "The occurrence of formulae in Attic inscriptions is, of course, universally recognized, although it has become clear that an over-rigid approach towards them, particularly in fifth and early fourth-century examples, is unwise."<sup>36</sup> In the absence of the entire citizenship decree for the Plataeans, scholarship has diverged over the issue of the degree to which one can infer that inscription formulae were relatively uniform during a given period. It is unclear what, if any, influence the second Peloponnesian War, now underway

---

<sup>35</sup> Thuc. 5.32.1

<sup>36</sup> See M. J. Osborne 1972: 129-30, which explains the formulae for citizenship grants, which were divided into two parts. The first clause contained a statement of the grant followed by the second clause, which referred to the enrollment of the new citizen or citizens into a deme, a tribe and a phratry. Osborne asserts that this formula was consistently upheld within the classical period.

in Athens, may have exerted on the citizenship decree, both in terms of the elements of the formula and the design and masonry work that produced the public decree.<sup>37</sup>

In the absence of convincing material evidence, the testimony of Apollodorus is considered by scholars to represent the clearest indication of what the decree might have said, notwithstanding the possibility that Apollodorus' testimony may have been manipulated in order to present a version of the decree that was more restrictive than the actual.<sup>38</sup> The block grant awarded to the Plataeans is significant because it establishes that a claim to citizenship could be made based on birth *or* decree.

Kapparis suggests that the Plataean citizenship decree granted full citizenship rights to the Plataeans in 427 BCE with restrictions on their service in priesthoods and archonships. This restriction may seem trivial since religious observance remained to a degree under the auspices of the phratries. The Athenian religious calendar is believed to have included up to 97 religious ceremonies per year, 118 in a Panathenaic year, according to Davies.<sup>39</sup>

Religious participation in Athens by the late fifth-century was an amalgam, with some rites dating back to the time of Solon or earlier, and others adopted around the year 500 BCE. The older rites continued to be observed and were included in two separate revisions to the city's religious codes, the first from 410 to 404 and the second from 403 to 399. What can be determined from the surviving evidence leaves room for speculation regarding the performance

---

<sup>37</sup>See M. J. Osborne 1972: 129-30. Osborne notes the possibility for error in the construction process and claims that mistakes were known to have occurred but does not offer examples.

<sup>38</sup> For a discussion of citizenship laws regarding the enrollment of citizens who may have had one parent who was not an Athenian citizen, see Kapparis: 1995: 373. The confusion surrounding the Plataeans and their descendants with respect to their admission and participation in Athenian civic affairs is often compared to individuals for whom citizenship was disputed based on ancestry. See Todd 2007: 280n26 for limiting Kapparis' belief that all surviving Plataean claims to citizenship were granted in subsequent generations. See Kapparis 1995: 376.

<sup>39</sup> See J.K. Davies 1967: 40.

of these rites and restrictions barring certain members of the *demos* from leading these rites.

On the nature of the evidence and its instructions regarding religious rites, Robert Parker, author of *Athenian Religion*, writes that “detailed prescriptions for the conduct of rites were not written out; nor is it clear that, for instance, rules of purity for priests and worshippers were ever encoded.”<sup>40</sup>

While religious prescriptions for city-wide rites have not been found, there is evidence of non-Athenians participating in religious festivals on the deme level. The Scambonid law (*IG i<sup>2</sup> 188*) mentions the metics as having a share in the sacrifice to Leos, hero of the Leontine tribe.<sup>41</sup> Additional evidence of participation in religious rites by non-citizens comes from Phrearrhioi (*SEG 35.113*), a deme that was situated along the coast and was considered large compared to other Attic demes. The first lines of the decree are missing but the surviving lines refer to those who were to receive a share in the sacrifice to Plouton. Lines 7-8 of the decree mention the sacrifice to Plouton and who was to receive a share in the sacrifice:

[...Π]λούτωνι θυόντωνσιν [δημ]όταις μετά των άλλων καί]

Scholars have offered interpretations on who the others, των άλλων, might be. While the identity of “the others” may remain uncertain, mentioning “the others” does signal the presence of a population that attended the rites in addition to the deme members, δημ]όταις. Robin Osborne reads “the others” as a reference to the civic officials and heralds who served the city large.<sup>42</sup> Robert Simms suggests “the others” may be a reference to itinerant festival goers from

---

<sup>40</sup> See R. Parker 1996: 53.

<sup>41</sup> Whitehead 1977: 86.

<sup>42</sup> R. Osborne, *Demos: The Discovery of Classical Attika* 1985: 177.

outside of Phrearrhioi.<sup>43</sup> In an article entitled “The ‘Others’ in a *lex sacra* from the Attic Deme Phrearrhioi,” Sara Wijma argues for a reading of the words, τῶν ἄλλων, as a reference to a policy of inclusion which the deme of Phrearrhioi adopted as a way to gain prominence beyond the local or regional level. Wijma views the presence of “the others” as a welcome addition to the members of the deme who may have come from beyond Athens to participate in the rites.<sup>44</sup> If this reading is correct, it may point to the possibility that access to religious rites was more open than access to civic privileges and participation in the democracy.

If we return to the question of Plataeans and the degree to which their citizenship afforded them full participation in Athenian civic life, it depends on how meaningful it would be to be prevented from performing religious rites, as Plataeans allegedly were. These restrictions may have been essentially immaterial in terms of one’s assimilation into Athenian life. On the other hand, with close to one hundred religious rites scheduled during the year, the role of religion was conspicuous, and exclusion from performance of even a minority of these rites may be an indication of underlying tensions among Athenian-born citizens and naturalized citizens. In his *Ideology of the Athenian Metic*, Whitehead asserts that metics and citizens performed the same roles in parallel festivals segregated between citizen and non-citizen. There is evidence, however, of metics participating alongside citizens in at least the Lenaea. The base of a statue of a herm appears to include a metic *choregos* participating at the Lenaea.<sup>45</sup>

---

<sup>43</sup> Simms 1998: 99.

<sup>44</sup> Wijma views the religious rites at Phrearrhioi as a local version of the Eleusinian Mysteries celebrated in Athens. Wijma argues for a parallel between Athens and Phrearrhioi with respect to accepting foreigners as participants in the rights and cites Herodotus 8.65.4 which asserts that any Greek who wished could participate in the Eleusinian Mysteries.

<sup>45</sup> Whitehead 1977: 80 fn 80. See *Hesperia* 40 (1971) 256-7 (no. 4). Whitehead believes the statue represents the comic *choregos*, Sosicrates, who “must surely be a metic.”

The status of Plataeans as naturalized citizens is often compared to that of the *metics*. In his *Ideology of the Athenian Metic*, J. K. Davies asserts that the decree did not signify full Athenian citizenship but rather conferred something like permanent *metic* status. Davies includes the Plataeans in the group of non-Athenians living in Athens whose claims to citizenship were indeterminate.<sup>46</sup> Davies concludes that the Athenians carefully controlled the number of new citizens with full participation rights. This devaluation of the citizenship award contradicts Thucydides' description. In the dialogue between the last Plataean defenders of the city before the Spartan judges, the Plataeans defend their loyalty to the Athenians as reasonable since the Athenians had helped when Sparta had declined, "εἰ δ' ἀποστῆναι Ἀθηναίων οὐκ ἠθελήσαμεν ὑμῶν κελευσάντων, οὐκ ἠδικοῦμεν."<sup>47</sup> The Plataeans go on to say that when they requested to become part of the Athenian alliance, they were accepted and shared their citizenship rights, "αὐτὸς δεόμενος προσηγάγετο ξυμμάχους καὶ πολιτείας μετέλαβεν."<sup>48</sup> Osborne's reading of the decree amounts to complete civic and religious enfranchisement except for rites pertaining to the priesthood. In his replication of the decree, Osborne emends line 5 of the decree with a provision that the Plataeans be excluded from the priesthood, citing Apollodorus' speech found in Demosthenes *Against Neaira*, "πλὴν εἴ τις ἱερωσύνη ἢ τελετὴ ἐστὶν ἐκ γένους."<sup>49</sup>

---

<sup>46</sup> Davies 1977: 107.

<sup>47</sup> Thucy 3.55.1.

<sup>48</sup> Thucy. 3.55.3; See MacDowell 1985: 319 for a view that this account by Thucydides is intended to portray the Plataeans as citizens before the siege of Plataea. MacDowell believes that Thucydides "makes the Plataians themselves say that they had already acquired citizenship some time before 427." If this is the case, it was while the Plataeans still resided in Plataea and therefore the citizenship rights were honorific.

<sup>49</sup> Osborne 1981-84, vol. 1.28.

Davies interprets the citizenship award as not equal to what a native-born Athenian enjoyed and offers alternatives to full citizenship. His skepticism stems from his reluctance to believe Athenians were willing to share all of their citizenship rights with non-Athenians.<sup>50</sup> In terms of textual evidence for inherent restrictions and limits on the citizenship award, it is based solely on Apollodorus' speech which is a reiteration of the decree, not the words of the actual decree. In response to the religious restriction and what it means, Kapparis asserts that the Plataeans were prohibited from performing some religious duties not out of a desire to stigmatize the Plataeans, but to preserve the "dignity" of the office.<sup>51</sup> Kapparis claims that it is likely that the Plataeans maintained their ties to their ancestral phratries, even after resettling in Athens, preferring to retain their own religious customs.<sup>52</sup>

Opinions differ regarding the degree to which Plataeans had a share in the democracy. Davies includes the Plataeans in the group of non-Athenians living in Athens whose claims to citizenship were challenged.<sup>53</sup> The Plataean question illustrates the difficulty of ascertaining to what degree Plataeans, and their descendants, were accorded full citizenship status. The precedent of offering 212 Plataeans citizenship was the benchmark case, but as we will see, the rules can be re-written and revised according to the circumstances.

### **Block Grant of Citizenship to Samians (403/2 BCE)**

In the last days of the Peloponnesian War, Athens issued a block grant to the Samians in recognition of their loyalty to Athens in the Peloponnesian War. During the Peloponnesian War,

---

<sup>50</sup> Davies 1977: 106.

<sup>51</sup> Kapparis 1995: 374.

<sup>52</sup> Kapparis 1995: 368.

<sup>53</sup> Davies 1977: 107.

Samos served as an Athenian base of operations in the Aegean from 412 to the conclusion of the war. During a siege by the Spartans, the Samians outlasted the Athenians and ultimately submitting to the Spartan navarch Lysander in 404.

The circumstances under which the Samians came to Athens are similar to those of the Plataeans, and as we shall see later, the Olynthians. Like the Plataeans, the Samians were war refugees who lost everything and looked to Athens as a safe harbor from the Spartans. Unlike the Plataeans, the Samians fought the Spartans alongside the Athenians. This was not the case with Plataeans who defended themselves against Thebes over its refusal to join the Boeotian League. Plataea had been an ally from at least 490 but had stepped away from this alliance during the 460's when the Athenians began to expand their commercial empire in the Aegean.

The decree that survived dates to somewhere between 403 and 402. Originally there were three *stelai* in Athens that publicized the decree, but one *stela* was either demolished during the tumult of the Thirty or was never inscribed.<sup>54</sup> This *stela* contained the most significant information, including the words, “citizenship to the Samians.” In addition, it is believed that this *stela* offered the Samians the right to establish their own form of government as well as the promise of envoys to accompany the Samian ambassadors to Sparta where they would negotiate the peace treaty to end the Peloponnesian war.

J. K. Davies notably does not mention the Samians when discussing the contested citizenship status of ethnic groups who were granted citizenship but whose entry into the

---

<sup>54</sup> See Osborne and Rhodes 2003: 12-17, which cites Tod 98 for the claim that the first *stela* was destroyed during the reign of the Thirty oligarchs. The authors argue that the *stela* was re-installed after the Thirty were removed from office, located between the theater of Dionysus and the odeon of *Herodes Atticus*. See M.J. Osborne Vol 1 1983: 33 who asserts that the decree was never inscribed.

Athenian citizenry was controversial.<sup>55</sup> Instead, Davies characterizes the Samians' citizenship award as one of "*isopoliteia*." Davies interprets the Samian citizenship grant as one which established an autonomous legal and political structure that separated the Samians from the rest of the *politeia*.<sup>56</sup> Osborne lists two groups for whom block grants were proposed but later denied, the group of *metics* who joined Thrasybulus after the initial fighting at the Peiraieus and the Samians. Like Davies, Osborne interprets the award as something less than citizenship. Davies characterizes the grant as "*isopolitei*" [*isopoliteia*?] which is significant since elsewhere Davies applies the term to characterize the relationship between a colony and its metropolis.<sup>57</sup> Invoking the term to describe the Samians and their relationship to the Athenian polity suggests that the Samians functioned as a separate but equal community within Athens. The debate centers on whether the decree's reference to the Samians' rights signals their preference to continue to abide by their own laws or if the Samians were marginalized.

The Samians probably preferred to maintain their original religious customs and legal system. The decree reflects the Athenians' willingness to share the democracy with those who have performed good deeds for them.<sup>58</sup> The citizenship decree to the Samians created an

---

<sup>55</sup> See J. K. Davies 1977-8: 107, which identifies Plataeans, Olynthians, and Thebans as members of refugee groups who were granted asylum in Athens but who did not qualify for citizenship. Davies cites the decree IG ii<sup>2</sup> 1569, lines 3 (Theban) and line 62 (Troze[nian]).

<sup>56</sup> Ibid. Davies argues that the provision within the Samian citizenship decree applied only to the Samian envoys present when the decree was drafted. This interpretation can be explained by the fact that the first *stèle* was lost. Davies cites R. Meiggs and D. M. Lewis, *The Greek Historical Inscriptions* (Oxford, 1969). For speculation on what the first may have included, see Osborne and Rhodes: 13 and 15 for translation of two surviving *stelai*, as well as an attempt at recovering the lost *stèle*. Both of the surviving *stelai* refer to a clause that must have included the words pledging the nature of an award to the Samians. For instance, Osborne and Rhodes, 13, translate the second *stèle* beginning with, "Praise the Samians because they are good men with regard to the Athenians; and everything shall be valid which the people of Athens decreed previously for the people of Samos."

<sup>57</sup> Ibid, 108. Davies describes the *kleruchies* that were established during Cleisthenes' time that obtained freedom to govern their colonies independently while maintaining support from Athens.

<sup>58</sup> IG ii<sup>2</sup> Lines 9-11: "ὅτι ἐσὶν ἄνδρες ἀγαθοὶ καὶ πρόθυμοι ποιεῖν ὅτι δύνανται ἀγαθόν, καὶ τὰ πεπραγμένα αὐτοῖς ὅτι δοκῶσιν ὀρθῶς ποιῆσαι Ἀθηναίοις καὶ Σαμίοις· καὶ ἀντὶ ὧν εἰς πεποιθήκασιν Ἀθηναίος . . . (.)"

autonomous group acting according to its own laws.<sup>59</sup> The political autonomy the Athenians granted the Samians resurfaces as the Samians use this principle in their argument to expel Athenian klerouchs from their island later in the mid-fourth century.<sup>60</sup> As a group residing within Athens, the Samians were expected to contribute militarily to any campaign the Athenians initiated and were bound by any treaties between foreign powers and the Athenians. The decree does not mention religious rites but we can infer from the decree that they will live according to their own “laws” and/or “customs” depending on how νόμοις is interpreted.<sup>61</sup> The conditions under which the Samians entered into the *politeia*, as full-fledged allies against Sparta, was an honorable one in the eyes of the Athenians.

Why weren't the Samians incorporated into the polity in the way that the Plataeans initially were, i.e. by being scattered among the 10 tribes? The Samians may have arrived in Athens with more clout than the Plataeans owing to the fact that Samians outlasted the Athenians during the siege led by the Spartan commander Lysander. The case of the Samian decree illustrates the pattern that citizenship remained a critical concern to the Athenians, one that they rigorously debated and challenged throughout the classical period. Davies defines the issue as, “A matter of intense interest and preoccupation: that the questions ‘Who is to be, and who is not to be, in the Athenian community, and why’ were continually being posed by pressures from within and

---

<sup>59</sup> IG ii<sup>2</sup> Line 13: “πολιτευόμενος ὅπως ἂν αὐτοὶ βόλωντα”

<sup>60</sup> Owing to the limits of this thesis, consideration of the relationship between the wording of the Samian decree of 403/2 and its influence on the Athenian klerouchies on the island of Samos will have to be postponed.

<sup>61</sup> IG ii<sup>2</sup> Lines 15-18: “τοῖς δὲ νόμοις χρῆσθαι τοῖς σφετέροις αὐτῶναὐτονόμος ὄντας, καὶ τᾶλλα ποιῆν κατὰ τὸς ὄρκος καὶ τὰς συνθήκας καθάπερ ξύνκειται Ἀθηναίοις καὶ Σαμίοις· καὶ περὶ τῶν ἐγκλημάτων ἃ ἄγ γίγνηται πρὸς ἀλλήλους διδόναι καὶ δέχεσθαι τὰς δίκας κατὰ τὰς συμβολὰς τὰς ὄσας.”

without: that the process of finding answers, and of justifying them, was a very important component of Athenian public and intellectual life.”<sup>62</sup>

### **The Citizenship Decree Awarded to *Metics* Who Assisted in the Overthrow of the Thirty**

In 401 BCE, a decree was issued that granted *isotelia* to foreigners living in Athens who fought at Piraeus and defeat the forces of the oligarchy. This decree is a revised version of the original decree put forth by Thrasybulus. The second decree which was awarded in 401 is the result of a *graphe paranomon* brought by Archinos against Thrasybulus. Thrasybulus’ promise to award citizenship to foreigners came at a time when there was a backlash against granting citizenship rights. In 405, the Athenians awarded the right to hold office to *thetes* as the population had shrunk after the plague and the ongoing war with Sparta. Having to admit *thetes* to the citizenry was a disaster for those who enjoyed the status and privilege that citizenship conferred. Following the overthrow of the Thirty, the Athenians began to implement laws that restricted access to citizenship. Archinos’ reconfiguration of Thrasybulus’ decree provides evidence of a trend towards restricting citizenship in an attempt to regain control over the citizenship rolls.

The resistance to Thrasybulus’ original decree was a reaction to the dilution of the citizen pool which some Athenians believed had lost its political and social identity. Upon returning to Athens after defeating the Thirty at the Piraeus, Thrasybulus sought to fulfill his earlier promise of citizenship to the *metics* who joined him. According to a passage in the *Athenaion Politeia*

---

<sup>62</sup> Davies, (1977-8) 106.

(40.2), in 403/2 BCE Archinos filed the *graphe paranomon* because Thrasybulus failed to submit the decree to the *Boule* for consideration before issuing the decree.<sup>63</sup> Ultimately the decree passed in 401, two years after the battle that toppled the oligarchic regime of the Thirty.

The surviving fragments of the decree point to a pared down version of the original decree with fewer privileges allotted to the recipients. The evidence includes five published fragments along with one unpublished fragment to which P. J. Rhodes refers in his *Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia*.<sup>64</sup> The published fragments of the decree appear to honor the *metics* who initially joined Thrasybulus at Phyle, in northwest Attica. Scholars are divided as to whether all of the men who joined Thrasybulus were honored regardless of whether they were part of the original contingent at Phyle, or only joined the fight at the Piraeus. The debate centers on who the recipients were — both in terms of their civic identity, citizen or metic, and when they joined the battle — at Phyle or later at the Piraeus.

According to the account in the *Athenaion Politeia*, after gathering at least 1,000 fighters at Phyle, Thrasybulus led his men to the Piraeus and occupied the hill of Munichia where they defeated the Thirty and their supporters. A second group joined Thrasybulus after his men survived the siege by the Thirty in Phyle. This group helped to defend the Piraeus from further attack by the Thirty and held the Piraeus until the truce. The decree memorializes the Athenians' "esteemed gratitude" to the "foreigners" who took part in the defeat of the Thirty. The number of honorands included on the stele ranges from as low as 53 to just over 100. If Thrasybulus led up to 1,000 men to the Piraeus, why does the decree honor a significantly smaller group? According

---

<sup>63</sup> *Ath. Pol.* 40.2. Taylor 2002: 379 points out that at the time the *Boule* did not exist.

<sup>64</sup> For a translation of the five published fragments, see Rhodes and Osborne 2003: 20-27. For reference to the unpublished fragment, see Rhodes 1981: 477. The unpublished fragment reportedly from the Agora relates to confiscation of property from the Thirty.

to Raubitschek in his 1941 article “The Heroes of Phyle,” no more than 100 men were honored and of these only a small part were foreigners. While foreigners were certainly a part of Thrasybulus’ fighters, the surviving fragments of the decree indicate that citizens outnumbered the *metics* by a ratio of two to one, or possibly three to one.<sup>65</sup>

Some scholars explain the discrepancy between the size of the force, at least 1,000 men, and the small number of honorands as a result of the distinction between the earliest supporters and those who joined the battle later at the Piraeus. The chronology of Thrasybulus’ campaign sets up a tiered system of recognition, with those joining earliest receiving top honors. In the early winter of 404/3 Thrasybulus, who had fled the rule of the Thirty, was living in Thebes. According to Osborne’s reading of the decree, the men who joined Thrasybulus in his march from Thebes to Phyle are those honored in the decree of 401. Osborne divides the group further into two distinct sub-groups, the first being the *metics* who joined the original group from Phyle at the hill of Munichia, and another group that maintained a presence at the Piraeus but did not participate in active fighting. This division distinguishes three distinct groups: the initial group of *metics* who gathered with Thrasybulus at Phyle; the second group who joined the first at Munichia; and the third group who maintained control over the hill until the rebellion overthrew the Thirty. Determining who the recipients were is problematic and continues to spark debate. What is important to consider from this discussion is the restrictiveness applied to admitting new citizens into what was regarded as an ethnically homogenous population group.

---

<sup>65</sup> Taylor 2002: 377-82.

## Olynthian Block Grant of Citizenship

In 352, Olynthus and Athens signed a peace treaty as Philip threatened to subdue Greece. Olynthus had not always been an Athenian ally. In 432, Olynthus had led the cities of Chalcidice in a revolt from the Athenian League and formed the Chalcidian League, with Olynthus as its capital. Later, in 382, when Sparta threatened to attack Olynthus, Athens attempted to broker an alliance with Olynthus in an effort to isolate Boeotia. Olynthus opted to remain independent and opposed Athens during the 360's, during which time Athens led military incursions up to Amphipolis.

In 349, as Philip's army continued to move south from Macedon, the Olynthians sent an embassy to Athens in an effort to form an alliance to defend themselves against Philip. During the spring and summer of 349/8, Olynthus sought military assistance from Athens twice. Athens initially sent an army of mercenaries followed by an army of citizen soldiers.<sup>66</sup> The second force, consisting of volunteer hoplites and cavalymen failed to reach Olynthus in time and the city was betrayed by a coup led by Lasthenes and Euthycrates that delivered the city to Philip.<sup>67</sup>

Philip's occupation of Olynthus did not affect Athens' political security at the time. Sealey asserts that unlike the fifth century when the Peloponnese was divided into spheres of influence between Athens and Sparta, Olynthian sovereignty was not a priority for Athens, since the city-

---

<sup>66</sup> Sealey cites Philochorus, *F. Gr. Hist.* IIIB 328F49, 50: ἐπι τούτου Ὀλυνθίος πολεμουμένοις ὑπὸ Φιλίππου καὶ πρέσβεις Ἀθήναζε πέμψασιν οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι συμμαχίαν τε ἐποίησαντο \*\* καὶ βοήθειαν ἔπεμψαν πελταστὰς δισχιλίου, τριήρεις δὲ τριάκοντα τάς μετὰ Χάρητος καὶ ἄς συνεπλήρωσαν ὀκτώ.

<sup>67</sup> Demosthenes makes reference to the call for citizen volunteers in *Against Meidias*. Demosthenes boasts of his willingness to donate a trireme to the campaign in Euboea in 358 BCE, while his opponent Meidias apparently shirked this duty, see Dem. 21.161. It is unclear if Demosthenes donated to the effort to defend Olynthus. See MacDowell 1990: 381n161 for an argument that Demosthenes did not donate to the campaign. See Osborne 1981-3: 64 for description of Olynthian conspiracy to deliver the city to Philip. Osborne cites Dem. *Third Phillipic* in which D. relates the events that led to the ouster, most likely in 351 BCE, of the political leader, Apollonides, owing to his opposition to the threat posed by Philip. See below for Apollonides' grant and subsequent revocation of Athenian citizenship.

state had been opposed to Athenian hegemony in the region, and defending Olynthus would have required a prolonged effort to stave off Philip's forces.<sup>68</sup> This failure to save Olynthus represents what Sealey sees as the end of Athenian willingness to defend city-states from foreign attack.<sup>69</sup>

The Olynthian block grant of citizenship, awarded most likely in 349/348, reflects the pattern of block grants reviewed above. The evidence for the decree is incomplete and the terms contained in the surviving evidence continues to prompt debate. As was seen in the previous discussions of block grants, without convincing evidence it is difficult to assess if Olynthian refugees were awarded residency permits beyond the thirty day limit (some believe it may have been as high as ninety days) similar to those issued to *metics*. The fact that residency permits were issued to the Olynthians may signify that the Olynthians were viewed as temporary residents who sought refuge in Athens for a short period. In the original grant, *IG ii<sup>2</sup> 211* (Tod 166), Whitehead refers to an argument advanced by A. Wilhelm<sup>70</sup> in which "*ateleia*" refers to the *metics*, who Wilhelm regards as "*xenoi*" but not "*politai*." Whitehead views the Olynthians as "*xenoi*" but not "*politai*."

Cohen blurs the distinction between *xenoi* and *politai* even further, arguing that the Athenians no longer were able to differentiate a citizen from a non-citizen, an argument that fails to convince in light of the lines drawn between native Athenian citizens and foreign-born

---

<sup>68</sup> See Carter 1971 for description of a weak Athenian response to Philip after Athens secured Thermopylae and the Hellespont in 352. See also Cawkwell 1962 for the argument that despite Demosthenes' efforts to garner support for a more robust response to Philip's incursions in the area surrounding Olynthus, the decision not to commit a greater force was not due to indifference, but was determined by what Cawkwell views as a reasonable position based on military considerations at the time.

<sup>69</sup> See Sealey 1976: 452.

<sup>70</sup> See Whitehead 1977: 15. Whitehead cites A. Wilhelm 1942: "Proxenie und Euergesie," in *Attische Urkunden* 5, 11-86 for an argument that the term *ateleia* refers to rights equivalent to that of *metics* but not of citizens; Whitehead also cites H. Pope 1935: 44. Pope suggests that *ateleia* refers to those "who have been given '*ateleia tou metoikiou*,' such as the exiles in *IG ii<sup>2</sup> 237* (Acharnians) and 545 (Thessalians), and have been permitted to remain a '*xenos*.'"

residents who were granted citizenship. Cohen asserts that the Athenians, towards the end of the Peloponnesian War, “Were accepting any individuals who would serve on board their warships,” which prompted an influx of new citizens. According to Cohen’s argument, by the fourth century, this group became increasingly assimilated owing to the apparent difficulty of distinguishing Athenians from non-Athenians in terms of their appearance. Cohen claims that the Elaiousians, Olynthians, Thebans and Acharians all contributed to this new group of *politai*.<sup>71</sup>

Cohen’s argument that the existence of these new *politai* and their participation in the *polis* as citizens was widely accepted is contradicted by a fragment that Osborne includes in his study of Olynthian citizenship.<sup>72</sup> Osborne discusses a grant that was awarded to Apollonides, in or around the year 351. Apollonides was a vocal opponent of Philip who was later expelled from Olynthus. Demosthenes refers to Apollonides in his *Third Philippic* as a victim of the traitors who handed the city over to Philip and sold its citizens into slavery.<sup>73</sup> After being expelled from Olynthus, Apollonides was apparently awarded a grant of citizenship but the grant was subsequently rescinded. It is unclear why Apollonides’ citizenship grant was revoked. Osborne suggests that Apollonides lost his citizenship as the result of a *graphe paranomon* that was brought against him but we do not have the evidence surrounding the court proceedings.<sup>74</sup> It may be that the citizenship grant offered to the Olynthians was another case of a citizenship grant with limited protections.

---

<sup>71</sup> See Cohen 2000: 63-68, esp. 67.

<sup>72</sup> See Cohen 2000: 69 asserts that Athenians had relinquished the myth of autochthony in favor of a more realistic apprehension of the ethnic constitution of the *politeia*: “By the beginning of the fourth century, however, there was no need – even appealing to Athenian juries – for ideological pretense that participation in [the??? not sure] Athenian *politeia* was a privilege reserved exclusively for autochthonous inhabitants of Attica.”

<sup>73</sup> See Dem. *Phil.* 3.56.8:

<sup>74</sup> See Osborne 1981-3: 64: “The reasons for the (almost immediate) cancellation of the award to Apollinides are puzzling.”

Further evidence for an Olynthian block grant comes from Harpokration's testimony in his collection of the *Ten Greek Orators*. Harpokration, writing almost two hundred years after the grant was issued, distinguishes between the *metics*, individuals whom the Athenians regarded as 'isoteles,' and men who were living in Athens but who had not yet established resident status.<sup>75</sup> Whitehead suggests that the nature of the citizenship decree to the Olynthians was intended to cover a short term, "for as long as . . ." or even "if they (he) live(s) in Athens."<sup>76</sup> Whitehead cites other decrees from the period including IG ii<sup>2</sup> 276, 287, 660, which he believes included the phrase "while living in Athens."<sup>77</sup> This phrase, "while living in Athens" suggests that the grant was extended to those who were not already living in Athens, as *metics* were, and for whom a return home at some point was likely. This interpretation contradicts Harpokration's reading. Harpokration believed the grant was extended to those already living in Athens but without a residency permit. Whether we adopt Harpokration's reading or Whitehead's depends in large part on the degree to which we think the Athenians absorbed *xenoi* — without taking stock of who they were and why they were there. I am inclined to side with Whitehead on this question since the Athenians were not inclined to admit *xenoi* and would want to assess the *metoikion* tax to a non-Athenian. Whitehead asserts that the Olynthians were treated as an exceptional case in that they were regarded as *metics* but were exempt from paying the *metoikion*.<sup>78</sup> This provision was extended in emergency cases, when the residents of whole cities were granted an exemption

---

<sup>75</sup> Whitehead 1977: 15, 23 cites IG ii<sup>2</sup> 276, 287, 660 as examples of grants in which citizenship was awarded to men dwelling or staying in Athens but who had not established a household.

<sup>76</sup> Whitehead 1977: 23n66.

<sup>77</sup> Whitehead 1977: 23n66.

<sup>78</sup> Whitehead 1977: 15. "In my opinion these men are foreigners living in Athens who have been exempted from the *metoikion*, and thus from metic-status itself."

from Athenian citizenship requirements. Osborne lists only three groups that received these grants, the Plataeans; the group of volunteers who offered to sail with the Athenian fleet at Arginousai; and the *metics* who helped in the overthrow of the Thirty.<sup>79</sup>

In the absence of further evidence, the actual nature of Olynthian citizenship is difficult to determine. Unlike the Plataeans, who had established good will with the Athenians over the course of close to one hundred years, the short-lived alliance between Athens and Polyanthus makes it difficult to regard the Olynthians as sharing in the same citizenship rights as the Plataeans or Samians.

---

<sup>79</sup> Osborne 1981 v. 3-4: 181 lists two other groups for whom block grants were proposed but later denied, the group of *metics* who joined Thrasybulus after the initial fighting at the Peiraieus ;and the Samians, only a few of whom actually received citizenship.

## CHAPTER TWO

### ETHNICITY AND CITIZENSHIP

The offer of political asylum in Athens, and for some, the subsequent ability to remain in Athens, is rooted in the ancient Greek tradition of *xenia*, loosely defined as ‘guest-host relations.’ Homer illustrates this ancient cultural tradition in many scenes of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* in which strangers are afforded hospitality and resources. One example of the customary openness and generosity afforded to guests, both familiar and unfamiliar, appears in Book 8 of the *Odyssey*. Odysseus lands on the island of the Phaiakians where he is taken in and treated to an elaborate meal among new friends. After dinner, the guest is entertained with songs calling to mind the deeds of heroes of the past. Odysseus’ arrival on the island of Phaiakia serves as a pivotal turning point in the hero’s quest to return home to Ithaka. After a dinner and song in honor of the guest, “εἴνεκα γὰρ ξείνοιο τάδ' αἰδοίοιο τέτυκται” (*Od.* 8.544), the king of the Phaiakians and host of the evening, Alkinoös, addresses the Phaiakians and Odysseus alike, calling them one and the same, “τερπόμεθα πάντες, ξεινοδόκοι καὶ ξεῖνος,” (*Od.* 8.541-2) He asks Odysseus who he is and where he is going. Once Odysseus answers him, Alkinoös announces that he and the rest of the Phaiakians will organize ships and recruit men to escort him home. Alkinoös concludes his address to Odysseus with the simple pledge that when a guest distinguishes himself in even the slightest way in terms of his resourcefulness, (ὅς τ' ὀλίγον περ ἐπιψαύη πραπίδεςσι [*Od.* 8.547]), he is worthy of being considered as a brother to the host, “ἀντὶ κασιγνήτου ξεῖνός θ' ἰκέτης τε τέτυκται ἀνέρι, ὅς τ' ὀλίγον περ ἐπιψαύη πραπίδεςσι.” (*Od.* 8.546-7) This scene captures the essence of the Greek code of hospitality that continued to influence political and social behavior towards newcomers into the fourth century.

From the time of Homer to the time of Pericles, there is a significant shift towards less openness and more state intervention into the private life of the city. Yet, as the Athenians struggled to rein in the historical openness of their society with legislation such as Pericles' citizenship law of 451/50, there continued to be examples of gift-giving. *Xenia* factored in the city's identity and its political behavior.

Before examining some examples of individual gifts given by the city to foreigners, some aspects of Odysseus' reception by the Phaiakians bear mentioning since they reflect a pattern that came to define Athenian guest-host relations during the classical period. First, Odysseus is given safe harbor, sustenance, and comfort before being asked to provide the simplest of details about his background. This was customary according to the principle of *xenia*. As a foreigner, Odysseus is immediately taken in and given a place at the king's table where he is the guest of honor. But more than a night of entertainment, the generosity is pragmatic. Alkinoös wants to know what business brought the stranger to Phaiakia and more importantly, how the Phaiakians might help the stranger. Offering aid to the stranger is generous but it also prudent. Alkinoös wants to know who Odysseus is and where he comes from in the hopes that the stranger, once safely home, may return as a trading partner.

As a port of trade and commerce, Athens was characterized by an openness that defined not only its economy but also its population, made up in part by resident aliens, the *metics*. Unlike Sparta, to which it is often compared, Athens offered its marketplace to industrious strangers who applied their resourcefulness to the task of expanding Athens' trade and commerce.<sup>80</sup>

---

<sup>80</sup> Hall 1997: 7-16 cites Karl Otfried Müller's *Die Dorer* as a source for setting up the dialectic between Athens and Sparta, See Müller 1830: 221-3 for a comparison between Athenian and Spartan attitudes towards innovation and open borders.

Another element of *xenia* that appears in the Phaiakian reception, and can also be seen later in Athenian constructions of kinship and shared *ethnos*, is Alkinoös' repeated references to kinship and equality. The same root, “ξεῖν” appears in the word “ξεῖνος,” “guest” and “ξεινοδόκοι,” “receivers of a guest.” Mutuality between the guest and host is emphasized by the shared root. When Alkinoös addresses his guest, Odysseus, he will call him ‘brother,’ once at the beginning and again at the end of the episode.<sup>81</sup> This idea of shared kinship played a significant role in the Athenian belief and would go on to form the foundation for Athenians’ unique identity among the Greeks.

For Homer and his audience, kinship rested primarily on an understanding of what he terms a “common identification.”<sup>82</sup> Later in classical Athens, the idea of kinship became entwined with *ethnos* where ethnic identity formed around the collective belief in autochthony. According to the autochthony myth, Athenians were born of the same land that Athens occupied. According to scholars Jonathan Hall and Arlene Saxonhouse ethnic identity is a socially constructed ideology. By the fifth century, autochthony had taken hold of the Athenian imagination in such a way that, “The ethnic group was not a biological group but a social group, distinguished from other collectivities by its subscription to a putative myth of shared descent and kinship and by its association with a ‘primordial’ territory.”<sup>83</sup> The myth of autochthony promoted the ideal of Athenian ethnic homogeneity over the course of the fifth and fourth centuries in a way that obscured the reality of ethnic diversity dating back to the influx of

---

<sup>81</sup> See *Od.* 8.546, “ἀντὶ κασινγήτου ξεῖνός”; *Od.* 8.585, “ἦ τίς που καὶ ἑταῖρος ἀνὴρ κεχαρισμένα εἰδώς, ἐσθλός; ἐπεὶ οὐ μὲν τι κασινγήτοιο χερείων γίνεται, ὅς κεν ἑταῖρος ἐὼν πεπνυμένα εἰδῆ.”

<sup>82</sup> See Hall 1997: 35.

<sup>83</sup> See Hall 1997: 2. See Saxonhouse 1992: 112-118 for a discussion of the autochthony myth.

craftsmen during Solon's time.

The autochthony myth is based on two cult heroes with similar names who were worshipped at the Athenian Acropolis, Erechtheus and Erichthonius. According to the mythic tradition, Erichthonius is alleged to have sprung from the ground as the impregnated seed that Athena wiped from her thigh after refusing Hephaestus. According to this version of the myth, the Earth brings Erichthonius into being and he becomes known as Athena's son. This connection to Athena is similar to Erechtheus who appears in the *Iliad* and who is also known as Athena's son and is worshipped at her sanctuary, (*Il.* 2.546-8) “οἱ δ' ἄρ' Ἀθήνας εἶχον εὐκτίμενον πτολίεθρον δῆμον Ἐρεχθῆος μεγάλητορος, ὃν ποτ' Ἀθήνη θρέψε Διὸς θυγάτηρ, τέκε δὲ ζείδωρος ἄρουρα.” Unlike the soil-born and raised-by-the-earth Erichthonius, however, Erechtheus consistently appears as an Athenian leader and is sometimes referred to as an early Athenian king.

The confusion between the two versions rests on a significant distinction in our understanding of the term “autochthonous.” The first meaning of autochthony is literally “to have been sprung from the soil” and this is the meaning ascribed to Erichthonius. The second meaning becomes significant in Athenian identity as a way of establishing an historical connection to a particular geographic location, in this case, Athens. Erechtheus, more than Erichthonius, is envisaged as a “culture hero” linked to the city's founding, as opposed to the soil. Some scholars have argued that Erichthonius is an alternative name for Erechtheus. I agree with Rosivach who views Erichthonius as an earlier Athenian hero who precedes Erechtheus and

whose name emphasizes his chthonic origins rather than an identity linked to the political organization of the city.<sup>84</sup>

The autochthony myth informed the collective identity as Athenians were brought up to believe that they were literally sprung from the soil and had always occupied the land on which Athens and the surrounding towns in Attica were built. In light of this belief, it is easy to understand why new citizens who were not sprung from that soil would encounter obstacles and resistance in their path to becoming full citizens. Rosivach analyzes the term *αὐτόχθονες* and separates the original meaning, “born from the earth” from the meaning Athenians later added to its original meaning, i.e. that the Athenians had always lived in Attica.<sup>85</sup> According to the myth, Athenians believed that they were descendants of earthborn Erechtheus.

The term “autochthony” first appears in Aeschylus’ *Agamemnon* in 458. In a speech announcing the return of Agamemnon after the Trojan war, the messenger describes the house of Priam as having been burned down to the ground in revenge for the theft of Helen, “ὀφλῶν γὰρ ἀρπαγῆς τε καὶ κλοπῆς δίκην τοῦ ῥυσίου θ’ ἤμαρτε καὶ πανώλεθρον αὐτόχθονον πατρῶον ἔθρισεν δόμον.” In this instance, the term is used to signify the total destruction of the house of Priam but it is describes the city of Troy, symbolized by Priam’s house, as burned to the ground and returned to its primordial state. Using Troy as a motif, Aeschylus recruits mythic heroes to portray the issue of the “other.” According to Nicole Loraux in “The Mourning Voice: An Essay

---

<sup>84</sup> Rosivach 1987: 294n4.

<sup>85</sup> Rosivach 1987: 294-5.

on Greek Tragedy”, the playwrights sought figures from the distant past to depict the changing complexion of the city.<sup>86</sup>

The Athenians’ reliance on the autochthony myth afforded them the ability to differentiate themselves from surrounding cities with ethnically mixed populations governed by oligarchs or tyrants. The autochthony myth situated the native Athenians on soil that was directly linked to their divine namesake, Athena, and provided the thread that connected the mythic past with the democratic present. In *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity*, Jonathan Hall argues that the issue of “other” became pronounced as the Athenians were vying for supremacy in the Delian League.<sup>87</sup> Hall links the autochthony myth to the Athenians’ need to develop an identity that was separate from the rest of the Greeks. By doing this, the myth ratified the political and social organization of Athens following the reforms of Cleisthenes, as if the city had existed as far back as the mythic imagination extended. The myth provided a narrative that in effect sanctioned the deme system of Cleisthenes as divinely determined. In fact, Cleisthenes named one of the tribes after Erechtheus.<sup>88</sup>

Athenians were made to believe in a fictionalized past that elided the history of migration and a population characterized more by diversity than unity. Over the course of the fifth and fourth centuries, the myth galvanized a purist strain among “autochthonous” Athenians that instructed them to maintain ethnic purity by restricting citizenship rights and privileges to native Athenians. Citizenship signified not only democratic equality but also membership in a shared

---

<sup>86</sup> Loraux 2002: 49.

<sup>87</sup> Hall 1997: 54.

<sup>88</sup> Connor 1993: 204.

past that was unique to those individuals who had, according to the myth, always inhabited the land of Athens. This attitude effectively constituted a separate and unequal group of residents who became the metics and resident aliens, residents who contributed to the economic and social growth of the city but who remained marginalized when it came to governing the city.

This division between a native Athenians and non-Athenians dates back to Draco whose homicide law was the first “legal distinction” that separated the population into two groups.<sup>89</sup> In *Race and Citizen Identity in the Classical Athenian Democracy*, Susan Lape traces the origins of ethnic identity in Athens beginning with Draco’s law, followed by Solon’s reforms and on to Cleisthenes’ reorganization of Athens into 10 tribes. Cleisthenes extended this reorganization to the rest of Attica, establishing 139 demes based on the traditional boundaries which divided local neighborhoods.<sup>90</sup> Lape points out that initially identity was based on where one lived. Lape analyzes the path the Athenians followed to create one *ethnikon* that absorbed all of Athens. One of the most effective programs the Athenians deployed to sow a sense of shared identity was the autochthony myth.<sup>91</sup>

### **From Myth to Practice**

The category of ‘citizen’ was made more explicit with Solon’s law of 594, which expanded the reach of Draco’s homicide law by leveraging the threat of *atimia* to prevent Athenians from resorting to self-help in dispute resolution. The significance of Solon’s law is two-fold. In the first place, Solon explicitly denies Athenians the right to use violence to resolve disputes and

---

<sup>89</sup> Lape 2010: 10.

<sup>90</sup> Lape 2010: 14.

<sup>91</sup> See Rosivach 1987 “Autochthony and the Athenians” in *The Classical Quarterly* for a discussion of the emergence of the autochthony myth.

condemns those who do to forfeit their right to be protected by the city.<sup>92</sup> By explicitly identifying the penalty of *atimia* for those who bring violence against another Athenian, Solon affirmatively grants the privilege of being able to expect that the state will protect them as part of their ‘share in the city.’ By the end of the fifth century, in addition to those who gained citizenship through Pericles’ citizenship law, there was a list of honors that afforded non-Athenians to ‘have a share in the city’ through privileges such as proxeny, *atelia*, and *enktesis*, which were awarded in recognition for contributions to the city of Athens. The examples below will focus on recipients of Athenian citizenship who planned on remaining in the city, as opposed to the majority of honorands for whom the gift was simply ceremonial.

Prior to Pericles’ law on citizenship of 451/0, Athenians may have recognized foreigners in Athens according to the principles of guest-host relations, known as *xenia*. Before Pericles’ law which stipulated that all citizens be born to natives of the city, the distinction between residents and citizens was less conspicuous. Athenians were accustomed to the presence of foreigners who moved about the city with relative ease. According to Herman in *Ritualised Friendship and the Greek City*, the community of elites in Athens and neighboring city-states regularly awarded guest privileges to one another through a “network of *xenia* alliances” that designated certain elites as *proxenoi*.<sup>93</sup> Since the nature of Athenian citizenship in the 7th and 6th centuries was not as formally constituted as it was following Pericles’ law, there is uncertainty regarding the naturalization of non-Athenians from the time of Solon to Pericles. What does seem plausible,

---

<sup>92</sup> See Arist. *AP* 8.5: ος αν στασιαζούσης τῆς πόλεως μὴ θῆται τὰ ὄπλα μηδὲ μεθ’ ἐτέρων, ἄτιμιον εἶναι καὶ τῆς πόλεως μὴ μετέχειν. For discussion of the significance of Solon’s decree and the effect it had on the recruitment of the term “*astoi*” in Pericles’ citizenship law, see A. Diller 1937: *Race Mixture among the Greeks before Alexander*; see also C. Patterson 1976: *Pericles’ Citizenship Law of 451/0 B.C.*: 5-24.

<sup>93</sup> G. Herman 1987: 138-9.

based on the evidence presented in Plutarch's *Solon* and the *Athenaion Politeia*, is that Athenian townspeople, or *astoi*, were afforded some financial relief from overwhelming debt through Solon's economic reforms and were protected from invasion by their hoplite army.<sup>94</sup> In addition, prior to Solon's archonship in the sixth century, Draco had intervened judicially in the case of murder and potentially other crimes among the population. Following Pericles' law of citizenship, the number of honors and grants bestowed by the Athenians on foreigners grew, and by the fourth-century, expanded to include other benefits intended to honor the recipients for their contributions to the state, or perhaps even more important, to recognize and promote aid in the future.

Pericles' law expanded the notion of *genos* into a wider association among citizens. In her 1976 dissertation, Cynthia Patterson describes the affiliation between Athenian citizens as both "horizontal," across social and cultural boundaries, and "vertical," up and down between the wealthy and the citizen-farmers. Patterson examines the population of fifth-century Athens as one in which the expansion of trade led many to take up residence in the city to pursue business opportunities. Pericles' citizenship law kept the divisions between the town and country populations in check since "cultural differences are important and often form the basis of political differences or differences of interest."<sup>95</sup> Patterson views Pericles' reforms as integral to shaping the Athenian democracy. Commenting on Pericles' decision to pay jurors for their service, Patterson writes, "It is clear that the new system enabled (and required) a greater amount

---

<sup>94</sup> See Plut. Solon 24.4, Παρέχει δ' ἀπορίαν καὶ ὁ τῶν δημοποιήτων νόμος, ὅτι γενέσθαι πολίτας οὐ δίδωσι πλὴν τοῖς φεύγουσιν ἀειφυγία τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἢ πανεστίους Ἀθήναζε μετοικιζόμενοις ἐπὶ τέχνῃ. See A.P. 4.2 for reference to Solon's economic reforms which afforded a return to Athens for those who had been forced to sell themselves into slavery in order to repay debts, "ἢ δὲ τάξις αὐτοῦ τόνδε τὸν τρόπον εἶχε. ἀπεδέδοτο μὲν ἡ πολιτεία τοῖς ὄπλα παρεχομένοις."

<sup>95</sup> Patterson 1976: 52.

of public participation which Plato considered dangerous — and Pericles apparently thought essential.”<sup>96</sup>

Once approved by the Assembly, a new citizen was enfranchised with all the privileges and duties of Athenian-born citizens with the exception of being barred from service as one of the nine archons, or to be a member of the Athenian priesthood.<sup>97</sup> Unlike an alien or metic, a naturalized citizen could own property, serve in any public office in Athens (with the exception of archon or priest); could initiate a case in court as well as serve as a juror; and could participate as a member of a jury as well as speak in the Assembly and the *Boule*. As a citizen, he could trade in the Agora freely, he was exempt from both the *xenika*, a tax levied on aliens, and the *metoikion*, a tax of twelve drachmas paid annually by metics.<sup>98</sup> Socially, he was free to marry an Athenian woman, with whom he might produce sons who would be recognized as Athenian citizens.

As M. J. Osborne points out in his introduction to *Naturalisation in Athens*, for the most part, these gifts of proxeny or citizenship were most often given to high-ranking dignitaries of other states and were frequently simply tokens of Athenian esteem. There were cases, however, in which a grant of citizenship was made to a leader from a neighboring city-state who had been thrown out of his city and sought asylum with the Athenians. A noteworthy example of Athenian

---

<sup>96</sup> Patterson 1976: 174.

<sup>97</sup> Dem. 59.92: “ὅσους γὰρ ἂν ποιήσῃται ὁ δῆμος ὁ Ἀθηναίων πολίτας, ὁ νόμος ἀπαγορεύει διαρρήδην μὴ ἐξεῖναι αὐτοῖς τῶν ἐννέα ἀρχόντων γενέσθαι, μηδὲ ἱερωσύνης μηδεμιᾶς μετασχεῖν· τοῖς δ' ἐκ τούτων μετέδωκεν ἤδη ὁ δῆμος ἀπάντων . . .”

<sup>98</sup> The distinction between a metic and an alien is not clear-cut. According to some scholars, a non-Athenian residing in Athens up to a period of 30 days, or as long as 90 days according to other scholars, was classified as an alien. An alien might be participating in some type of commercial venture, or might have been staying as a guest within a household. A metic is most often understood to have been a resident alien, i.e., an individual who had established some type of residency in the city and remained past whatever period was deemed as ‘temporary.’ Unlike an alien, a metic was subject not only to pay a specific annual tax but could also be conscripted into military service.

*xenia* is the case of Arybbas, the king of the Molossoi, a small city in north-west Greece. In 343/2, Arybbas fled to Athens to escape his nephew, Philip of Macedon, who had overthrown his wife's uncle. The *stele* that commemorated his asylum grant included provisions that stipulated that Arybbas was entitled to the same protections and privileges accorded to the other Athenians; if Arybbas was killed while in Athens, the penalty would be the same as if he were an Athenian. The *stele* explicitly confers "citizenship" upon Arybbas, ("ἡ πολιτεία ἡ δοθ[ε]ῖσα . . . ὑπαρχ[ο]υσ[ι] ἀντῶι καὶ τοῖς ἐκγόνο[ι]ς . . ." [IG <sup>ii22</sup>226]). In addition, the Athenians promised to return Arybbas and his sons to power once the Athenian generals had recovered his fatherland. Arybbas is believed to have received the largest *stele* commemorating an award of citizenship in Athens, but the promise of being re-instated as ruler of the Molossians never came to pass and Arybbas is said to have died while in exile, presumably in Athens.<sup>99</sup>

Status similar to full citizenship, *isoteleia*, or 'equality of obligations', was awarded to foreigners who had served Athens in a significant way. The award of *isoteleia* was given to the men who joined the initial group of foreigners who marched from Phyle to the Piraeus to overthrow the Thirty Tyrants in 403. Later, in 338/7, the Acharians who assisted the Athens in their battle against Philip at Chaeronea received a grant of *isoteleia*. The Athenians' view of *isoteleia* seems to point in the direction of a temporary grant of citizenship until a return to the foreigner's homeland, if in fact the recipient elected to remain in Athens, such as was seen with the Olynthians.<sup>100</sup> Citizenship awards or an award of *isoteleia* or *proxenia* was primarily an honorific title. In most cases, individual grants of citizenship were an expression of gratitude. In

---

<sup>99</sup> IG <sup>ii2</sup> 226; See M. J. Osborne 1983: 56-60; See also P. J. Rhodes and R. Osborne 2003: 348-355.

<sup>100</sup> Rhodes and Osborne: 2003: 382-3. As editors, Rhodes and Osborne note that the decree does not contain the term '*isoteleia*' but rather spells out what privileges the decree bestowed.

addition, an individual was awarded a citizenship grant as an incentive given to privileged foreigners who were perceived to be valuable to Athens, either militarily, economically, or both.

## CHAPTER THREE

### CONCLUSION

The examples above highlight the contradictions within the Athenian democracy. On the one hand, Athenians projected an image of openness and equality to their neighbors, in direct contrast to the closed society of the Spartans.<sup>101</sup> The diversity that characterized the Athenian population was greater than that of neighboring city-states.<sup>102</sup> Internally, however, the Athenians protected admission into the democracy by cultivating an ethno-centric identity through the propagation of the autochthony myth. This attitude manifested itself in the scrutiny and restrictiveness which the Athenians deployed again and again as Athenian allies sought asylum in Athens. Beyond the exclusivity of restricting membership to adult males above the age of 18, the conditions for the admission of a new citizen from outside Athens were dependent on a demonstration of character traits that the Athenians admired and appreciated. For instance some *metics* demonstrated their ability to fight as defenders of the democracy against the Thirty. The Samians and Plataeans both served as Athenian allies against a shared enemy. While the degree to which these new citizens obtained full membership in the democracy is debatable, the conditions for membership hinged on the demonstration of loyalty to Athens and a commitment to serve the city's interest.

---

<sup>101</sup> Sparta did assimilate non-Spartans known as the *perioikoi* into their army after conquering nearby city-states. Despite serving in the Spartan army, the *perioikoi* did not receive the protections and rights of Spartan citizens.

<sup>102</sup> See Pope 1976: 72 who cites Thucydides, 1.2.6 for the increase in the population of Athenian citizens from *metics* and exiles, “καὶ παράδειγμα τότε τοῦ λόγου οὐκ ἐλάχιστόν ἐστι διὰ τὰς μετοικίας ἐς τὰ ἄλλα μὴ ὁμοίως αὐξηθῆναι· ἐκ γὰρ τῆς ἄλλης Ἑλλάδος οἱ πολέμῳ ἢ στάσει ἐκπίπτοντες παρ’ Ἀθηναίους οἱ δυνατώτατοι ὡς βέβαιον ὄν ἀνεχώρουν, καὶ πολῖται γινόμενοι εὐθὺς ἀπὸ παλαιοῦ μείζω ἔτι ἐποίησαν πλήθει ἀνθρώπων τὴν πόλιν . . .”. See also Whitehead 1977: 19 for a description of the diversity of the population in Athens from the end of the fifth century.

Naturalization was a privilege awarded to those who had defended Athens, or in some cases, individuals who could assist Athens in the future. On the other hand, the number of non-Athenians residing in Athens without this privilege, as metics, was greater than the number of individuals who were honored with Athenian citizenship. The Plataeans, the Samians, and the *metics* who fought under Thrasybulus were conspicuous beneficiaries of the citizenship grants and served as examples to the population. Acting on behalf of the city's security and defending Athens from attack rewarded non-Athenians with the right to enjoy access to the benefits of Athenian democracy. If, however, one's behavior was no longer exemplary or the political alliance was no longer needed, the degree to which one could claim Athenian citizenship became problematic as was seen in the case of Theodotos.

The fact that naturalization was not widespread was due to the need to maintain order, or at least a feeling that order existed. The need for order or a re-ordering of the city's population is what motivated Cleisthenes' reforms and Pericles' citizenship law. But beneath the surface of these laws lay the unruly nature of *polis* life, especially when we recall Pericles' need to request that his son be made exempt from his citizenship law. In an essay entitled "Cities of Reason," Oswyn Murray describes the ancient Greek city as an example of politics with less ethnic and tribal affiliations than the modern city. Murray's understanding of Athenian political history pivots on the need to maintain *eunomia* within the community as a whole. When the city began to divide into smaller factional communities, characterized by ethnic associations and financial alliances, the vision of a larger community was lost.

The formulae and rituals that accompanied citizenship enrollment were designed to inculcate a sense that the democracy was able to be both open and controlled at the same time.

Murray sees the scripted nature of the rituals as essential to the Athenians' attempt "To discover or to aid in the creation of a general will to action, and to express that general will in an ordered ritual."<sup>103</sup> As was seen in the examples above, the reality of membership in the democracy for recipients of citizenship grants was much less ordered than the formulaic language of the inscriptions or the rituals that accompanied them.

---

<sup>103</sup> See Murray 1987: 340.

## LIST OF REFERENCES

- Cawkwell, G. L. 1962. "The Defence of Olynthus." *CQ* 12.1: 122-140.
- Carter, J. M. 1971. "Athens, Euboea and Olynthus." *Historia* 20: 418-429.
- Cohen, E. 2000. *The Athenian Nation*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Connor, W. R. 1993. "The Ionian era of Athenian civic identity." *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* (PAPS) Vol. 137, No. 2: 194-206.
- Davies, J. K. 1967. "Demosthenes on Liturgies: A Note." *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*, Vol. 87: 33-40.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1977-8. "Athenian Citizenship: The Descent Group and the Alternatives." *CJ* 73: 105-21.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1981. *Wealth and the Power of Wealth in Classical Athens*. Salem, NH: Ayer Co. Publishers.
- Diller, A. 1937. *Race Mixture among the Greeks before Alexander*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Dover, K. J. 1978. *Greek Homosexuality*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Ehrenberg, V. 1973. *From Solon to Socrates* 2d. ed. London: Methuen & Co. Ltd.
- Fisher, N. R. E. 1976. *Social Values in Classical Athens*. London: Dent.
- Farenga, V. 2006. *Citizen and Self in Ancient Greece, Individuals Performing Justice and the Law*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Francken, C. M. 1865. *Commentationes Lysiacaе*. Utrecht: Kemink and Sons.
- Garnsey, P. ed. 1980. *Non-Slave Labour in the Greco-Roman World*. Cambridge: The Cambridge Philological Society.
- Hall, J. M. 1997. *Ethnic identity in Greek antiquity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Herman, G. 1987. *Ritualised Friendship and the Greek City*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kapparis, K. A. 1995. "The Athenian decree for the naturalisation of the Plataeans." *GRBS* 36: 359- 378.
- \_\_\_\_\_. and Wolpert, A., eds. 2011. (eds), *Legal Speeches of Democratic Athens*. Indianapolis: Hackett Press.
- Lewis, D. and R. Meiggs. 1969. *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the End of the fifth Century*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. and Rhodes, P. J., eds. 1997. *The Decrees of the Greek States*. Oxford: Clarendon Press and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Loraux, N. 1993. *The Children of Athena: Athenian Ideas about Citizenship and the Division between the Sexes*. Trans. C. Levine. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2002. "The Mourning Voice: An Essay on Greek Tragedy." Trans. E. T. Rawlings. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Manville, P. B. 1990. 1990. *The Origins of Citizenship in Ancient Athens*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- MacDowell, D. M. 1978. *The Law in Classical Athens*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

- ed. 1990. *Demosthenes: Against Meidias*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Murray, O. 1987. "Cities of Reason." *European Journal of Sociology* 28: 325-346.
- Muller, K. O. 1830. *The History and Antiquities of the Doric Race*. Oxford.
- Osborne, M.J. 1972. "Attic Citizenship Decrees: A Note." *The Annual of the British School at Athens*, Vol. 67: 129-158.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1981-3. *Naturalization in Athens*, Volumes I, III and IV. Brussels.
- Osborne R. G. and Rhodes, P. J. 2003. *Greek Historical Inscriptions 404-323 BC*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Parker, R. 1997. *Athenian Religion: a history*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Patterson, C. 1976. Pericles' Citizenship Law of 451/0 B.C. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Ph.D. dissertation.
- Pope, H. 1976. *Non-Athenians in Attic Inscriptions: Prolegomena and a Prosopography in Alphabetical Order*. Chicago: Ares Publishers.
- Rhodes, P. J. 1981. *Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia*. Oxford: Clarendon Press and New York: Oxford University Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1986. *The Greek City-States: A Sourcebook*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. & Lewis, D. 1997. *The Decrees of the Greek States*. Oxford: Clarendon Press & New York: Oxford University Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. & Osborne R. G. 2003. *Greek Historical Inscriptions 404-323 BC*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2010. *A History of the Classical Greek World 478-323 BC*. Oxford and Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell Ltd.
- Rosivach, Vincent. 1987. "Autochthony and the Athenians" in *The Classical Quarterly* Vol. 37, No. 2, pp. 294-306
- Rusten, J.S., ed. 1989. *Thucydides: The Peloponnesian War, Book II*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Saxonhouse, A. 1992. *Fear of Diversity: The Birth of Political Science in Ancient Greek Thought*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Sealey, R. *A History of the Greek City-States ca. 700 – 338 B.C.* Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Simms, R. 1998. "The Phrearrhian lex sacra. An Interpretation", *Hesp.* 67.
- Todd, S. C. 2007. *A Commentary on Lysias: Speeches I-11*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Whitehead, D. 1977. *The Ideology of the Athenian Metic*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge Philological Society.
- Wijma, Sara M. 2013, The "Others" in a lex sacra from the Attic Deme Phrearrhioi (SEG 35.113) in *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* Bd. 187, pp. 199-205.
- Wolpert, A. and Kapparis K. A., eds. 2011. *Legal Speeches of Democratic Athens*. Indianapolis: Hackett Press. 54.

