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This thesis considers the position of the Athenian metic in the fifth and fourth centuries B.C.

Chapter I, the Introduction, sets the limits of the study.

In Chapter II the status of the resident alien is shown to have been no accident, but a conscious creation, well-defined within the Kleisthenic democracy. While the rights of the metic appear superficially analogous to those of the citizen, in fact they differed in five essentials: 1) the metic was not independent but required a "patron" or prostates; 2) he paid an annual tax, the metoikion; 3) he had no political rights; 4) he could not marry an Athenian citizen; and 5) he was forbidden to own real property, either land or houses.

Chapter III tests the validity of the antithesis between the citizen or homo politicus and the non-citizen or homo economicus. The economic pursuits of both metic and citizen are outlined, and it is thus seen that the metic's rôle in the Athenian economy was not casual but fundamental: he monopolized banking and trade and was predominant in industry. By contrast the citizen's activities were those based on his ownership of land. Because of this division, land, industry, and commerce never became permanently interrelated and Athens' economy remained inherently weak.
Indispensable as the metic was to Athens, Chapter IV points out that he never overcame the citizen's jealous hold on the right to citizenship. In fact, a very high penalty was set for the usurpation of this privilege. The naturalization of the metic was rare even in the fourth century, when the demos lavished every kind of honour on foreign kings and dignitaries whose patronage it sought.

Chapter V concludes that, although the metic was responsible for Athens' economic superiority and, indeed, for much of her cultural heritage, his contributions have been underestimated, if not ignored. As a result, our picture of Athenian life is one-sided.

A discussion of two historical problems that concern the metic and a chronological table are appended.
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Athenian writers of the classical era showed only a passing interest in the non-citizen population. None, for example, saw fit to describe the life, or estimate the importance, of the resident alien. Indeed, Xenophon's *Revenues* is unique in that it discusses the metic specifically and at some length. As a result, we are forced to rely for evidence upon allusions scattered, at times by the sheerest accident, throughout diverse works composed for far different purposes.

The Athenian orators are the richest literary source, among whom Demosthenes is by far the most fruitful author. Much too can be derived from Aristotle's *Athenaion Politeia* and *Politics* and Plato's *Laws*. In other words, all the best authorities are of the fourth century, as is most of the epigraphic evidence, which includes building accounts, manumission inscriptions, and honorary decrees. Of necessity, then, a study of the metic is based mainly on fourth-century evidence. However, since I believe that the metic's status - his legal rights, privileges, and disabilities - did not change significantly from its inception at the end of the sixth century, an account of the metic's position in Athens in the fourth century will be valid for the fifth as well. By the same token, I have seen fit to include, where they existed, details drawn from fifth-century sources.

On the other hand, the importance of the metic to Athens
and his rôle in the economy was by no means static but fluctuated with the prosperity of Athens itself or, more accurately, of the Peiraieus. What these fluctuations were and when they occurred I have pointed out in the conclusions to my chapter on the economic position of the metic. To simplify the reading and to show each period or event in relationship to others, a chronological table has been appended.

Since it is difficult to make a clear distinction between the metic and the xenos, there is a problem of terminology. The word "metic" or "resident alien" refers specifically to the non-citizen who has assumed that status, while alien or xenos, the more general term, embraces all "foreigners" in Athens, only part of whom were metics.

Unless otherwise indicated, English translations are those published in the Loeb Library editions, even where the Greek text cited may itself differ. The one exception is Thucydides, for whom I have used Crawley's translation.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In 371/0 Pasion, the Athenian banker, died leaving a fortune of seventy talents. Pasion had not always been wealthy, or a banker. Originally, he had been a slave who was given his freedom by his employers, Antisthenes and Archestratos. Later he became head of their banking house and was eventually granted Athenian citizenship. Pasion's good fortune was not unique: ten years after his death his own former freedman, Phormion, also a successful banker, received a similar gift of citizenship. And from Deinarchos we hear briefly of two other bankers, Epigenes and Konon, who became citizens through the efforts of Demosthenes the orator. Before their naturalization all four bankers had possessed the legal status of metics.

In Athens the naturalization of metics was rare. Thus it is worth asking why four bankers in particular should be chosen for this privilege. In seeking an answer to this question, I have been led to a study of the Athenian economy and of the metic's rôle in it. Moreover, before I could view even this in its

1 Dem. 46.13.
2 Dem. 36.5.
3 Ibid. 43.
4 Dem. 59.2.
5 Dem. 46.13.
6 1.43.
totality, I was obliged to consider the metic's legal position. It is with the latter that we shall begin.
CHAPTER II

THE STATUS OF THE METIC

A. Deme of Residence

In literature there is no standard identification of the metic analogous to the citizen's demotic. As an example, Demosthenes' orations show considerable variety. In his speech Against Meidias he introduces τὸν μέτοικον τὸν Αἰγύπτιον, Πάμφιλον, but, when summoned as a witness, the same man appears merely as Pamphilos. Elsewhere, he mentions Ktesikles, the metoikos, and Kephisiades, τὸν ἄνθρωπον μέτοικον. On the other hand, in a whole series of commercial suits, the principals are almost exclusively metics, yet none is so designated. They are referred to by their ethnics, as Nausikrates, the Karystian, or Artemon and Apollodoros, the Phaselites.

In inscriptions the phrase "residing in" together with the deme identifies the metic. There are many examples in the building accounts, such as Ἀχείος εἰς Μελίτην οἰκ(οῦντι) in IG I² 373.103 (409/8) or Εὔθυμιός εἰς Καλλιττήν οἰκοῦντι in IG II² 1672.8 (329/8). In the Catalogi Paterarum Argentaeorum, where the defendants are freedmen and thus metics, this designation

1. 21.163 and 168.
2 48.20 and 52.9.
3 35.10. Others are 32, 33, 34, and 56.
is particularly common. Indeed, a number of the plaintiffs are themselves metics. A typical example is IG II²1559.55-58, Πολύτιμος ἐν Κολλυ(τῷ) οἴκῳ(ῶν) σκυτοτο(μος) ἀποφυγ(ῶν) Καλλίαν Καλλίαδου Πασανίε(α) φιάλ(ην) σταθ(μόν). Metics also appear in poletai lists. In IG I²329.14 (414/3) the slaves of the Hermokopid Κηφισοδόρου μετοικοῦ ἐμ Περα[νη] are confiscated. This is a rare instance in which the word metoikos appears in the body of an inscription.

It was Wilamowitz who first suggested that the status of the metic depended on registration in a deme. With acceptance into the deme the alien assumed the rights and duties of the metic. As a legal entity he was at once identifiable by the phrase "residing in," an official designation similar to the citizen's demotic. Lists of metics are known to have been


5 See Andokides, On the Mysteries 15.

6 It is also found in IG II²1951.103 (ca. 400) where the ναυπηγός of a vessel is named 'Ἀμύνανθος μέτοι(κος).

7 "Demotika der attischen Metoeken," Hermes 22 (1887) 107-123.

8 Cf. M. Clerc, Les Métèques Athéniens (Paris 1893) 237 ff.; H. Francotte, L'Industrie dans la Grèce Ancienne (Brussels 1900) 204; Busolt-Swoboda, StK 1.294; and H. Hommel, RE 15 (1932) 1433, s.v. Μέτοικοι. All accept Wilamowitz' view. They have not,
Nothing could be more practical than that the individual demarch inscribe such a list together with the ληξιαρχικὸν γραμματεῖον.

Following the work begun by Wilamowitz, Clerc compiled an extensive list showing the distribution of metics by demes. It is worthy of careful consideration. Although there were however, accepted his further contention that the metics belonged to the tribes and were in fact "quasi-citizens." Metics, he pointed out ("Demotika," 214), supplied choruses for the Lenaia and served in the infantry. Since the citizens carried out both these functions by tribes, the metics must have belonged to the tribes as well. Unfortunately, nothing is known about how the metics carried out their responsibilities to the Athenian state. But it is assuming far too much to include them in the tribes merely to solve a practical problem. Indeed, Ath. Pol. 53.2 and 58.2 indicate the opposite. Lawsuits of aliens, unlike those of citizens, were divided by lot among the ten tribes, presumably because the aliens had no tribes.


10 Μέτεχες 450 ff.
between 170 and 174 demes, metics are found listed in only 31, these predominantly urban and suburban. Of 263 metics identifiable in inscriptions mainly from the fifth and fourth centuries, fifty reside in Melite alone, 41 in the Peiraeus, and 26 in each of Alopeke and Kollytos. To consider two inscriptions, IG I²373 and 374, the Erechtheion building accounts, of 38 metics fourteen are domiciled in Melite and seven in Alopeke. The residence of metics in city demes is not surprising considering their banausic occupations. The Kleisthenic distribution of citizens equally into ten tribes and their hereditary membership in the demes were at the base of the Athenian political system. Since the metics had no share in the political life of Athens, there was nothing to prevent their concentration in a few demes strictly on the basis of occupational advantage.

In certain classes of inscriptions the metic's designation never appears. In the Monumenta Privata Peregrinorum the ethnic is used, at times along with the patronymic. Yet many, if not most, of the aliens in these funeral inscriptions must be metics. Honorary decrees are another group in which metics are undesignated. In IG II²554 (ca. 300) a metic can be identified from the context. Euxenides of Phaselis is praised among other reasons

11 Strabo 9.1.16. According to C. W. J. Eliot, Coastal Demes of Attika (Toronto 1962) 3, this was "an accurate count to judge from the number of deme names known today."

12 There are 2,648 inscriptions in all, IG II²7832-10,530. Since there is no separate group for metics, I assume that they are included in the above.
because τάς τε εἰσφορὰς ἀπὸ [ἀς]ας ὡςας ἐψηφίσται ὁ δῆμος ε[ι]ςενηκείν τοὺς μετοίκους ε[ι]ςάκτως [ε]ιςενήκοχεν. Unfortunately, in these inscriptions metics cannot be identified accurately unless known from other sources.

B. The Prostates

In the Politics Aristotle differentiates the citizen's legal status from that of the metic by pointing to the latter's need of a prostates. According to Isokrates the Athenians judged the metic by his choice of "patron." Only twice, and then fleetingly, does the prostates appear in literature - both times in Demosthenes. In the oration Against Aristogeiton the metic Zobia does not take the stand personally to corroborate her complaints against the defendant. Instead, the speaker

13 Clerc, Méteques 243, suggests that the designation of the metic was employed only in official state documents in order to distinguish him from other elements of the population. Since the metic probably retained citizenship in his country of origin, in his own eyes he was, e.g., a Karian or Phaselite, not an Athenian, and was proud to refer to himself as such in monuments of his own. Hence the ethnic was also more acceptable to him in honorary inscriptions. This is true of epidoseis lists, but since examples fall later than the fourth century, I have not included them in this study. See, e.g., IG II² 791.

14 1275a 12-13.

15 8.53.
summons her prostates. Apollodoros, in the famous suit Against Neaira, accuses the courtesan of living as the wife of an Athenian citizen, the very man she once chose as her prostates. If actual references to the prostates are scant, it is known, at any rate, that the metic could not be without a "patron" unless

16 25.58.
17 59.37. I have translated prostates as patron in deference to common usage, although there is no evidence that the word ever had the same implications as the Roman patronus. Both Thucydides (3.75; 4.46) and Aristotle (Ath. Pol. 22.5; 28.2) use prostates as champion or leader, generally of the demos. The word also means protector, as in Aischylos' Suppliants 963-964, where the Argive king promises his protection to the Danaidai: προστάτης δ' ἔγω ἄστοι τε πάντες, ἄνωπερ ἢ δὲ κραίνεται ψῆφος. In describing Neaira's choice of a patron Demosthenes employs the verb προίσταμαι uniquely, as far as I know. According to LSJ⁹ (s.v. προίστημι, A II) the expression προίστασθαι τοιοῦτος ἑαυτῷ means "to take as one's leader or guardian." Generally, the terminology was προστάτην νέμειν or γραφεῖσθαι. The former is found in the lexicographers and Aristotle's Politics (cited above). As for the latter, see Sophokles' Oidipous the King 411, where Teiresias declares: οὔ Κρέοντος προστάτου γεγραμμένοι. Cf. Aristophanes' Peace 684, τὸν δῆμον ἀρχεσθεῖσ' ὤτι οὐτω πονηρὸν προστάτην ἐπεγράψατο and the scholiast ad locum: ἧ μεταφορὰ ἀπὸ τῶν μετοίκων τούς προστάτας προγραφοῦνταν ἑαυτοῖς.
officially freed by a decree of the demos. It was an offence indictable under a γραφὴ ἀπροστασίου and considered serious enough to warrant punishment by sale into slavery.

The role of the prostates remains a problem. If the definitions of the lexicographers are to be believed, the metic required his assistance in all matters, public and private. Yet in the literary sources, no prostates is found as witness, spokesman, or guarantor for the metic in his legal and financial transactions, nor does his name accompany that of the metic in inscriptions.

Wilamowitz came to the conclusion that the prostates had no rôle whatever in the life of the Athenian metic. It is no coincidence, he argued, that, wherever a prostates does appear, it

18 Dem. 35.48; Ath. Pol. 58.3; and Harpokration, s.v. προστάτης. The punishment is known from entries in the lexica of Photios and Suidas, s.v. πωληταί. See J. H. Lipsius, Das attische Recht und Rechtsverfahren. (Leipzig 1905-1915) 372-373, and Busolt-Swoboda, StK 1.294 and 2(1926)1095. Both accept the punishment.

19 Harpokration, s.v. προστάτης: οἱ τῶν μετοίκων Ἀθηναίων προστήκοτες προστάται ἐκαλοῦντο· ἀναγκαῖον γὰρ ἂν ἔκαστον τῶν μετοίκων πολίτην τινὰ Ἀθηναίων νέμειν προστάτην. Ὁμ. ἀπροστασίου· δ...τίνα προστησόμενον περὶ πάντων τῶν ἰδίων καὶ τῶν κοινῶν.

20 "Demotika," 223-225.
is as the representative of a woman. Because the Athenian woman had no legal status unless represented by a *kyrios*, he concluded that the metic woman required a *prostates* as her *kyrios*. All other references are to non-Athenian institutions. Lysias, for instance, speaks contemptuously of Philon, an Athenian citizen, for living in Oropos ἐπὶ προστάτου. Similarly, Lykourgos taunts Leokrates, also an Athenian, for having had a Megarian *prostates*. Even Aristotle's words, quoted above, do not apply specifically to Athens but πολλαχοῦ. (Wilamowitz assumed that Athens is not included.) The role of the Athenian *prostates*, he continued, was purely vestigial, stemming from an archaic client-patron relationship. With the introduction of the metic to the demes, personal clientage disappeared but the *prostates* remained. He acted as guarantor, ἀγωγητής, for the metic on the occasion of his official admission into the deme. With that single act his function ended and the metic was independent.

Wilamowitz' conclusions are, in my opinion, unacceptable. By rejecting Aristotle and the lexicographers, he creates new puzzles. Let us consider the passages from Lysias and Lykourgos. Would not the terminology employed by the orators be that most immediately understandable and, therefore, most effective in an Athenian court? It is doubtful that the speakers or their listeners knew the precise details of metic life in Oropos or Megara. But they did know about Athens and in describing the

21 31.9 and 14.

22 Against Leokrates 21 and 145.
status of the metic elsewhere would tend to employ the same terminology. I believe that at Athens a metic lived ἐπὶ προστάτιυν or προστάτην ἐξών. Isokrates' remarks are pointless if the relationship was not a continuing one. Finally, there is no purpose in a special γραφὴ ἀποστασίου if, in effect, the metic had no patron. Implicit in the offence is the existence of a permanent status of dependant.

In view of the size of the alien population and its floating character, a precise means of identity would be advantageous to the metic himself who, after all, had well-delineated rights, yet, if challenged, had no phratry to which he might appeal. The Athenians, moreover, were always extremely cautious lest non-citizens insinuate themselves into their own ranks. The prostates would serve a very real function in that the character and activities of each registered metic would be known to at least one Athenian citizen.

C. The Metic Tax

The metic paid a special poll tax, the metoikion, which amounted to twelve drachmas annually for a man and six for a self-supporting woman, and which was farmed out by the poletai, who

23 Cf. Lipsius, Das attische Recht 371-373 and Busolt-Swoboda, StK 2.985-986, who disagree with Wilamowitz in believing that the prostates had a continuing function in the metic's life. Because of the lack of evidence they too are not very definite about his precise role.

24 Harpokration, s.v. μετοικιόν. A woman was self-sufficient
also had jurisdiction over metics in default. The penalty was very harsh. In his speech Against Aristogeiton Demosthenes describes how the defendant dragged Zobia off to the \textit{πωλητηρίον τοῦ μετοικίου}. Had her tax not been paid, she would have been sold into slavery.

The tax has been interpreted as registration fee, protection money, or source of revenue. As a method of registration, the \textit{metoikion} is cumbersome, if not superfluous. Admission into an

---

if she had no husband or adult son who paid the tax. See below (under Occupations in which Metics are Found) for the number of alien women gainfully employed.


26 25.57. See also Plutarch, \textit{Lives of the Ten Orators} 842B, where the orator Lykourgos rescues Xenokrates the philosopher from a tax collector leading him away to the \textit{metoikion} (sic). Diogenes Laertios (4.14) tells the same story, changing the hero to Demetrios of Phaleron, who actually purchases Xenokrates from the auction block.

27 Those who interpret it as registration fee are Wilamowitz, "Demotika," 223 n.1; Clere, \textit{Mètèques} 20; and Hommel, 1448. Lipsius \textit{Das attische Recht} 372, calls it \textit{Schutzgeld} and Busolt-Swoboda, StK 2.986, refer to it as \textit{Klassenabgabe}, Wohnrechts- und Schutzgeld. J. Hasebroek, \textit{Trade and Politics in Ancient Greece} (London 1933) 159, considers it revenue as does A. M. Andreades, \textit{A History of Greek Public Finance}, Vol. 1 (Cambridge, Mass. 1933) 280.
official deme of residence under the aegis of a patron served just this function and provided a basis for participation in the state similar to that of the citizen. Besides, twelve drachmas a year was no trifling sum or nominal fee, as has been suggested. In the fifth century it was about a day's wage a month, imposed without reference to property or worth in addition to regular taxes. It could have been a serious burden on the lowest classes. On either count I can not consider the *metoikion* a "mere" registration fee, nor did Plato. In the *Laws* he states that there will be not even a small *metoikion*. Yet his concern for supervision of the metics is even greater than that of the Athenians, for he would expel them after twenty years' residence. He could not have considered the *metoikion* as a useful form of registration.

28 Admittedly a drachma purchased more in the fifth than in the fourth century. In the Erechtheion accounts of 409/8 the standard wage for slave, metic, or citizen is a drachma a day. In the Eleusinian accounts of 329/8 the average has risen to 1\$ dr. for unskilled and 2\$ for skilled labour. Bare subsistence costs about three obols, since this is the amount given the public slaves in the latter inscriptions. Ἐρασίμος at the same period received four obols a day for their maintenance (*Ath. Pol.* 42.3). By these standards in the fourth century a family of four required at least two dr. a day for minimum subsistence. Those who earned below this would have felt the *metoikion* as onerous.

29 850 B.
I interpret the *metoikion* as a common imposition in most Greek states, a burden on the resident alien in return for the rights and privileges of his status - a kind of *Schutzgeld*. In addition it kept the destitute from becoming metics by setting a minimum financial limit for permanent residence. As a source of revenue, it was not an enormous sum. *Vis-à-vis* the citizen, however, the metic did give *prosodos* and not receive it, as Xenophon well points out. That the Athenians punished default by slavery is not surprising, for even citizens who did not pay their taxes were disfranchised.

D. The Status of the Metic

The *xenos*, once initiated in the above manner, became a *metoikos*. Whether the change of status was voluntary or obligatory remains in doubt. Officially, there were two distinct groups. Thucydides distinguishes τοὺς μετοίκους καὶ ξένους ὁμοίως παρῆσαν. In the *Politics* Aristotle warns against too populous a state where

---

30 See Dem. 29.3 for Megara and Lysias 31.9 for Oropos.

31 *Revenues* 2.1. Cf. Andreades, *Public Finance* 280: "But even if we admit that the metoekion produced far less (e.g. 20-30 talents), the importance of the revenues was nevertheless quite exceptional for a third reason; since the indirect taxes, on which the public finance of the Greek cities was based, had the disadvantage of fluctuating proportionately with consumption, a fixed revenue - as being direct - was very acceptable to those who were charged with the preparation of the budget."

32 4.90.1.
it is easy for xenoi and metoikoi to usurp the rights of citizenship. According to Pollux those not inscribed as metics were called ἀνεξάκτωτοι. Aristophanes of Byzantion names them ξένοι παρεπιθημοι, stating further that they became metics after a definite lapse of time. That this was the procedure in at least two other Greek states is shown by a fifth-century Lokrian decree concerning the relations between Chaleion and Oiantheia. It specifies that their respective citizens are to become metics after one month's residence in the other's territory. A group of Athenian inscriptions can only be explained on the assumption that a similar procedure existed in Athens. These decrees grant exemption from the metoikion to aliens, many of whom intended to reside only temporarily in Athens. IG II²141, for example, grants

34 3.57.
35 In Lexeis he defines the metic: μέτοικος δε ἐστιν, ὅποταν τις ἀπὸ ξένης ἐλεῶν ἐνοικιά τῇ πόλει τέλος τελῶν εἰς ἀποτελαμένας τινὰς χρείας τῆς πόλεως: ἐως μὲν οὖν ποσῶν ἡμερῶν παρεπιθημος καλεῖται καὶ ἄτελῆς ἐστιν· ἐὰν δὲ ὑπερβῇ τὸν ὀρισμένον χρόνον, μέτοικος ἡδὲ γίγνεται καὶ ὑποτελῆς (cited by Hommel, 1413-1414). Wilamowitz, "Demotika," 234 and Hommel, 1414 do not accept this definition as evidence for the fifth and fourth centuries but only for the third, when Aristophanes lived. Lipsius, Das attische Recht 370, and Busolt-Swoboda, StK 294, on the other hand, base their opinions on its acceptance.
36 GDI 1479.
this and other exemptions to Sidonians ὑπόσοι...ἐπιδημοῦσιν καὶ ἐμπορίαν Ἀθηνᾶς. Since it was assumed that these aliens would pay the metoikion, it must have been obligatory for all after a definite period of time.

I interpret the evidence as follows. No alien could remain in Athens indefinitely without assuming the duties and responsibilities of a permanent resident. After a stipulated time he presented himself to some public official, probably the Polemarch, and submitted to an examination before becoming a metic. Athens did not accept all applicants, only those who were able to support themselves and pay the customary taxes, the metoikion in particular. Better still, they should have a trade or profession. Broadly speaking, there were three groups of xenoi in Athens: a) transients, παρεπιδημοῦντες, on specific business; b) allies or subjects whose relations were defined by treaty; c) individuals like the Sidonian merchants with special privileges and exemptions. For the most part, metics were permanent residents.
who had immigrated to Athens with their entire households. Only the very wealthy could maintain a residence and pay taxes in two states.

E. Taxation

Metics paid taxes other than the metoikion in exactly the same manner as citizens, by discharging annual liturgies and by contributing to special levies on property. What comprised the liturgies of metics is unknown, although Demosthenes does distinguish them from those of the citizens. It is certain that metics acted as choregoi, since Lysias boasts of having provided

40 Legally freedmen were also metics, as indicated in note 4.

41 This interpretation is provisional and in no way does justice to the related question of the xenos in Athens. A distinction was rarely made by the Athenians. To them metics were xenoi. Leptines' law, for instance, forbids exemption from taxation to citizens, isoteleis, and xenoi (Dem. 20.29). The last group includes metics. Similarly, Demosthenes' oration Against Euboulides (57.55) was written in defence of an Athenian accused of being an alien. He asks, εἰτ' ἐγὼ ξένος; ποῦ μετοίκιον ματαθείς; Throughout this speech xenos and metoikos are used interchangeably. Thus it is very often difficult to distinguish with certainty the alien from the metic. Indeed, at some point all metics (except freedmen) were xenoi. Further research on this aspect of the question might prove fruitful.

42 20.18.
choruses himself. For payment of the eisphorai metics were organized like the rest of the population into symmoriai with their own epimeletai and tamiai. At what rate they were taxed

43 12.20. Cf. IG II²141.35. The scholiast to Aristophanes' Ploutos 954 states that the metics were prohibited from taking part in the choruses at the tragic contests (ἐν τῷ ἀστικῷ χώρᾳ), but not at the Lenaia because there they also acted as choregoi. From an obscure passage in Ulpian (Dindorf's edition 9.463, his reference Dem. 20.462.13), we also learn that metics feasted one another at public festivals (εἰστίων ἀλλήλους). This may refer to a ἐστίασις of the metic. There is no extant reference to triremes provided by metics. The first known foreign trierarch was Stesileides of Siphnos, IG II²1623.204,251,268 (333/2). See below under Isoteleia for more about this man.

44 Lysias, loc. cit. See also IG II²554, where a metic is honoured for services which included τὰς τε εἰσφορὰς ἀπ[άς]ας ὡσας ἐψήφιστα: ο ὁδήμος ε[ἰ]σενεγκεῖν τοὺς μετοίκους. Isokrates 17.41 concerns a metic who boasts that as registrar ἐπέγραψα τὴν μεγίστην εἰσφοράν. This speech is dated before 378/7 when the new system of taxation based on symmoria was introduced (Harpokration, s.v. συμμορία). Hypereides, fragment 24, mentions a μετοίκικης συμμορίας ταμίας, as does IG II²244.26, which refers as well to epimeletai.
is a problem. Demosthenes refers to the ἐκτὸν μέρος τῶν μετοίκων. \[45\] IG II²244 confirms this rate, at least for the period ca. 335. But what was this "sixth portion"? Boeckh, adhering to his principle of a progressive levy on capital, maintained that, while the citizen's rate of taxation varied from 1/5 to 1/10 depending on his telos, that of the metic was universally 1/6. This system would, of course, leave the wealthiest group relatively free and fall heavily on those with less capital—quite contrary to the progressive principle. Lécrivain objected to the complexity of Boeckh's system and suggested that the metic's 1/6 was actually the sixth part of the entire levy. But in the fourth century the metics did not stand in a ratio of 1:6 to the citizens. In 323 their ratio was 3:8 and in 313 almost 1:2. Even if we

\[45\] 22.61.

\[46\] Line 20, εἰσφέρειν δὲ καὶ τοὺς μετοίκους τὸ ἐκτὸν μέ[ρος].

\[47\] A. Boeckh, The Public Economy of Athens (London 1842) 539.

\[48\] D-S 2,1.510 (s.v. eisphora). Busolt-Swoboda, StK 1.296-297 agree with Lécrivain.

\[49\] A. W. Gomme, The Population of Athens in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries B. C. (Oxford 1933) 26, gives the following figures for metics and citizens (men, women and children):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Citizens</th>
<th>Metics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>431</td>
<td>172,000</td>
<td>28,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>425</td>
<td>116,000</td>
<td>21,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>323</td>
<td>112,000</td>
<td>42,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313</td>
<td>84,000</td>
<td>35,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Andreades, Public Finance 288, has pointed out the difficulties
were to concede (and this we do not know) that as a group they were less wealthy than the citizens, being mainly artisans and traders, the very nature of their position gave them the one thing the citizens lacked - liquid assets. A relationship of 1:6 in taxation is, I believe, unreasonably disproportionate. Furthermore, in the context of Demosthenes' speech Against Androtion, the sixth portion is most easily interpreted as an extra burden or higher rate that the metic might hope to avoid by pretending to citizenship.

Perhaps Jones is correct in believing that "the *eisphora* was not a progressive tax,... all liable to it paid the same proportion of their capital, whether they were rich or poor." Within this system, all metics had a standard rate of taxation different from that of the citizens.

Of one thing we can be convinced. The metic's rate of taxation was in some way less favourable than that of the citizen.

of estimating the metic population, especially on the basis of the number of hoplites in 431. Earlier conjectures were generally higher than Gomme's for the same period (e.g., Francotte, 45,800 and Clerc, 96,000). For a recent view see A. H. M. Jones, *Athenian Democracy* (Oxford 1960) 164-165, who also believes that Gomme's figures are too low.

50 *Athenian Democracy* 28. Although he makes no mention of the metics, he discusses at length (23-30) the Athenian system of *eisphorai*. 
Otherwise, a grant of *isoteleia*, the privilege of εἰσφοράς εἰσφέρειν μετὰ τῶν Ἀθηναίων, was meaningless.

F. Military Obligations

Athens recruited metics for military service, for example, as hoplites during the Second Peloponnesian War. Although nothing is known of their training or organization, it appears that they did not serve in the regular tribal *taxeis* but in their own battalions. Indeed, one of the honours commonly

51 Metics took no part in the *ephebeia*. According to an anecdote related by Plutarch (*Themistokles* 1) the Kynosarges was exclusively the gymnasium of *nothoi* or aliens until Themistokles did away with discrimination by introducing Athenian citizens there. In Dem. 23.213 *nothoi* are still registered in the Kynosarges. Perhaps in the fourth century it was a place of registration for metic or alien children, often called *nothoi*, and a gymnasium for military exercise.

52 *IG I²* 949 (ca. 424), one of the casualty lists arranges citizens by tribe, followed by the categories ἐνγραφοί, τοχόται, and *xeneis*. The two ἐνγραφοί have occasioned endless concern. To Wilamowitz, "Demotika," 217, they were men of Plataia, Salamis, Eleutherai, or Oropos. Clerc, *Métèques* 45 ff. considered them *isoteleis* and the *xenoi* metics. Gertrude Smith, "Athenian Casualty Lists," *CP* 14 (1919) 359 agreed with Clerc. See H. Pope, *Non-Athenians in Attic Inscriptions* (New York 1935) 79 n. 42 for other opinions. I present these views without feeling it necessary to choose among them. I do, however, think
bestowed on the privileged alien was permission στρατείας στρατεύεσθαι μετὰ τῶν Ἀθηναίων. Reviewing Attika's resources in 431, Perikles specifically includes metic hoplites among the 16,000 "in the garrisons and on home duty at Athens." I agree with Gomme that reserve duty was probably their primary function, although on occasion they joined in campaigns into contiguous territory, e.g., the Megarid in 431. Wilamowitz

it significant that the three groups are kept quite distinct from the citizens. See also Jameson, "The Decree of Themistokles," 400: "Scholars writing on the metics have assumed that the registers used for their military service were in the hands of the individual demes. The virtually certain restoration of the decree says that they are to be taken from those registered with the polemarch (lines 30-31)." I presume that the metics were not mobilized through their demes with the citizens because they served in their own ταξείς. The most efficient way to enlist them was through the Polemarch's master list of all ἕξνω̣ι.

53 Thuc. 2.13.6-7.


55 Thuc. 2.31.2. Gomme, Commentary 2(1956)93 believes they replaced 3,000 citizens absent in Chalkidike. Delion was the first important occasion on which metics are known to have been used for foreign service (Thuc. 4.90.1).
believed that metics belonged to the tribes and assumed that for military purposes they were completely assimilated into the ranks of the citizens. But this overlooks the very essence of their position. Since only the wealthier metics could afford heavy armour, hoplites would necessarily be the successful artisans, traders, and "industrialists" whose occupations were most essential to Athens in wartime, and who, if recruited indiscriminately along with the citizens, would create a serious gap in Athens' economy. As a reserve force, on the other hand, they could continue to produce armaments and ensure supplies and thus doubly advance the war-effort. Naturally, the lower class of metics would be more expendable, since slaves could take their place. I assume that they served as light-armed troops along with the *xenoi* and *thetes* whenever a *levée en masse* was decreed.

No metic, whatever his financial position, could attain the rank of knight.

It was as rowers in the fleet that the poorer metics came increasingly to serve. During the early years of the Second Peloponnesian War, Athens had recruited many foreign sailors but

---

56 "Demotika," 215-217. He cites Xenophon, *Revenues* 2.2, ἄφελοιμεν δὲ καὶ τὸ συστρατεύεσθαι ὀπλίτας μετοίκους τοῖς ἀστοῖς. Xenophon seems to overstate his case for abolishing the metics' military obligations. There is, however, no reason to believe that resident aliens were carefully segregated from citizens when on expedition. They merely fought as a group, just as did each of the tribes.

57 Thuc. 4.94.1.

58 Xenophon, *Revenues* 2.5.
in emergencies, Perikles points out, she could be a match for
the Lakedaimonians by enlisting her own citizens and metics.
Later, with the defection of the xenoi, she was forced to rely
mainly on the resident aliens and thetes. At the end of the
century Pseudo-Xenophon could write, δείγμα: η πόλις μετόικων
...διὰ τὸ ναυτικόν. This continued to be their function.
In the First Philippic Demosthenes describes the manning of the
fleet with metics, χωρίς οἴκοντές, and citizens. It is
hardly surprising that, in an age of mercenary armies, service
in the fleet became a source of employment for the lowest strata
of the population.

G. Legal Position

In early times the Polemarch had acted as protector of the
alien. Only remnants of this role survived in the fifth and
fourth centuries. According to Aristotle the Polemarch "did for
the resident alien all that the archon did for the Athenian
citizen." He also reviewed private suits (τὸ αί μοῖκον) of
metics and divided them by lot among the ten tribes. Indeed,
the first step in the prosecution of a metic was to summon him

59 Thuc. 1.143.1; 3.16.1.
60 Thuc. 7.13.2 and 63.3-4. In the latter Nikias addresses
the nautai, who from the context must be metics.
61 Constitution of the Athenians 1.12.
62 4.36.
63 Cf. Isokrates 8.48 and Dem. 50.6, 7, and 23, where the
latter describes the extremely haphazard method of recruiting
sailors.
64 Ath. Pol. 58.2-3; Dem. 46.22.
before the Polemarch. There he had to post bail or remain in jail. Neaira, when accused by Phrynion of being his slave, appointed three Athenian citizens as her sureties until her status was determined. Isokrates records the bail of a metic as high as six talents. In all cases the metic had to produce guarantors because in the eyes of Athens he was apolis and, if not transient, at least rootless. He had no immovable property or

65 Lysias 23.2 and passim.

66 Dem. 32.29. Protos, the merchant, had disappeared rather than be implicated in the proceedings. The speaker explains what might have been done to hold him: "You would have called him before the Polemarch, and have had him put under bail (μανηγγύς); and, if he had appointed sureties (μανέστησε τούς ἐγγυήν), he would have been forced to remain, or you would have had persons from whom you could recover damages; if he had not given bail, he would have gone to prison (εἰς τὸ οἰκῆμα)." Lipsius, Das attische Recht 811, points out that the citizens suffered similar treatment only in certain types of public suits (Dem. 24.144). For metics it was standard procedure in all cases, public or private.


68 17.12. Other cases give no indication of the amount of bail demanded.
ancestral ties. Like Protos, the merchant, he could disappear instantly without trace. In theory, at any rate, this course was an unlikely one for the citizen to follow.

Aristotle is silent about the public suits of the metics. Fortunately, many actual cases are extant in the orators. Demosthenes recounts how Epainetos of Andros γράφεται πρὸς τοὺς θεσμοθέτας γραφὴν against the Athenian Stephanos because he had unlawfully imprisoned him for adultery. In another speech the assembly condemns a citizen for profanation of the Mysteries on the probole of Menippos a Karian. There is no hint of intervention by the Polemarch in either case. Similarly, in a series of emporikai dikai metics appear before the Thesmothetai as both defendants and plaintiffs. By all indications, public suits of metics were tried in the same manner as those of citizens, in the court appropriate to the charge. Both Clerc and Busolt concluded further that the metic did not have the broad right of indictment that the citizen enjoyed. In Athens the rule was γραψάσω Ἀθηναίων ὁ βουλόμενος. When exercised publicly, this amounted to a kind of time. The metic, as befitted his non-political role, could indict only in matters of personal concern – never in the interest of a third party or of the state.

69 59.66.
70 21.175.
71 Dem. 32, 33, 34, 35, and 56.
72 Clerc, Méthèques 91, states: "Pour les actions privées, la jurisdiction dépend du statut personnel du défendeur, sinon absolument de la présence d'un métèque dans l'affaire; pour les
Resident aliens were competent to appear in court as witnesses. Aischines orders the court-clerk, καλεῖ μοι Ἀριστοφάνην Ὀλύνθιον, καὶ τὴν μαρτυρίαν ἀναγίγνωσκε. In one of Demosthenes' orations there appear as witnesses a Boiotian, an isoteles, Aratos of Halikarnassos, and a ship's pilot called Erasikles.

In one respect the metic's legal position did differ considerably from that of the citizen. The murder of a resident alien (or foreigner or slave) was tried by the court of the Palladion along with cases of unintentional homicide. The punishment was correspondingly lighter than that inflicted by the Areiopagos. The accused, if found guilty, was permitted to leave the country without confiscation of goods.

The metic's person was not highly valued. His murder was in actions publiques, elle dépend de la nature de la cause, sans acception de personnes." Lipsius, op. cit. 66 and 244, and Busolt-Swoboda, StK 1.298 and 2.1094, have a similar view.

73 2.155.
75 Ath. Pol. 57.3. See also D. M. MacDowell, Athenian Homicide Law in the Age of the Orators (Manchester 1963) 69, "... the implication is that even the deliberate killing of such a person was not considered important enough for trial by the Areiopagos."
76 Dem. 23.45, 71, and 72 and MacDowell, ibid. 19 and 126.
the same category as that of a slave. For a number of offences he even faced the punishment of sale into slavery. On the other hand, the metic did enjoy a fully defined legal position. It was both to Athens' credit and to her advantage that within this definition she afforded the alien full protection of his rights.

H. Disabilities

By Aristotle's definition the metic was ὁ τῶν τελέον μὴ μετέχων. For he was excluded from all magistracies and priest­hoods and could not sit on the juries or in the assembly. To the individual metic, however, non-participation in public life was probably of far less concern than the economic disability he experienced in being unable to own real property either in land or houses. Unless granted ἐμκτήσεις (ἐγκτήσις) by popular decree,

77 Ταφαὶ ἀπορροφασίας and ἐξενίας and non-payment of the metoikion.

78 Politics 1278a 38.

79 Dem. 57.48 and 59.73 for offices, priesthoods and sacrifices; Lysias 13.73 and 76 juries and assembly; Ath. Pol. 42.1 ἐφεβεία; Dem. 21.56 and 60 and Plutarch, Phokion 30 choruses and contests. According to the scholiast to Aristophanes' Ploutos cited above (under Taxation), this refers only to tragic contests.

80 Invariably one finds ἐμκτήσεις in Prozeny decrees and decrees granting ἰσοτελεία (see below), i.e., it was a concomitant of other privileges. (See IG I2 83; II2 53, 130, 206, 554, 706, and 732.) In some inscriptions either land or house is specified; in others both are granted.
he could invest only in movable property. Even his home and work-
ing quarters were rented. This prohibition had two serious con-
sequences. In the first place he could not safely invest his
capital in mortgages. Phormion, the banker, for instance, being
a freedman, could not assume responsibility for certain monies lent
out on security of land and houses since legally he could not seize
them in the event of default. Secondly, the metic could not in-
vest in the mining industry. As Glotz explains, "Inability to own
the land involved inability to excavate beneath it." Extant
mining leases bear out this view.

A metic could not marry an Athenian citizen. By the fourth
century it was an indictable offence punishable by sale into
slavery. Generally speaking, epigamia was a rare honour. I have
not seen a single decree that includes the right of intermarriage
among the privileges bestowed on the alien.

31 Xenophon, Revenues 2.6.
32 Dem. 36.6.
33 G. Glotz, Ancient Greece at Work (London and New York
1928) 182.
34 See below under Isoteleia.
35 Dem. 59.16 and 52.
36 It was occasionally granted to a whole state because of
outstanding service to Athens. See Lysias 34.3 (Euboians) and
Isokrates 14.51 (Plataians).
I. Privileges

1. Ateleia

As the word itself implies, *ateleia* is exemption from tax or taxes. It was not specifically a privilege of the alien, since citizens enjoyed it as well. Aristotle describes the ephebes, for example, as *ateleis πάντων* during their two years of training, while Demosthenes' oration *Against Leptines* is *περὶ τῆς ἀτελείας* of both citizens and aliens. Diodoros affirms that Themistokles urged the Athenians to make all metics and craftsmen *ateleis*. The earliest epigraphic reference to *ateleia* is IG I² 39, the Chalkis decree of 446/5. IG I² 106 (ca. 410) exemplifies the formula most commonly applied to aliens. It grants *ateleia* from the *metoikion* to three men sojourning in Athens "until they should return home." IG II² 211 (348/7) grants the same privilege to Olynthian refugees at Athens.

In some cases *ateleia* involved more than the *metoikion*. It was complete immunity from all liturgies. According to Demosthenes this exemption could be granted to both citizens and metics. In opposing Leptines' law, which was to prohibit *ateleia*, he states that he does not believe that there are five aliens with exemption in Athens. He finally assumes ten as well as five citizens. Even if we make allowances for rhetorical exaggeration:

---

87 Ath. Pol. 42.5.
88 11.45.3.
89 20.18-21.
ation, the number of actual metics with total exemption must have been very few indeed. It is of some interest to consider the examples he cites. For Leukon, ruler of the Bosporos, and Epikerdes of Kyrene, neither of whom resided in Athens, ateleia was purely honorific. Two other foreigners who assisted Athens in Byzantion and were exiled on her account subsequently received προξενίαν, εὐεργεσίαν, ἀτέλειαν ἀπάντων.

A study of the known examples, both literary and epigraphic, leads to conclusions that have been little stressed. Ateleia can not be uncritically described as a privilege of the metic. For foreign kings and dignitaries it was an honour without practical significance, often a kind of "international" reward for unusually high financial benefactions. For others, mainly exiles, it afforded a privileged status below that of actual citizenship while sojourning in Athens. In almost every instance the recipients were proxenoi or exiles who intended to return to their native land and were, properly speaking, not part of the metic population. In my opinion, the reward of ateleia was

90 Ibid. 30 and 41-44.
91 Ibid. 60.
92 E.g., in the example cited above, Leukon granted exemption from dues to merchants conveying corn to Athens and even gave corn in a year of shortage (ibid. 31-33). Epikerdes gave money to the defeated Athenians at the time of the Syracusan disaster (41).
93 For proxenoi see P. Monceaux, D-S 4.1.734, who states that
usually politically motivated.

they were a group of privileged *xenoi* above the other aliens. The *proxenia*, which was originally bestowed only on foreigners residing in their own native lands, was even in the fourth century rarely granted to an Athenian citizen or metic. For further discussion along these lines, see Busolt-Swoboda, *StK* 1.229 and 2. 1246; Hommel, 1448; and Pope, *Non-Athenians* 50, where a bibliography is listed. For exiles, see Pope, *ibid.* 71-74. A typical example is *IG II⁲* 211, which granted *ateleia* to Olynthians and recorded that they were in exile because they had been driven out by Philip. The distinction I make, then, is between those who won honour as metics, and those who, through service to Athens in some other capacity, generally in their own native lands, won a privileged status above that of the metic for the duration of their residence in Athens.

The seventeen decrees studied included the Chalkis decree and the Sidonian decree, *IG II⁲* 141 (cited above under the Status of the Metic). Of the rest six were for exiles, four for *proxenoi*, one a deme decree, and four too fragmentary to allow identification of the recipients. Among the exiles were the Mantineians and Thasians (*IG II⁲* 33), the Olynthians (*IG II⁲* 211), the Akarnanians (*IG II⁲* 237), the Boiotians (*IG II⁲* 245), and the Thessalians (*IG II⁲* 545). In this group and the examples cited by Demosthenes were eight instances in the fourth century of *ateleia* of liturgies (total exemption). Of the eight recipients six were *proxenoi*. See especially *IG II⁲* 141, which provided that Sidonian citizens
2. Isoteleia

The privilege of isoteleia conferred on the alien a status above that of the ordinary metic. It gave him parity with the citizen in financial obligations (literally, equality in tele). Hesychios, for instance, defines isoteleis as μέτοικοι ἵσα τοῖς ἀστοῖς τέλη διδόντες. The first literary reference to isoteleia comes at the end of the fifth century, shortly before normally resident at Sidon should, if they settled temporarily at Athens for purposes of trade, be exempt from the metoikion, eisphora, and choregia. As M. N. Tod, A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions, Vol. 2 (Oxford 1948) 119, points out: "This rider extends indefinitely the period of sojourn in Attica allowed to Sidonian merchants without becoming liable to the obligations of the metic status." Far from being a privilege of the metic it kept certain aliens from the onus of that position. Cf. Clerc, Métèques 197, "Si l'on excepte ces métèques qui l'on peut appeler des métèques d'occasion l'atélie du metoikion était fort rare."

94 One must remember that most exiles honoured were, like the Olynthians, supporters of Athens and might prove useful in that capacity again if the opposing regime were removed from power.

95 Cf. Harpokration, s.v. ἰσοτελής καὶ ἰσοτέλεια· τιμή τις διδομένη τοῖς ἀξίοις φανεῖσι τῶν μετοίκων καθ' ἣν καὶ τοῦ μετοικίου ἄφεσις αὐτοῖς ἐγίγνετο.
the overthrow of the Thirty, when it was promised to all non-citizens who would support the cause of the democracy. In the

96 Xenophon, Hell. 2.4.25. I do not consider IG II²10 a decree bestowing isoteleia, although many scholars have restored the word in line 9. (See Tod, Greek Historical Inscriptions 2 no. 100 for a bibliography. Tod follows Wilhelm in restoring Archinos as the mover of the motion in 401/0 and line 9 as και ἐποίουν τὰ προστατ[τὸμενα, τούτοις ἔναι: ἱσοτέλειαιν οἶκοῖς; Ἀθηναῖοι καὶ ἑπιγαμίαν καὶ ἐγγύσιν καθά[πο Ἀθηναίοις.) New fragments of the decree published by D. Hereward, "New Fragments of IG II²10," BSA 47 (1952) 102-117, have increased the number of persons honoured to over 100, all of whom are listed under the name of an Athenian tribe. Thus, there is no longer any basis on which to divide the recipients into three categories, one of which received isoteleia. Indeed, Wilhelm's restoration is without parallel. I have found no other instance of a grant of isoteleia together with epigamia.

I agree with A. Raubitschek, "The Heroes of Phyle," Hesperia 10 (1941) 286, that IG II²10, including the new fragments, is the original proposal of Thrasyboulous, passed in 404/3, the archonship of Pythodoros, immediately after the restoration of the democracy and rescinded in the next year by Archinos (Ath. Pol. 40.2). Archinos later moved another motion granting less spectacular honours to about 100 men, the heroes of Phyle (Aischines 3.187), all of whom are citizens in the fragments of the decree.
Ath. Pol. Aristotle expressly distinguishes *isoteleis* as a group from both metics and *proxenoi*, all three of whom were under the jurisdiction of the Polemarch.

From 383/2, the date of the first decree granting *isoteleia*, epigraphical evidence is plentiful and has engendered debate about the precise nature of the status. Again and again the following formulae recur together with *isoteleia*: τὰς εἰσφοράς εἰσφέρειν καὶ τὰ τέλη τελεῖν καθάπερ Ἀθηναῖοι; τὰς στρατείας στρατεύεσθαι μετ' Ἀθηναίων and δίδοναι δίκας καὶ λαμβάνειν καθάπερ Ἀθηναίοι. Especially common with *isoteleia* is *ehktesis*, the published by Raubitschek (*op. cit.*). IG II²10, on the other hand, appears to record enfranchisements alone, among which are many names and occupations similar to those in the manumission inscriptions. (Here, however, there is neither demotic nor deme of residence.) This may be why Aristotle thought that some of them were slaves.

97 Ath. Pol. 58.2.

98 Hommel, L421, interprets, "Gelegentlich wurde noch die Befreiung vom Gerichtsstand des Polemarchos...dazu gewährt."

In view of Ath. Pol. 58.2, this is most unlikely. Perhaps a clue may be found in IG II²53, a proxeny decree ca. 387/6, where [τὰς δίκας] εἶναι αὐτῷ πρὸς τὸν πολέμαρχον [καθάπερ] ὃ[τ]ὶς ἄλλοις προξένοις. This must mean direct access to the Polemarch without mediation of a *prostataes*. The privilege of δίκας δίδοναι καθάπερ Ἀθηναῖοι I interpret similarly. Cf. Busolt-Swoboda,
right to own real property. Some scholars reached the conclusion that some, if not all, of the above privileges were an integral part of the status of isoteleia. Boeckh, for example, believed that the isoteleis were on the same footing as citizens with the exception of political rights, while Busolt-Swoboda defined the status as follows: exemption from the metoikion, equality with the citizen in financial and military obligations, freedom from the prostates in dealing with the Polemarch, and the right to own real property. Others, notably Clerc, have pointed out the difficulties of such a broad interpretation. First, decrees usually bestow isoteleia along with other privileges. IG II² 660 (ca. 350), e.g., grants isoteleia καὶ εκτεσις καὶ τὰς στρατείας στρατεύσεως μετ' Ἀθηναίων. Καὶ...καὶ indicates a series; the first καὶ does not introduce an appositional explanation of isoteleia. Secondly, there is a variety

StK 2.986, who extend to all isoteleis freedom from a prostates. But it is not specified in every case and probably only applied when so decreed.

99 Public Economy 654 and StK 2.986.

100 Métèques 202 ff. For a similar view, see V. Thumser, "Untersuchungen über die attischen Metöken," Wiener Studien 7 (1885) 66-67.

101 K. Meisterhans, Grammatik der attischen Inschriften (Berlin 1900) 249, points out: "Im allgemeinen jedoch wird καὶ...καὶ nur gebraucht in formelhaften Verbindungen." J. D. Denniston, The Greek Particles (second edition, Oxford
of combinations. Is one to assume, for example, that, when only isoteleia and ekktesis are specified, the others rights are automatically included? Yet elsewhere they are spelled out. In one instance, IG II²109.50 (ca. 363), isoteleia καθάπερ Ἀθηναῖοι is even found alone. The conclusion Clerc reached was that isoteleia, as its name signifies, related purely to financial obligations and had no demonstrable political or legal overtones. Other privileges, however, could and usually did accompany it.

It would be well to elaborate on two assumptions that have been accepted as fact on very scant evidence. Almost without variation historians state that the isoteleis could own property and, as a corollary, lease mining concessions from the state.

Lysias, it is argued, was an isoteles and on his own admission owned three houses. What Lysias says is that, although he and Polemarchos had three houses between them (τρίων ἴμιν οἴκιῶν οὐσῶν), the Thirty did not permit the latter's funeral to be conducted from any of them. Lysias may or may not have owned these houses. Even if he had merely rented them, that was not the issue. But let us assume that Lysias did own property. It is possible that the right to ownership was granted to his father

1954) 323-324, cites Meisterhans, adding, "Normally the first is preparatory, the second connective...."

102 E.g., Boeckh, loc. cit.; Busolt-Swoboda, loc. cit.; Glotz, Ancient Greece at Work 182.

103 12.18.
Kephalos, a wealthy manufacturer of armaments and close friend of Perikles. Enktesis, for obvious reasons, descended to one's children. Or perhaps Lysias himself received enktesis along with isoteleia, not an unusual combination. In my opinion, Lysias' oration Against Eratosthenes is no proof that isoteleia included ownership of land.

Xenophon is the source of the second belief about isoteleis and mining. In the Revenues he expatiates on the need for silver, hoping to encourage more men to exploit the mines. He also remarks with approval that the state has known this a long time, for παρεξῆς γοῦν ἐπὶ ἱσοτελείᾳ καὶ τῶν ξένων τῷ βουλομένῳ ἐργάζεσθαι ἐν τοῖς μετάλλοις. One might well ask what he means. It is a strange way of saying that isoteleis were entitled to enter the mining industry. Could it not equally mean

104 The source for Lysias' status as an isoteles is Plutarch, Lives of the Ten Orators 836Α.

that any alien could "work" the mines on the same basis as the citizens - the payment of a tax to the state? Or perhaps a tax concession was offered to aliens to induce them to work on the mining sites as craftsmen or overseers. (Slaves were employed for the labour underground.) It is easy to see that the industry might not have attracted sufficient artisans since it would entail movement to the mining areas. The citizen who leased the mines did not, of course, have to be present at the operations but sent a hired representative, slave, or freedman. These are several possible interpretations.

Xenophon's statement is still a puzzle to modern scholars. Calhoun comments on the mining leases: "The purchasers of mines in the long inscription, as in those previously discovered, appear in every instance to be Athenian citizens. Consequently Xenophon's statement, that the state granted to aliens the right of exploiting mines upon equal terms with citizens, is still without confirmation, and it becomes increasingly difficult to

106 Suidas, s.v. ἁγράφου μετάλλου δίκη, although the amount of the tax is by no means certain. Cf. Harpokration, s.v. ἀπονομή. According to LSJ9 (s.v. ἐργάζομαι, II.3) ἐργάζεσθα: γὺν means to work the land. In this sense with a direct object it is found frequently in the mining leases, e.g., Crosby 13.7 μέταλλον] ἐμ Παγγαίῳ ὁ ἡργᾶς(ετο). The verb can also be used absolutely (LSJ9, s.v. II.6) meaning to work at a trade or business and as such is found in the works of Demosthenes. It seems to me that either translation is possible in Xenophon's use of the word.

regard the discrepancy as a mere coincidence." R. J. Hopper, in an article evaluating new epigraphical evidence for mining in the fourth century, states: "Curious is the absence of aliens, though Xenophon mentions their participation ἐπὶ ἑστέλαξι, which is generally taken to mean 'on equal terms.' The only persons of foreign origin seem to be Kallaischros and Stesileides of Siphnos, who are property owners (doubtfully mine operators); if they were citizens they would be described by their demotic; therefore it is to be assumed that they were isoteleis possessing γῆς ἐγκέπτης ...

One wonders why the two Siphnians are not designated as isoteleis. It commonly replaced the citizen's demotic and the metic's deme of residence in inscriptions and appears to have been a kind of honorary title. In Demosthenes' orations Theodotos isoteles appears twice. The Catalogi Paterarum


110 Dem. 34.18 and 35.14. In the former Theodotos appears as an arbitrator (διαιτητὴς) to whom is referred κατὰ συνέκμας a dispute about a bottomry loan. According to Lipsius, Das attische Recht 782 n.17, mercantile suits of this kind were not subject to public arbitration. He therefore interprets Theodotos' role as that of a private arbitrator (Privatschiedsrichter), rather than an official διαιτητὴς. Cf. Thumser, op. cit. 66 and Bonner and Smith, 116, where similar views are to be found.
Argentearum provide several examples of isoteleis listed as plaintiffs. There is also a small group of Monumenta Privata of isoteleis distinct from those of citizens and foreigners. Unless then there was some omission in inscribing, Kallaischros and Stesileides were probably not isoteleis but aliens with special privileges.

Much effort has been expended in trying to define isoteleia. Meanwhile, another aspect of the question has been virtually ignored - the number and character of its recipients. Was it a realizable goal of the metic, a stepping-stone as it were toward citizenship? Study of the inscriptions has led to conclusions quite similar to those reached about ateleia. While there are examples of metics receiving isoteleia and other privileges for distinguished service, by far the largest group of recipients were once again exiles and proxenoi, often specifically "until they should return home." The following statistics, moreover,

111 IG II²1554.12; 1558.53; and 1565.20.
112 IG II²7862-7881.
113 Compare a number of plaintiffs in the Catalogi Paterarum Argentearum who are designated by ethnic rather than by demotic or deme of residence. E.g., IG II²1553.25, Νικίαν Ὅλυνθοιον; 1559.46, Ὅλυνθοί; and 1559.5, Ἐηβαῖον. In each case the individual belonged to a group which had received special honours from Athens and thus enjoyed some kind of privileged status above that of the metic.
appear significant: a) as outlined above, no isoteles is recorded in the mining inscriptions; b) among the horoi inscriptions there is one isoteles; c) in the Monumenta Privata there are 19 isoteleis compared with 2633 citizens and 2648 foreigners; d) reference has already been made to the isoteleis in the Catalogi Paterarum Argentearum.

It is not difficult to conclude that the importance of isoteleia in the history and position of the Athenian metic has been over-emphasized. I do not believe that the average metic, unless he became a Pasion or a Phormion, could ever aspire to this status. It was an honour mainly for the transient dignitary. Numerically, if the inscriptions are an accurate reflection, it was of negligible significance.

114 See M. I. Finley, Studies in Land and Credit in Ancient Athens, 500-200 B.C. (New Brunswick, N.J. 1951) 77, who states: "There are 99 identifiable names of parties on the available Attic stones. Of these, 87 have demotics and are therefore citizens, 11 have neither patronymic nor demotic, and one (in no. 116) is labelled an isoteles." There were no isoteleis on the new horoi stones from the Agora published by J. V. A. Fine, The American Excavations in the Athenian Agora, Hesperia, Supplement 9: Horoi: Studies in Mortgage, Real Security, and Land Tenure in Ancient Athens (Athens) 1951.
CHAPTER III
THE ECONOMIC POSITION OF THE METIC

A. Occupations in which Metics are Found.

"In ancient times," wrote Aristotle, "the artisan class in some states consisted of slaves or aliens, owing to which the great mass of artisans are so even now." These few words have been heatedly debated by scholars attempting to clarify the relationship of citizen to non-citizen in Athenian economic history. Max Weber, the father of modern sociology, put the question most succinctly by postulating two distinct types of individual in Athens, the citizen, *homo politicus*, living mainly as a *rentier*, and the non-citizen, or *homo economicus*. Similar, if less extreme, are the conclusions of Henri Francotte. "L'Industrie est spécialement exercée par des étrangers et par des esclaves." But it was above all Johannes Hasebroek who particularized - even popularized - Weber's generalization. "The fundamental cleavage in the Greek State was between the *rentiers* who lived at the expense of the State or on the proceeds of their own property and investments and the 'cityless' mass of aliens (as they are described in the *de Vectigalibus*)."

---

1 *Politics*: 1278a 6-7.
3 *L'Industrie* 214.
4 *Trade and Politics* 35. Cf. Glotz, *Ancient Greece at Work* 166-167, for a somewhat similar approach. For a full bibliography, see Hasebroek, *op. cit.* 41 n.3; Hommel, 1449-1450; and Pope, *Non-Athenians* 45 n.23.
The problem then is integral to a study of the metic. To appreciate his rôle in Athenian economic history, one must first establish his relationship to the citizen.

No one can deny that Aristotle's statement had a basis in fact outside Athens. In Sparta, the archetype of aristocracy, a Lykourgan law forbade the soldier-citizens to practise a trade. Although this freedom from all but military obligations was especially a Lakedaimonian trait, Herodotos tells us that all the Greeks except the Korinthians shared this disdain for work and respect for war. In Thebes, for instance, no one was admitted to office who had not kept out of a trade for the preceding ten years.

How much did Athens reflect this attitude? Certainly, it had a strong appeal for her philosophers. Sokrates expresses their apprehension about the manual trades. To paraphrase, a sedentary existence spent indoors not only destroys the body but dulls the mind through excessive preoccupation. Such a life leaves no time for friends, politics, or military training.

5 Xenophon, Constitution of the Lakedaimonians 7.1-2; Plutarch, Agesilaos 26.
6 2.167.
7 Aristotle, Politics 1278a 25.
8 Xenophon, Economics 4.2-4.
Leisure, on the other hand, is the very sister of eleutheria. When queried about gentlemanly pursuits, he suggests at once farming and the art of war. Plato, himself an aristocrat and admirer of the Spartan system, stresses above all the evils of money-making which, he fears, can only lead to the corruption of free men. In the society of the Laws (albeit less perfect than that of the Republic) no citizen may become a retail trader (καπηλος) or merchant (εμπορος) or act as another man's servant (διακονια). Retail trade, the most degrading occupation, he leaves to men who, by their corruption, can be no great loss to the state, i.e., metics and aliens. In Plato's view, political affairs are a full-time occupation for the ideal citizen.

Aristotle is even more explicit than Plato. In describing the four forms of democracy, he attributes the progressive de-

10 Xenophon loc. cit. By contrast see Sokrates' advice to Aristarchos (Xenophon, Mem. 2.7). Sokrates' ideas are more ambivalent than his successors'. Reputedly a sculptor himself, who held his dialogues in the shops of craftsmen, he expresses not so much aristocratic contempt for work as genuine belief that the banausic life eventually produces an inferior man.
11 Laws 741 E and 919 C-D.
12 Ibid. 919 C and 920 A. In turn no alien can reside permanently as a metic unless he has a trade (850 A-B).
13 Ibid. 846 D.
terioration of the system to the admission to citizenship of artisans, market-people, and wage-earners. Such people live a mean existence (βίος φαύλος) without a shred of arete in their occupations. They cannot lead a life in accordance with virtue or share in government without changing the quality of the constitution and so ought not to be admitted to citizenship in the perfect state. There, handicrafts, trade, and even agriculture are to be left to metics and slaves. The citizens will concern themselves exclusively with war and politics.

Did these theories correspond to Athenian institutions or were they merely philosophers' visions? In order to establish the metics' role in Athenian life, let us first consider the evidence for their professions.

A rich source of professions is the Catalogi Paterarum Argentearum, IG II² 1553-1578 (ca. 330). They are a series of dikai ἀποστασίου, the suit which a master might bring against his ex-slave for failure to carry out obligations agreed upon at manumission. The defendants listed have been successful and so are now completely independent. In each case, the freedman's

14 Politics 1319a 25-29.
15 Ibid. 1328b 37 - 1329a 39.
16 Ath. Pol. 58.3; Harpokration, s.v. δίκη ἀποστασίου.

The controversy surrounding these inscriptions abated considerably with Wilamowitz' publication in Hermes 22 (1887) 110 n.1 of IG II² 1560, in which he had restored a heading: πολεμαρχοὺν]τος
name, occupation, deme of residence, and former master are listed in a set formula: 'Ἀφελίων ἐν Κολλυ(τφ) οἰκῶ(ν)
κλίνοπ(οις) ἀποφυγόν Εὑπόλεμον Εὑπολέμο(ν) Ἀγρύ(ληθεν)
φιάλ(ην) σταθμὸ(ν). In studying these inscriptions I have confined myself to D. M. Lewis’ recent publication of IG II² 1554-17.

1. No. of ex-slaves: man  45
   woman  18

Δημοτέλους τοῦ Ἀντιμάχου Ἀ[λαίεως] δίκαι ἀπὸστασίου... On freedmen see Chapter II (under Deme of Residence n.4). The Athenian who manumitted his slave might demand from him certain continuing services in return for his freedom. At the same time, although the freedman had the same legal rights as the metic, he had to accept his ex-master as his prostates. By winning a δίκη ἀποστασίου he became free from obligations and able to choose his own patron. For full discussion, mainly on legal aspects, see C. D. Buck, "Inscriptions Found upon the Acropolis," AJA 4 (1888) 149-164; M. N. Tod, "Some Unpublished 'Catalogi Paterarum Argentearum'," BSA 8 (1901) 197-230; and W. L. Westermann, "Two Studies in Athenian Manumissions," The Journal of Near East Studies 1 (1949) 92-104.

17 Hesperia 28 (1959) 203-238. It includes Agora 13182, a new fragment joining IG II² 1554 and 1559.

18 I have followed the method of Gomme, Population 41-42. Since, however, he included in his statistics the doubtful IG II² 10, which is not a manumission inscription, his findings do
2. Demes in which they reside:

- Athens and environs: 51
- Peiraeus: 11
- Coast and Inland: 19

3. Occupations of ex-slaves:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agriculture</th>
<th>Manufacture</th>
<th>Transport</th>
<th>Trade</th>
<th>Personal Service</th>
<th>Misc.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We are entering the world of Aristophanes. His pages are alive with the νευρορράφοις καὶ σκυτοτόμοις καὶ βυρσοπάλαισιν who sat not in the assembly or law-courts but in the tiny workshops of Kydathenaion. Freedmen's industrial skills are varied. There are a blacksmith (χαλκεῦς) from the Peiraeus and two goldsmiths (χρυσοχόοι) from Kydathenaion. Melite is the home of a

not accurately reflect the numerical proportion between male and female. Pope, Non-Athenians 64, has a ratio closer to my own. In a study of all the inscriptions she found 89 men and boys and seventy women and girls. My total for females is slightly higher since, like Tod, I consider παιδία not boys or girls but female servants. In one case the word is employed together with that for nurse (παιδί, τίτη, A.259). Παις was a common Greek term for slave (Dem. 34.41). Eleven παιδία have identifiable names; ten are feminine and one is doubtful.

19 In a number of cases the deme has not survived on the stone.

20 Knights 739.
pair of gem-engravers (δακτυλιογράφοι). Among the leather workers are four saddlers (σκυτοτόμοι), a shoemaker (ὑποθηματοποιός), and a tanner (σκυλοδέψως). There are also a couch-maker (μινοποιός), a manufacturer of flutes (αύλοποιός), a miller (μυλωθέρος), and a carpenter (τέκτων).

Trade is well represented. The titles of the despised retailers are long and colourful: σιταμοσύλλης, sesame dealer ὀσπριοσύλλης, green-grocer, and ταριχοσύλλης, dried fish salesman. There are also an ironmonger (σιδηροσύλλης), a baker (ἄρτοπωλής), and two dealers in frankincense (λιβανωτοί), perhaps, the proprietors of perfume shops. Naturally enough, the two emporoi reside in the Peiraiæus.

The primitive character of Greek transport is strikingly revealed by our four representatives. There are a carrier of jars (ἄμφορεσφόρος), a muleteer (ὄρεωκόρος), and two donkey-drovers (ὄνηλάται). Agricultural workers include two vine-dressers (ἄμπελουργοί), one of whom resides in the rural deme of Ὀε, and six γεωργούς, who are not farmers but farm-hands, since metics could not own land. Only one of their demes can be identified as truly rural, Hagnon in the Mesogeia. Among the miscellaneous occupations are a barber (μουρεύς), a cook (μάγειρος), a clerk from Thorikos (γραμματεύς), and a hired labourer (μισθωτός).

Athenian women are rare, indeed, in inscriptions. Yet almost half of these metics are women, each with her own

21 Except, of course, in funeral inscriptions.
occupation. Twenty-five, like Homeric ἀμφίπολοι, card and spin and weave. There are twenty-four wool-workers (ταλασσούργοι) and a sempstress (ἀμεστρία). The nurse (τίτη) is also a familiar figure. Demosthenes tells us that "even" free-born Athenian ladies took up this trade in times of extreme hardship. What the eleven παιδία did is unknown. We have assumed that they were female maidservants. If Lewis' translation is correct, the Ψηκίστρια or female tender of horses is most unexpected. Elsewhere Tod identified two female cobblers, a sharp contrast to the sheltered life of the gynaikeion.

Although only one vendeuse appears, she represents a thriving trade. The χατζῆδες held their own amid the noisy hawkers in the Agora, and even made the rounds of the building projects. The metic Satyra sells her wares to the workmen on the Erechtheion, while her counterpart Thettale provides felt caps for the public.

22 57.45.

23 There are good grounds for not accepting Lewis' interpretation. Although Ψηκίστρια is not found in LSJ⁹, there are a verb Ἀχχω, to rub down or stroke, and a noun Ψηκτρα, curry-comb (for horses) or scraper. The latter may also be a strigil, the instrument used to scrape the skin after a bath. And when one recalls Homer's many descriptions of female slaves bathing guests, it seems far more probable that the Ψηκίστρια was a bathing attendant and masseuse.
slaves at Eleusis. In the eyes of the citizen such work was degrading. By mingling with the xenoi, one risked being confused with them, as was Euxitheos' mother, the vendor of ribbons.

We find only one entertainer, a flute player (κιθαρίστα), one of many alien women similarly employed, for musicians, dancers, and courtesans were invariably ex-slaves and foreigners. Neaira, for example, began her varied career as a slave in Corinth, while Aspasia was from Miletos.

Δεῖται: καὶ πόλεως μετοίκων διέ το θέος τῶν τεχνῶν..., wrote Pseudo-Xenophon in 424. But only in the construction industry can an attempt be made to verify the statement statistically. Here the building accounts provide a record of the wages, 

24 IG II² 1654.40 and 1672.71.
25 Dem. 57.34.
26 Dem. 59 passim.
27 On the other hand, one cannot help but remark that Aspasia attained a level of independence and intellectual ability unknown to the more secluded γυναικεῖς. Cf. A. E. Zimmern, The Greek Commonwealth (fifth edition, Oxford 1931) 335-342, for realistic comments on the unbridgeable gulf between Athenian and alien women. For a modern view see Simone de Beauvoir, The Second Sex (New York 1957) 90-91.

28 Constitution of the Athenians 1.12. The date is that suggested to me by Professor M. F. McGregor. But see also A. W. Gomme, "The Old Oligarch," More Essays in Greek History and Literature (Oxford 1962) 68, who suggests a date between 420 and 415.
occupations, and demes of metics, as well as their numerical proportion to citizens and slaves.

Workmen on the Erechtheion were hired directly by the state at a common salary, a drachma a day, the architect earning no more than the day-labourer (ὑπομέτρος). The 38 identifiable metics are skilled in every trade and in all, except carpentry, outnumber the citizens. As might be expected, stone-masons are the largest group, thirteen in all. Seven of them do the rougher jobs, while the other 6 channel column-drummers. Since this work is carried on in groups, several men bring their own slaves. Ameiniades of Koile has one slave, Axiopeithes of Melite has two, while Simias of Alopeke works on a grand scale with a "company" of five. The four day-labourers who do odd jobs stand in contrast to the eight "artists" hired to create the frieze. All three metal workers, Sisyphos the gilder, Sostratos the dealer in lead, and Adonis who sells gold leaf reside in Melite.

29 The Erechtheion building accounts include IG I2373 (409/408) and 374 (408/407-407/406) and II21654 (394/1). The Eleusinian accounts are IG II21672 (329/328) and 1673 (327/326).

30 My findings are identical with those of Pope, op. cit. 52-54. The distribution of the 38 by industry is: seven masons, six channellers, four carpenters, eight sculptors, three metal-workers, four day-labourers, one vendor, one painting contractor, and four undesignated. A comparison of metic, citizen, and slave will be made in the next chapter.
At Eleusis the entire system has changed. First, the mode of payment is different. While certain workmen are still paid by the day, their wages are now graded. They receive from nine to fifteen obols a day depending on their skill. A large body of state slaves receives only subsistence, three obols a day each. None of the workmen is recorded by name. Those who are identified are mainly entrepreneurs and contractors paid by the piece. In this inscription there are 37 metics varying in craft from shoemaker to demolitions contractor. As an example, in one prytany Agathon of Alopeke contracts to quarry, transport, and lay stones at three drachmas, one obol each. He earns 831 drachmas - a large business. Obviously he did not complete the job himself. Yet his assistants are unrecorded. By contrast another masonry contractor, Daos of Kydathenaion, earns only eighteen drachmas in the same prytany. Perhaps he worked alone. At the other extreme, Tibeios the metic receives only four drachmas for carrying sand. Nikon of Eleusis has the distasteful task of carting away a corpse. One hopes it is only the remains of the young pig purchased for sacrifice from Sotion of Melite.

The profession monopolized by the metic was that of emporos.

31 There are nineteen contractors (four stone, three brick, four metal, three painting, four wood, one demolition), four cartage agents, two rope dealers, one shoemaker, two locksmiths, two sawyers, one mason, one marble-worker, three miscellaneous entrepreneurs, and two undesignated.
overseas merchant. Demosthenes' private orations present a vivid tableau of "that gang of scoundrels in the Peiraeus." In five speeches about bottomry loans every merchant is an alien. In fact, all the ship-owners and most of the money-lenders are non-citizens. Consider the speech composed for his uncle Demon. The latter lends money to the merchant Protos to purchase Sicilian corn for the Athenian market. While Protos is en route with his cargo, the ship-owner, Hegestratos, and his

32 Hesychios defined emporos as metoikos. See Francotte, op. cit. 192, "...le commerce (maritime) paraît être surtout dans les mains des étrangers." Cf. Glotz, op. cit. 183-185 and especially Hasebroek, op. cit. 1-43.

33 32.10: ἐστὶν ἐργαστήριον μοχθερῶν ἀνθρώπων συνεστηκότων ἐν τῷ Πειραιεῖ.

34 32 passim. A word of explanation about bottomry loans is in order. There were three distinct persons involved: 1) the merchant who borrowed money, generally on security of his cargo, and accompanied it to its destination; 2) the ship-owner; 3) the money-lender. For the merchant it was a kind of insurance because in the event of loss (through shipwreck, pirates, war, etc.) the lender had no redress. Demosthenes has recorded an actual agreement of this type (35.10). See Hasebroek, loc. cit., and for a popular account G. M. Calhoun, The Business Life of Ancient Athens (Chicago 1926) 43-77.
underling, Zenothemis, both Massaliotes, attempt to sink the ship. They too, it seems, have secretly borrowed money on its cargo. In the fracas which ensues, Hegestratos leaps overboard and is drowned. By the time the case reaches court, Protos himself has disappeared, suggesting complicity. Such were the risks of bottomry loans, but as an investment they were very profitable, paying up to 36%.

The oration Against Lakritos is based on a similar incident. The Athenian Androkles lends 3,000 drachmas to two Phaselites, Artemon and Apollodoros, for the transport of wine to the Pontos. Later, when payment falls due, the pair allege that their ship has been wrecked. Involved in the affair are also Nausikrates of Karystos, Androkles' Euboian partner in the loan, Hyblesios, the ship-owner, and Hippias of Halikarnassos, the officer in charge of the cargo. Theodotos, an isoteles, and Kephisodotos of Boiotia were present when the loan was made. Before the case is over, it is discovered that Aratos of Halikarnassos and Antipatros of Kition had also lent money to the fraudulent pair.

But let us not dwell on the complexities of maritime loans. Needless to say, the other orations are just as bewildering, and

35 The interest agreed upon was due at the termination of the voyage; so that, in actual fact, bottomry loans usually produced a return higher than 36% per annum. Interest rates for other types of loans found throughout this paper have been calculated annually.

36 35 passim.
just as exaggerated in their portrayal of the deeds and misdeeds of the merchant class.

Banking too attracted metics. It was quite literally a servile profession. The life of Pasion will serve as an illustration. Originally the slave of the bankers Antisthenes and Archestratos, he won his freedom by his honesty and ability, eventually rising to the head of the firm. In turn he trained and freed his slave Phormion, who, on his death, not only succeeded to the business but married his former master's wife. Apparently this was a common practice. Sokrates, the banker, also gave his wife to his freedman, Satyros, as did Sokles to Timodemos. Naturally enough, the bankers' own children often resented this. For example, Isaios is known to have defended the banker, Eumathes, when the son of his ex-master, Epigenes, claimed him as his own slave.

37 The other three speeches of this class are 33, 34, and 56. They concern respectively Apatourios, a Byzantine merchant; three metics, Chrysippos and his brother and Theodoros, the Phoenician, who advance money to the metic Phormion for a voyage to Bosporos; and two Egyptian metics, Dareios and Pamphilos, who lend money to Parmeniskos and Dionysodoros, also Egyptians.

38 Dem. 36.30 and 43.

39 Ibid. 28-29.

40 Fragment 18 (Forster's edition in the Loeb Classical Library). Cf. Dem. 36, a defence against Pasion's son, Apollo-doros, who claimed that Phormion had misappropriated 20 talents.
Wealthy metics often invested their capital in industry. The ramifications of Pasion's bank were wide. Among the properties revealed in his will was a shield-factory with a yearly income of one talent. The manufacture of shields had also proved lucrative to Kephálós and his sons, Lysias and Polemarchos, the most illustrious family of metics of the fifth century.

The posts of foreman, manager, or representative were usually filled by metics. Nikias, son of Nikeratos, let out his 1,000 mining slaves to Sosias the Thracian at an obol a day a man. Similarly, when Demosthenes' guardians shunned the task of managing the sword-factory left by his father, they made Milyas the freedman foreman. It was a metic, too, Philondas the Megarian, whom the general Timotheos sent to Macedon to receive King Amyntas' gift of timber on his behalf.

B. Ratio of Citizens to Non-citizens in Industry

Our study of professions would be incomplete, if we did not return to the building accounts in order to compare the proportion of citizens to non-citizens in industry. A study of those clearly designated as citizen, metic, or slave in the Erechtheum accounts

41 Dem. 36.11.
42 Lysias 12.19.
44 Dem. 27.19.
has produced the following figures:

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Citizens</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metics</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slaves</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Complete statistical accuracy is, unfortunately, impossible because of the recurrence of certain names without identifying formula. Some of them are properly identified elsewhere and are invariably the names of mectics or slaves. There is no record of a citizen without demotic. Thus, I suggest that the following workmen are mectics or slaves: Spodias, Timokrates, Kleon, Mammanos, Ikaros, and Nikostratos. Since this is only a surmise, they are not included in my analysis, nor is the occasional unidentified synergos serving as assistant to one of the artisans.


47 Normally the citizen's demotic accompanies his name. In one case only the patronymic also occurs, in IG 12373.109 (Ἀλκίππου Κεφίς). The metic's designation is his deme of residence and the slave's the name of his owner, e.g. Κροῖσος Φιλοκλέους.
Not only do all workmen receive the same wages, but there is, in my opinion, no truly significant pattern of occupations by class. Among the 22 citizens are two architects, Philokles in 409/8 and Archilochos in 408/7, three sculptors, and seventeen artisans. The latter are all skilled. In the largest single group, 34 stone-masons, there are ten citizens, eight of them employed channelling columns, a work which required both precision and experience. Generally speaking, metics and citizens perform the same work.

Interpretations of the Eleusinian accounts vary greatly for...

48 I have restricted myself to numerical comparisons of the three groups, considering it beyond the scope of my investigations to follow Glotz into a detailed analysis of each man's wages and share of the work. On page 174 he points out: "It even happens, and that in the wood industries, in which they are relatively numerous, that the citizens do less work and obtain less remuneration than their rivals. Three of them are employed, with two Metics, on shaping beams at 80 much a foot. They take things easily and do 9, 47, and 68 feet respectively, earning a total of 31 drachmas for the three, while one of the two Metics disposes of 84 feet and the other of 180, making 66 drachmas between them." I do not question the accuracy of this account, only the feasibility of drawing too far-reaching conclusions from an isolated inscription.
two main reasons. First, they do not record individual artisans, but contractors with their own assistants whose number and status cannot be determined. Secondly, names without identifying formula are far more common than in the earlier inscriptions. Despite these difficulties, the following figures are reasonably accurate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Citizens</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metics</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aliens</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slaves</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

49 Zimmern, *The Greek Commonwealth* 264, finds two slaves. Gomme, *op. cit.* 40 n.2, estimates their number as "at least 71." I myself identified fifty.

50 Aliens are designated by ethnics: three Boiotians, one Samian, one Knidian, two Troizenians, one Korinthian, and five Megarians. For statistical purposes I have included them with the metics. Other totals are: Francotte 207, 36 citizens, 36 metics, 12 aliens, and 47 slaves; Gomme 40, 36 citizens and 71 slaves; Glotz 174 and 180, 20 citizens, 45 metics, 9 aliens, and 20 slaves. Pope's figures, 54-56, I have confirmed and record above.

51 They are mainly public slaves, ἡμέρας, receiving subsistence (three obols a day), and number seventeen in IG II²1672.70 and 28 in 1673.28. Although I myself identified only five others, private slaves (the χαῖρες of Kephisodoros in line 100, Agathon in line 63, Artemas in line 74, Soteris in line 184, and Karios in line 196, all in IG II²1672), I have accepted Pope's figure of 54 as extremely conservative. Many others must be concealed among the unidentified workman.
As an illustration of the problems involved here, the four dealers, Herakleides, Ameinias, Kallikrates, and Philon are described by the epithet \( \epsilon \kappa \tau \omicron \upsilon \Theta \eta \sigma \varepsilon \iota \omicron \). Two of them Pope classes as citizens because "Ameinias, line 66, sells baskets like the citizen Ameinias in line 168, and there is another Herakleides, a citizen, in line 94: another Kallikrates, likewise a dealer in metal in 1673.16, has no identifying epithet. But \( \Phi \lambda \omega \nu \epsilon \kappa \tau \omicron \upsilon \Theta \eta \sigma \varepsilon \iota \omicron \) in lines 30, 123, 167, 192, the \( \Phi \lambda \omega \nu \) in 97, 102, 194, 208, and the metic Philon in 174 are, I think, the same man." This is economical but not conclusive. Wilamowitz believed they were slaves (\( \chi \nu \omega \rho \iota \varsigma \omicron \omega \kappa \omicron \omicron \upsilon \tau \varepsilon \varsigma \varsigma \) described as \( \epsilon \kappa \tau \omicron \upsilon \Theta \eta \sigma \varepsilon \iota \omicron \) because they sold their wares from booths erected in a part of the market-place near the Theseion. I too believe that they were slaves, but that \( \epsilon \kappa \tau \omicron \upsilon \Theta \eta \sigma \varepsilon \iota \omicron \) indicated their place not of work but of residence. Like most Greek temples, the Theseion had more than one function. It was not only a shrine of the hero Theseus, but a place of refuge for slaves. I suggest that such slaves resided in the precincts of the Theseion and actually worked there at their skills. Some of them were even allowed to sell these products in the market or on building sites.

---

52 Ibid. 55. All four \( \epsilon \kappa \tau \omicron \upsilon \Theta \eta \sigma \varepsilon \iota \omicron \) are found in IG II\( ^2 \)1672, Herakleides originally in line 10 and Kallikrates in line 237.

53 "Demotika," 119 n.l.

54 This interpretation was suggested to me by Professor C. W. J. Eliot. See the literary and epigraphical testimonia for the Theseion assembled by R. E. Wycherley, The Athenian Agora, Vol. 3 (Princeton 1957) 113-119. They include the scholiast to
Throughout the two inscriptions workmen are recorded in groups. In IG II² 1672.27 three τέκτονες receive fifteen obols a day, an extremely high wage indicating skilled artisans. In the next line are six μισθωτοί paid at the average rate of nine obols a day (τῷ ἀνδρὶ οἰκοσίτῳ). An even more mysterious group of misthotoi are those ἐγέγραμεν in IG II² 1673.28. In all, there are over sixty of these unidentifiable individuals.

Among the citizens there is again no consistent occupational pattern. All are contractors or dealers, with enterprises both large and small, providing mainly building materials. One of the Aristophanes' Knights 1312, εἰς τὸ Ἐνετέα ξινός. Εὐνακτεία τῶν ὀικετῶν ἀσαλίαν εἴχον; Plutarch, Theseus 36 and De Exilio 17; and definitions in the lexica of Hesychios and Photios (s.v. Ἐνετέας). The four slaves sell a variety of wares, baskets, bronze jars, nails, and sundry equipment for doors. They may not, of course, have been manufactured in the Theseion. Possibly the slaves granted asylum worked outside by the day in order to pay their expenses or even to amass money to purchase their freedom. Wycherley, on the other hand, is quite wrong in his reference to this inscription. He writes (119) that "in lists of materials for construction various items come ἐκ τοῦ Ἐνετέα." In the building accounts it is the men who are given some form of identification, generally their place of residence. The origin of materials is never indicated in this way.
most extensive businesses is the kiln of Lykourgos of Melite, which turns out 26,000 bricks in one prytany. Their transport alone costs 390 drachmas. While we do not know what amount Lykourgos himself earns, his rival Euthias of Eleusis receives 360 drachmas for a similar order of 9,000 bricks. At the other extreme, Ergasos of Ikaros delivers two small bundles of reeds, receiving eight and two drachmas respectively. So varied are the citizens' pursuits.

What conclusions are to be drawn from a study of the two accounts? First, it is obvious that no real comparisons can be made between them. Each records a different type of detail. The contractors who provide building materials for the Erechtheion are unknown, while at Eleusis the workmen are largely anonymous. Citizens constitute from 25% to 29% of both groups. In the earlier inscriptions metics are 50% of craftsmen and labourers, almost double the citizens. But, among contractors and dealers at Eleusis, they are only 25%, little more than the citizens. I accept these figures as generally reflective of industrial occupations and also suggest that the noticeable increase in slave-labour in the later inscriptions indicates a displacement of free labour, especially citizens.

Historians of the metic have invariably been content to stop here. The facts are revealing enough. Metics have a virtual monopoly of trade, commerce, and finance, while in industry they predominate. Aristotle's statement, therefore, does find verification in the facts of Athenian life. However, not only has
our sphere of comparison - the building industry - been extremely limited, but we have made no attempt to define the activities that do engross the citizens. In my opinion, no one has sufficiently appreciated the significance of the metics' inability to hold land. Starting from this prohibition, then, let us outline the economic pursuits forbidden to the metic - those that necessarily constitute the domain of the citizen.

C. Economic Pursuits Closed to the Metic.

Throughout the classical period land was the basis of the Athenian economy. And, since the alien was denied real property, agriculture remained the exclusive sphere of the citizen. Until the Second Peloponnesian War, Thucydides writes, "most Athenians still lived in the country with their families and households, and were consequently not at all inclined to move...." Even [55 Clerc, whose work suffers from a general lack of perspective, merely includes this prohibition in a list of disabilities in his chapter on civil law. Hommel, who follows Clerc closely, and is himself even more concerned with legal and terminological problems, relegates the question of enktesis to a preliminary chapter of definitions, and disposes of the metic's inability to hold land in half a sentence. Typically, the space he devotes to the economic role of the metic is two columns as compared to 32 for the legal and historical aspects of the question.

[56 2.16.1-2.]}
in 403, in spite of the losses of war, Lysias estimates that 3/4 of the citizens still owned land. Two anecdotes of Xenophon exemplify the plight of many at this time. They concern Aristarchos and Eutheros, two Athenians reduced to poverty. Their losses are revealing. Eutheros, now a reluctant manual labourer, previously lived off foreign holdings (τὰ ἐν τῇ ἄξοροιᾳ κτήματα), while Aristarchos complains: "We get nothing from our land because our enemies have seized it, and nothing from our house property now there are so few residents in the city." The latter, it is to be noted, despite his plaints, still has slaves and houses.

A cursory reading of the private orations of Demosthenes and Isaicos is enough to convince us that in the fourth century too the typical citizen was a landowner. Aphobos, one of Demosthenes' guardians, both owned and worked his own land (γεωργοῦντα τὴν γῆν). Elsewhere a plaintiff describes how two of his creditors forced their way onto his farm and tried to carry off the household slaves. Apollodoros, the son of the banker Phormion, lived off his property, disdaining his father's old calling. He owned real estate in three demes and was rich enough

57 Against Hippotherses, cited by Busolt-Swoboda 1.178 n.3.
58 Mem. 2.8.1
59 Ibid. 2.7.2.
60 30.26.
61 Dem. 47.52 and 53.
to serve as trierarch. So great were the expenses of office that the general Timotheos was required to mortgage all his property, even giving up his farm as security. Indeed, the demands of public life forced three of the above to be absent from Attika for lengthy periods. Like Xenophon's ideal farmer, Ischomachos, they probably left their estates in the care of a trusted bailiff.

"Time is money," said Benjamin Franklin. In Athens his dictum might well have been, "Land is money." We hear of a client of Lysias who leased his farm to four different men in a period of only seven years. The father of Ischomachos indulged in a kind of land speculation, buying up uncultivated land for improvement and resale at a profit. When the banker Nausikrates died, leaving all his property (in outstanding

62 Dem. 50.8.
63 Dem. 49.11. See also, for comparison, the following orations where land-owners of varied worth appear: Dem. 42.22 and 28; 43.69-70; Isaios 2.29, 34, and 35; 3.80; 5.29; 7.31; 11.41-43.
64 Economics 12.2-3.
65 7.9-10. One of the lessees is a freedman (ἀπελευθερως). This is one of the few references to the leasing of land owned by a private individual, although there are a number of extant decrees on the leasing of public land. See Finley, Land and Credit 216 n.68.
debts) to his two young sons, their guardians collected the money and invested it in land and lodging houses. Scant information prevents our knowing how common these practices were.

For the citizen ownership of land opened the way to hypothecation. Even orphans' estates could be administered through a mortgage (μισθωσίς οίκου). Presumably, some estates were profitable enough to produce not only a fixed rent for the child but a satisfactory profit for the administrator or lessee. When the child reached his majority, the estate was returned, it was hoped, in a flourishing state. Meanwhile, the lessee had to

67 Dem. 38.7.

68 Historians generally note a steady decline from the time of the Peloponnesian War and throughout the ensuing period of warfare. For the first time, complaints are heard of the accumulation of large estates on the part of a few wealthy citizens in contrast to the equality of the past (Dem. 13.30; 23.208). It is the later period to which the horoi are dated (365/2-259/8), indicating to some an increase in mortgages. This is not conclusive, however. Some other means of proclaiming a lien might have been employed earlier. See Fine, Horoi 48-50 and chapter eight, where the whole problem is discussed. For earlier views, cf. Boeckh, Public Economy 62-64, 486, and passim; Busolt-Swoboda, StK 1.178-181; E. Orth, RE 12 (1925) 635-642, s.v. "Landwirtschaft."

69 See Finley, 38-44 and horoi, nos. 116-129 and Fine, chapter five and appropriate inscriptions. They cite the literary sources.
put up evaluated real property as security (ἀποτίμημα). This requirement at once excluded non-citizens. The Athenians' attitude to their estates, and especially to landed property, is clear in Lysias' Against Diogeiton, a speech suing a guardian for dissipation of an estate: "But yet, had he wished to act justly by the children, he was free to act in accordance with the laws which deal with orphans for the guidance of incapable as well as capable guardians; he might have farmed out the estate and so got rid of a load of cares, or have purchased land and used the income for the children's support."

There were, of course, ordinary types of mortgages (πράσις ἐπὶ λύσει and ὑποθήκη). Normally they paid 12% per annum. Pasion's bank, for example, had loaned out eleven talents on security of land and lodging houses. The amount is high considering that the largest sum recorded on an extant horos stone is 8,000 drachmas. For one who was a citizen - and had the cash - such an investment was both profitable and secure.

A seldom discussed, yet obvious, source of revenue for the

70 Harpokration, s. v. ἀποτίμημα.
71 32.23.
72 See Finley, chapter three, and Fine, chapters four and seven and the corresponding horoi.
73 Dem. 36.5-6.
74 See Finley, 30 and Appendix 1. Mortgages for higher amounts are found in the literary sources.
citizen was house-rent. The metic population alone fluctuated between a low of 21,000 in 425 and a high of 42,000 in 323, figures which do not include *xenoi* and *χωρίς οίκοντες*, whose numbers are impossible to calculate. All required housing; many of the wealthier needed working quarters. Yet none could own property. One cannot over-estimate the amount of income that citizen-landlords must have derived from the alien and slave populations alone. How many like Kiron owned two buildings, a dwelling of their own and a second house let out to tenants? For the poorer classes there were *συνοικία*, like the Roman *insulae*. We even hear of speculators (ναυκληροί), who sub-let tenements at a return doubtless much higher than the normal 8½% *per annum*. The latter is low compared to the average Athenian interest rates and probably fluctuated with general economic conditions.

Citizens, as we have shown, also monopolized the mining industry. Actually, mines remained state property and were leased out, subject to a tax, by the *poletai*. Slaves laboured

---

76 Isaios 8.35.
77 Dem. 36.34; 45.28; 53.13 and Isaios 6.19-20 where the freedwoman of the citizen *Δυκτέμων* manages his *συνοικία* in the Peiraeus and runs a brothel there as well.
78 Harpokration, s.v. ναυκληρος.
79 Isaios 11.42.
80 Ath. Pol. 47.2. For many details of mining procedures see Dem. 37 and 42. Inscriptions include *IG II²* 1582-1589 and
underground and, according to Xenophon, were highly profitable to their owners. The ἰποθόρα system, as it was known, was a source of wealth for several fifth-century "millionaires," including Nikias and Hipponikos. In Xenophon's own day the industry's condition was unhealthy and had been so since the escape of 20,000 mining slaves to the Spartans at Dekeleia. Although extant poletai lists date from 367/6, the mines did not actually flourish again until ca. 345, during Duboulos' administration. Thus, except for the gap caused by war, mining was a source of income for fifth- and fourth-century Athenians, but not for metics.

D. Conclusions about the Metic's Role in the Economy.

Whatever its faults as a generalization, Weber's antithesis between homo politicus and homo economicus has validity. The second category, the economic one, was always flexible, in early times including citizen as well as alien and only gradually becoming synonymous with the metic. The reasons for this are historically determinable and may be adumbrated as follows.

In the sixth and early fifth centuries many rural Athenians, impelled perhaps by debt or poverty, left their land and found

Miss Crosby's recent publications of those found in the Agora. For works on mining, see Chapter II under Isoteleia n.105.

81 Xenophon, Revenues 4.14-18, and Andokides 1.38.
82 Thuc. 7.27.5.
urban employment, readily acquiring trades or becoming small businessmen. If contempt for ρη βαναυσοπ existed at this time, it was due primarily to that prejudice common in all ages to landed aristocrat and small peasant alike. For some, however, there was no alternative. It was not until the middle of the fifth century, when Athens found herself the mistress of a maritime empire, that a transformation began to take place in the life and ethos of her citizens. Allied tribute had become a part of her annual revenues. Simultaneously, the democracy acquired a new complexity. In addition to powers recently taken from the Areiopagos, the Heliastic court found itself responsible for a mass of new legal suits, including some from the subject states. Aside from any personal motives, Perikles'

83 Cf. Isokrates 7.32 and 44.
84 See Plutarch, Solon 2, for the early respect for trade and commerce. Solon himself was reputedly a merchant. The Alkmeonidai, who derived part of their wealth from Lydia (Herodotus 6.125), are generally believed to have had trading connections in Asia Minor.
85 Ath. Pol. 25.2 ca. 462.
86 IG I² 16, e.g., the Phaselis decree, dated by Gomme, Commentary 1.239, and Tod, Greek Inscriptions 1.58, ca. 450, concerns suits ἀπο συμβολὰν, but see H. T. Wade-Gery, "The Judicial Treaty with Phaselis and the History of the Athenian Courts," Essays in Greek History (Oxford 1958) 180-200, where the decree is dated 469-462, before Ephialtes' reforms. For other kinds of cases see Gomme, ibid. 1.236-243 and Pseudo-Xenophon, Constitution of
introduction of pay for jurors can be explained simply as a means of attracting increased attendance. The assembly too must have met more frequently now that military, even "international," decisions were taken daily. Quite literally, the duties of citizenship became a full-time occupation. By 424 jurors received a salary of three obols a day, while the same amount was paid to those who attended the assembly by 393. Again and again Aristotle stresses the pernicious effects of payment for office, which he likens to the sieve of the Danaïdes. His bitterness cannot be explained entirely by his political theories. In my opinion, he did not exaggerate the very real changes in the democracy after 450.

There were, of course, other reasons for this transformation. Constant warfare is always demanding and leaves little time for other activities. This is especially true of a hoplite army.

the Athenians 1.16-18.

87 Ath. Pol. 27.3-4.

88 Jury-pay of three obols is mentioned by Aristophanes in the Knights 51 and 255, dated to 424, and assembly-pay in the Ἐκκλεσία-ζούσαι 301 and 392, dated to 393. For the whole question of distributions and salaries and an estimate of the amount of revenue expended in this manner, see Böckh, Public Economy 216-246; Andreades, Public Finance 238-267; and the recent study by J. J. Buchanan, Theorika (New York 1962) passim.

89 Politics 1320a 32.
Military exercises and manoeuvres are a continuous preoccupation. In fact, it is hardly an exaggeration to estimate that Athenian hoplites spent some part of every day in gymnasia. The war itself, then, meant constant training and expeditions abroad for a large section of the populace. Thousands more were needed to man the fleet. Perikles' policy, which made Athens a fortress behind city-walls, promised, and actually did assume, responsibility for all, even the inactive.

One might call these only the exigencies of war. But in 400 the demos showed no great eagerness to return to its mundane pre-war tasks. Under the extreme democrats state-support through salaries and distributions had so increased that Boeckh could write that "it was by this means that the Athenians delivered themselves to the power of Macedon." The Theoric Fund also drained revenues. Originally introduced by Agyrrhios at the beginning of the fourth century to subsidize poorer citizens' enjoyment of the Dionysiac Festival, under Euboulos it was extended to other occasions, particularly religious festivals.

---
90 Op. cit. 224. Andreades 259 states in a similar vein that "...all the misfortunes of the fourth century took their rise from the fact that military preparations were sacrificed to the distribution of money to the citizens." In Aristophanes' Knights 797 Kleon's aim is a dicast's pay of five obols a day. By Aristotle's time a full drachma was paid for attendance at ordinary meetings of the assembly and nine obols for extraordinary (Ath. Pol. 62.2).
and distributed quite indiscriminately. Demosthenes attacks it bitterly as a source of ruin. More than once a sum as high as five drachmas was given to every claimant. Buchanan, following Boeckh, estimates that distributions were made 25 to 30 days a year - a total expenditure of 30 talents. In the fourth century taxes and confiscations became so common that the rich concealed their property in fear, endeavouring to invest it at interest and thus render it "invisible."

The results were twofold. The poorer citizens, those who had once worked through lack of landed property or other estates, ceased to be productive. Only out of extreme necessity did they accept employment, and then of a temporary nature, a supplement, as it were, to their state subsidies. To work for another was the mark of a slave, as trade was the stigma of an alien and

91 Harpokration, s.v. θεώρικα. See Buchanan's arguments for accepting Harpokration's evidence (48-53).
92 Dem. 1.20; 3.31-33; 13 passim.
93 Hypereides 5.26 and Deinarchos 1.56.
94 In prosperous years this might be trebled. In actual fact, Buchanan quotes Boeckh, stating (88) that "with this range from 25 to 90 talents I see no cause to quarrel."
95 Isokrates 7.24-25 and 35; 15.159-160. Cf. Dem. 45.66 where money deposited with a banker is concealed. Houses, slaves, and furniture were φανερὰ οὐσία and money lent out at interest ἀφανῆς οὐσία. See Hasebroek, Trade and Politics 88-89, and particularly the same scholar's article "Zum griechischen Bankwesen der klassischen Zeit," Hermes 55 (1920) 156-158.
lamp-making of a barbarian. Euxitheos pleads with the Athenians: "Many are the servile tasks which free men are compelled by poverty to perform, and for these they should be pitied, men of Athens, rather than be brought also to utter ruin." That Euxitheos and his mother even faced the loss of citizenship is significant.

From every point of view the conclusions are inescapable. The metic did not merely participate in a casual way in the Athenian economy, but assumed the productive role gladly relinquished by the citizens. Freedmen, as befits their origin, undertook the lowest work. Metics predominated as skilled craftsmen. Banking and trade they monopolized. The former required money, the latter mobility. The citizens possessed neither. Both required that kind of initiative worshipped as a virtue in the nineteenth century A.D. but distinctly an anathema in the fifth B.C.

As suggested above, the typical citizen of means was a landowner with a well-defined range of economic activities open to him — activities from which the metic was excluded. One might retort, of course, that it was this very prohibition that forced wealthy metics to become merchants and bankers and seek out fields of investment. This is true. But the prohibition also caused an inherent weakness, since it divided the economy into two distinct

96 Xenophon, Mem. 2.8.4; Dem. 57.30-31 and the scholiast to Aristophanes' Wasps 1001, who quotes Andokides' characterization of lamp-making as the work of an alien or barbarian.

97 Dem. 57.45.
parts. As a result, the partnership between Athenians and metics was not a permanent one. The wealth and enterprise of the latter never served to create an economy in which land, industry, and commerce were closely interrelated. If the metic could not bridge this gulf, the citizen would not. While he might invest money in trading ventures or even deposit his surplus cash in one of Athens' banking houses, he made no attempt to deprive the metic of his function.

98 The citizens were never so averse to industry as to trade. See Dem. 48.12 where the property of Konon includes two houses, each with slaves employed respectively at weaving sack-cloth and grinding colours. Demosthenes' father was exceptional in that his estate consisted entirely of money loaned out at interest and factories. Even one of the factories was not his own but given as security for a debt. See Dem. 27.9-11 for the interesting items that constitute his fortune. In Dem. 32 and 35 Demon and Androkles invest in bottomry loans. On the other hand, mortgages were rarely used for productive purposes. Finley, Land and Credit, cites the literary references and finds only one mortgage so employed. Citizens usually borrowed for personal needs, taxes, liturgies, or dowries. Finley, ibid. 83 and 272 n.56, writes: "The speaker in [Demosthenes], Against Boiotos II 40.52, went into debt for 1,000 drachmas to meet the cost of his father's funeral, a sum to be compared with the 2,000 drachmas he and his father together had borrowed for a mining venture, one of the few genuinely productive loans, apart from bottomry, to be found in the entire literature."
So long as Athens enjoyed prosperity as the commercial centre of the Aegean, the partnership was a felicitous one. Aristophanes once compared citizen to metic as wheat to bran. His metaphor proved doubly apt, for they were just as separable. The first quarter of the fourth century gave early signs of an incipient economic as well as military decline. With it the metic population shrank. Isokrates, speaking On the Peace in 355, prophesies: "...we shall advance day by day in prosperity, relieved of paying war-taxes, of fitting out triremes, and of discharging the other burdens which are imposed by war, without fear cultivating our lands and sailing the seas and engaging in those other occupations which now, because of the war, have entirely come to an end. Nay, we shall see our city enjoying twice the revenues which she now receives, and thronged with merchants and foreigners and resident aliens, by whom she is now deserted." Another work of the same year, Xenophon's Revenues, advocates offering incentives to encourage immigration, for "... all without a city would covet the right of settling in Athens, and would increase our revenues." He becomes more explicit: "The rise in the number of residents and visitors would of course

99 Acharniâns 508.

100 8.20-21: ὑψώμεθα δὲ τὴν πόλιν διπλασίας μὲν ἢ νῦν τὰς προσόδους λαμβάνουσαν, μεστὴν δὲ γινομένην ἐμπόρων καὶ ξένων καὶ μετοίκων ὡν νῦν ἐρήμη καθέστηκεν.

101 2.7. ...πάντας ἂν οἱ ἀπόλιδες τῆς Ἀθηναίων μετοικίας ὄρεγοντο καὶ τὰς προσόδους ᾧν αὔξοιεν.
lead to a corresponding expansion of our imports and exports, sales, rents and customs." Here, surely, is reasoning worthy of boards of trade of every age.

Andreades sums up his work on Greek public finance by decrying Athens' financial system "as in all probability the real cause of the destruction of the noblest of all states known to history." Perhaps this is so, but one must remember that the continued dichotomy between metic and citizen insured that their partnership was transitory and thus the soundness of Athens' economy illusory. Indeed, in later years when commercial hegemony shifted to Rhodes and Delos, merchants - and among them Athenian metics - flocked to these new centres, leaving the

---

102 3.5.

103 363. He also quotes Léon Say (391), "Ce sont les bonnes finances qui font la bonne politique." He then points out: "It is of course true that a good financial policy presupposes a good government." As my starting point I have taken Finley's brief remarks (77-78): "However one may explain the jealous insistence upon the citizen's monopoly of real property, the fact remains that in large measure land and money remained two separate spheres. A citizen could mediate between them, a non-citizen could not. Throughout the period of Greek independence, the economy did not demand that the wall be torn down. ... The economic history of Athens might well be written with this as the point of departure."
E. Xenophon's Revenues and its Significance.

The Revenues appeared in 355, the year in which the "Social War" ended and with it Athens' Second Confederacy. Henceforth, foreign revenues were cut off and statesmen began to project schemes for self-sufficiency based on internal resources. In his treatise Xenophon concentrates on two main sources of revenue, mines and metics; only the latter need concern us here. Xenophon's first and most immediate goal being to increase the number of metics, he proposes the following concessions as an inducement to immigration: 1) that metics no longer be obligated to serve as hoplites along with citizens - a duty injurious both to their trades and their private affairs; 2) that every effort be made to increase their loyalty by the granting of honours, as, for example, the right to serve in the cavalry; 3) that suitable applicants be allowed to hold land and build homes on the many vacant sites within the city walls; 4) that

104 Since Boeckh's Dissertation on the Silver Mines of Laurion (appended to The Public Economy) historians have generally considered Xenophon's proposals on mining completely fanciful. On the other hand, Archelaus' successful economic programme, which resulted in a renaissance of the mining industry and an increase in the number of metics, is thought to have been inspired by the Revenues.

105 Revenues 2.2-4.
106 Ibid. 2.5.
107 Ibid. 2.6.
a board of guardians for metics (μετοικοφύλακες) be appointed in order to create good will.

The concessions themselves are not so startling as Xenophon's ultimate goal, that the rich no longer be burdened with the costs of war and especially that "every Athenian may receive sufficient maintenance at public expense." Where do the resident aliens fit into this scheme? According to Xenophon, they are one of the "best sources of revenue" because they are completely self-supporting and, while they receive no payments (μισθός), they pay the metoikion. But, more important, unlike the mines, immigration of metics requires no initial outlay of capital on the part of Athenians, but merely the creation of "honours" by the simple expedient of votes by the assembly (ψηφίσματα φιλάνθρωπα).

Xenophon has given us a clue. To our economic arguments may be added an appendix, as it were, on the metics' contributions to Athens' revenues, for they contributed both directly and indirectly. As merchants, they paid on all imports and exports 2% customs-dues (τὰ ἐλλιμένια), which in 399/8, a year

108 Ibid. 2.7.
109 Ibid. 6.1.
110 Ibid. 4.33: ἵκανην ἀν πᾶσιν Ἀθηναίοις τροφῆν ἀπὸ κοινοῦ γενέσθαι.
111 Ibid. 2.1
112 Ibid. 3.6.
of extreme hardship, totalled 36 talents. Although it is impossible to calculate the total, Andreades believes it improbable that it ever sank in a prosperous year below forty talents. It is sufficient to point out that by paying the metoikion every 10,000 metics increased the revenues by twenty talents. This was no trifling amount in a system where regular taxes consisted of liturgies and thus never afforded a cash surplus. In addition, wealthy metics could no more avoid voluntary contributions, epidoseis, than citizens. Pasion alone gave 1,000 shields and five completely manned triremes. The metic Chrysippos appealed to the sympathy of the courts in his suit Against Phormion by reminding the Athenians how he and his brother had made them a gift of one talent in cash and later, in a year of shortage, had imported wheat for public sale at abnormally low prices. Whether metics resorted to epidoseis in order to stave off the ravages of sycophants and confiscations, or simply to create good will as an avenue to citizenship, we do not know.

Xenophon has made his point, however. The resident aliens, though they contributed more as individuals than the citizens, could expect no tangible return. For the rich metic this mattered little. But for the average metic, there were definite disadvantages. He received no assistance in times of famine or

113 Andokides 1.133.
114 298.
115 Dem. 45.85.
116 Dem. 34.38-39.
shortage, shared in none of the distributions when foreign princes were generous, and was ineligible for state funds, such as the Theorika. The metoikion, moreover, made it impossible for destitute non-citizens to remain in the state without risking sale into slavery. It is no wonder that in times of economic distress the metic population quickly abandoned its adopted home.

In my opinion, by the fourth century citizenship was no longer restricted out of mere sentiment or pride. Its tangible benefits were obvious, as were the advantages of a large and active non-citizen population. In prosperity the two complemented one another.
CHAPTER IV
CITIZENSHIP AND THE METIC

In 353 the Athenians, not content with their previous grant of citizenship to Charidemos, the Euboian leader of mercenaries, seriously considered making his person inviolable. Demosthenes' oration Against Aristokrates opposed this extension of privilege in the following terms: "The truth is that in those days to be made a citizen of Athens was an honour so precious in the eyes of the world that, to earn that favour alone, men were ready to render to you those memorable services. To-day it is so worthless that not a few men who have already received it have wrought worse mischief to you than your declared enemies." The sentiments echo those of Isokrates, who in 355 had also severely chided his countrymen for bestowing citizenship too freely.

Against a background of such complaints, we might expect that metics would be among the first to benefit from any relaxation of the restrictions on citizenship. But just the opposite is the case. Only six years later in 346/5 the Athenians decided to act upon their suspicion that metics had infiltrated the demes and phratries. A wide-spread διαψήφισις was held and every demesman forced to undergo scrutiny to prove that he was a genuine citizen either by birth or by decree of the demos.

1 Dem. 23.200.
2 8.50 and 88.
3 Aischines 1.77 and 86; Harpokration, s.v. διαψήφισις. On this scrutiny and its legal implications, see A. Diller, "The
Even the graphe ξενίας, the punishment for which was slavery, had been insufficient to prevent metics and xenoi from pretending to citizenship. For Euxitheos, one of the accused, tells us that many aliens were expelled from all the demes. Despite his own plight, however, he feels little sympathy for the ejected: "In my opinion, it is your duty to treat with severity those who are proved to be aliens, who without having either won your consent or asked for it, have by stealth and violence come to participate in your religious rites and your common privileges."

Decree of Demophilus, 346/345 B.C.," TAPA 63 (1932) 193-205. Diller believes that this decree "introduced a great change in the scrutinies in the demes. It made them universal, uniform, and compulsory. All existing members were to be scrutinized at once, and all future members at the time of their admission." He concludes (205) that it was only with this decree that appellants from the decisions of individual demes became subject to the graphe ξενίας. Gomme argues against this, disturbed by the harshness of the punishment meted out (slavery), if an appeal were unsuccessful. See "The Law of Citizenship at Athens," Essays in Greek History 67-86.

4 Dem. 57.2.

5 Ibid. 3. Other orations which concern aliens' attempts to become citizens are: Lysias 13.73-76, in which Agoratos claims to have been made an Athenian citizen for his part in the assassination of Phrynichos (cf. IG 12.110); Lysias 23,
Demosthenes reveals why the alien was forced to employ bribery and stealth in order to gain the rights of a citizen. So stringent were the rules laid down for the demos that - except for a very few - it was legally impossible to win the status openly and honestly. In the first place, citizenship could be granted only to one who deserved it through distinguished service to the Athenian people (ὅς 'ἄνδρα γαθῶν εἰς τὸν δῆμον τὸν Ἀθηναίων). And even when bestowed by the demos, the gift did not become valid until confirmed at the next session of the assembly by a secret vote of more than 6,000 citizens. In addition, any Athenian who so desired might then prefer an indictment for illegality. On more than one occasion, Demosthenes continues, the courts had rescinded a grant of citizenship.

How then are we to interpret Demosthenes' accusation that citizenship as well as all other honours had been "dragged through the mire and made contemptible by those execrable and god-forsaken politicians"? At first glance the facts of Athenian life seem

Against Pankleon, who claimed to be a Plataian and thus to have the rights of a citizen; Aischines 1.114 and passim; Dem. 59 passim; Isaios 12 passim; and Hypereides 4.3, where Agasikles is impeached for having bribed his way into the deme of Halimous (cf. Deinarchos, fragment 7, and Harpokration, s.v. 'Αγασίκλης).

6 Dem. 59.39.
7 Ibid. 90-91.
8 Dem. 23.201.
to contradict it. But the paradox soon vanishes with a study of the evidence for citizenship. Demosthenes lists a number of recipients. Their names read like a "who's who" of the fourth century. They include Kotys, king of Thrace, Simon and Bianor, sons of Berisades, king of Thrace, Ariobarzanes, satrap of Phrygia, Philiskos, leader of mercenaries and viceroy in the Hellespont, Leukon, ruler of the Bosporos, and his sons, Spartokos, Peirisades, and Apollonios. Extant inscriptions award citizenship to Dionysios I of Sicily and his sons, Evagoras, king of Kyprian Salamis, and Arrybas, exiled king of the Molossians. Other categories of new citizens are ambassadors and exiles. Search as we may we are inevitably forced

9 Ibid. 118.
10 Ibid. 12.
11 Ibid. 141-142.
12 Dem. 20.30.
13 IG II²103 (368).
15 IG II²226 (ca. 342).
16 IG II²394 and 566.
17 IG II²17, 24, and 25, Sthorys, Archippos, and Hipparchos, Thasian exiles; IG II²237, Phormion and Karphinas, Akarnanians. For further discussion on exiles, see Pope, Non-Athenians 71-74, as well as her general chapter on non-Athenians naturalized and honoured (47-50). Most of the examples cited in this chapter are from the fourth century. Earlier naturalizations were even more rare. It was only as a result of prolonged loyalty and service
to admit that in most of the known examples, both literary and epigraphic, the recipients of Athenian citizenship were notmetics, who could well have used the privilege, but an assembly of foreign rulers, dignitaries, and exiles, whose support was essential in a century of international intrigue and whose patronage was all but purchased in this way. Even though the privilege was often purely honorific, it could at times bring

that the Plataians (Dem. 59.94-104) and Samians (IG I²126 and II²1) were awarded this honour. During the latter part of the Second Peloponnesian War, Perikles' citizenship law of 451/0 (see below, under Appendix A) seems to have been ignored and "mixed marriages" were allowed. Perhaps this was due to the active participation of the metics in the war or even - a more practical reason - the loss of Athenian manpower. At any rate, it became necessary to reenact Perikles' law in 403. Once again both parents had to be citizens (Dem. 57.30). This is not the only sign of a conservative reaction at this time. See also Lysias' Against Hippotherses (cited from Dionysios of Halikarnassos in Lamb's edition of Lysias p. 891 in the Loeb Classical Library), written in opposition to the proposal of Phormisios that citizenship be restricted to those who owned land; Ath. Pol. 40.2, where Archinos rescinds the grant of citizenship to metics and slaves who had helped to restore the democracy in 403 (see above, under Isoteleia n.96); and Plutarch, Lives of the Ten Orators 835 F, for Lysias' frustrated efforts to become an Athenian citizen.
tangible results - gifts of food and money or trading concessions.

We do, of course, know of four metics who became citizens - four who were all of one profession - the bankers, Pasion, Phormion, Epigenes, and Konon. We have yet to offer some explanation for this. According to Pasion's son Apollodoros the Athenians awarded citizenship to his father because of his ability to make money. Pasion, as we know, was very generous and, on one occasion alone, gave Athens 1,000 shields. Yet, several years earlier when Lysias gave similar gifts of shields and money, he was not made a citizen. Indeed, so few metics were ever naturalized that the choice of four bankers can be no mere coincidence. Citizens often needed cash and willingly mortgaged their property. What better way was there to make available the accumulated reserves of a wealthy metic banker than to grant him citizenship? Expediency, then, not mere generosity, explains the naturalization of the four bankers. Certainly, the example is

18 Leukon, e.g., who controlled the Black Sea trade routes so important to Athens, had given exemption from dues and priority in lading (Dem. 20.31). See Tod, Greek Inscriptions 2.104 for Athenian efforts to win the alliance of Dionysios I.

19 See above, under Introduction.

20 Dem. 36.30: ἀπὸ τοῦ χρηματίσασθαι καὶ ἐτέρων πλείω κτήσασθαι.

21 Plutarch, loc. cit.
isolated. All the evidence indicates that the attitude of the Athenians toward the resident alien never changed. Throughout the classical period citizenship was jealously guarded against the slightest encroachment. Thus, the legal status of

22 The literary sources are very clear, with one exception. Deinarchos (1.43) tells us that Demosthenes conferred citizenship on Chairephilos, Pheidon, Pamphilos, and Pheidippos. Pheidippos of Paiania is a trierarch in IG II²1631.622 (323/2), while Pamphilos, son of Chairephilos, also a Paianian, appears in a list of donors of epidoseis, IG II²417.14 (ca. 330). According to Pope 28 all four received Athenian citizenship for generosity during the food shortage of 330/326. They seem to have been a family of metics. Unfortunately, in dealing with the epigraphic evidence we can base our conclusions on only a few of the extant inscriptions that award citizenship. The majority of them do not make it clear who are receiving the privilege. Unless they appear elsewhere they cannot be identified. Even PA offers little help, often merely recording that "so and so" received Athenian citizenship. One inscription probably concerns a metic. IG II²391 records the grant of citizenship to Alkimachos of Apollonia who [ἐις τὴν σωρησίαν τῇ ἴπολεως ἐπέδω[κεν]]. He had given an epidosis. If we accept both these examples, neither of which is without difficulties, there is some precedent for the awarding of citizenship to metics in return for gifts of money. Personally, I cannot see why this would not have been the case in times of extreme shortage. Certainly, though, it was the exception, not the rule.
the individual metic vis-à-vis the citizen was as lasting as the alien's residence in Attika, even if it were prolonged for several generations.
CHAPTER V
GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

E. H. Carr, in his series of lectures entitled *What is History*, illustrates how "interpretation enters into every fact of history" with the following observation: "Our picture of Greece in the fifth century B.C. is defective not primarily because so many of the bits have been accidentally lost, but because it is, by and large, the picture formed by a tiny group of people in the city of Athens. We know a lot about what fifth-century Greece looked like to an Athenian citizen; but hardly anything about what it looked like to a Spartan, a Corinthian or a Theban - not to mention a Persian, or a slave or other non-citizen resident in Athens."

The metic is among those outside real "history." In the textbook he receives at best a footnote. In true nineteenth-century tradition we identify ourselves with the Athenian citizens, a minority in what was really a more diverse world. In the present empiric and very critical age, it would be surprising if some broader picture did not emerge. I believe that we can state, without detracting even slightly from the accomplishments of the past, that in Athens there were not "quasi-citizens," as Wilamowitz phrases it, but second-class citizens. These were the

---

metics. And like Carr we might find it fruitful to leave aside the glorification of "democracy" long enough to ask about their life in Athens. It is unfortunate that, for the most part, they do not speak for themselves; and in the face of their silence we are forced to rely on the works of others who make only the briefest allusions to the non-citizens. We can, however, draw a sketch, part of which has been presented here. We should know much more if only one of the comedies called Metoikos (and there were several) had survived. For, surprisingly, nearly all the writers of the New Comedy were metics - as were most of Athens' sculptors and artists.

In this study we have restricted ourselves to the economic position of the metic, a side of Athenian life usually ignored, but necessary to balance the more spectacular political and intellectual achievements. As a result we have left untouched another part of the metic's history. It is always startling to

2 E.g., Antiphanes, Alexis, Anaxandrides, and Philemon, fourth- and early third-century poets of the Middle and New Comedy; Mys, the sculptor of the reliefs on the shield of Athena Promachos, and Agorakritos, pupil of Pheidias; Polygnotos of Thasos, Zeuxis of Herakleia, and Parrhasios of Ephesos, famous fifth- and early fourth-century painters; Hippodamos of Miletos, the architect of the Peiraius; and, of the ten orators, Lysias, Isaicos, and Deinarchos.
discover for the first time that the Greek philosophers, apart from Sokrates and Plato, were non-Athenians. Those who came to Athens to found schools, as many did, came as metics. Aristotle, the metic, may strike us as novel. But there is ample evidence to show that Athenian metics were responsible not only for the economic superiority of Athens but also for much of her artistic and intellectual heritage. To state this does not detract from Athens' glory; rather it underscores the richness of the Hellenic world.
APPENDIX

THE METIC IN ATHENIAN HISTORY

A. Two Historical Problems

1. Kleisthenes' Enfranchisements

...Κλεισθένης μετὰ τὴν τῶν τυράννων ἐκβολήν· πολλοὺς γὰρ ἐφυλέτευσε καὶ δοῦλους μετοίκους (Aristotle, Politics 1275b 36-37).

Historians generally have been suspicious of these enfranchisements, although in the Ath. Pol. Aristotle is unambiguous in his reference to new citizens (νεοπολίται). In fact, he tells us that Kleisthenes instituted demotics for their protection. "He made those who lived in a common deme fellow-demesmen in order that men should not be called by their patronymics and thereby disclose who were the new citizens." Adhering closely to their

1 The text cited is that edited by W. D. Ross (Oxford 1957).


own theories about Aristotle's method of writing history, James Day and Mortimer Chambers, the co-authors of Aristotle's History of Athenian Democracy, have attempted a new explanation of these two difficult passages. Aristotle's teleological outlook, they assert, led him not only to prejudice but to manipulation of sources and facts in order to fit them to his preconceived theory of the four stages of democracy. Believing that more citizens mean more democracy, he saw in the details of Kleisthenes' reforms only an attempt to admit more citizens. Day and Chambers base this application of their thesis on their own translation of the clause ὅπως μετάσχωσι πλείους τῆς πολιτείας, "that more might share in the citizenship." However, they admit that it can be construed equally well as "that more might share in the administration of the government."

First, it is obvious that we cannot accept Aristotle's explanation for the need of demotics. Modern research refutes it. The deme, the smallest administrative unit in the new tribal system, was integral to Kleisthenic democracy, which created a more broadly based Council truly representative of every region of Attika. Through the deme and the demotic new ties replaced former clan loyalties. Demotics would have served no purpose in

4 111-120.
6 See Eliot, Coastal Demes of Attika 3-4.
concealing the origins of new citizens since Athenians continued both to belong to phratries and to use patronymics. This was guesswork on Aristotle's part. On the other hand, there is no reason to impute to Aristotle the belief that the whole Kleisthenic system was merely a screen for new citizens. When he is being most precise, he defines a citizen as one who has a right to participate in judicial functions and in office. If we adopt this definition, then Kleisthenes' purpose was "to mix all the citizens together in order that more might have a share in the running of government." This is an accurate description of what Kleisthenes did, without reference to new citizens at all. The inclusion of the latter need not have motivated Aristotle any more than it did Kleisthenes himself. They are not integral to the reforms but a possible concomitant of them.

7 See Wade-Gery, op. cit. 150-152, for a discussion of this problem including a fragment of Philochoros (FGrH 3b, 328 F35) that states that the phratries are to admit ὁργανῖσε as well as ὀμογάλακτες. Although the fragment is undatable, it has often been adduced as evidence that Kleisthenes forced new citizens into the phratries. Wade-Gery himself considers it a Solonian law. Cf. Day and Chambers 113-114. For a recent discussion, including relevant bibliography, see A. Andrewes, "Philochoros on Phratries," JHS 81 (1961) 1-15.

8 Politics 1275a 22-24: πολίτης δ' ἀκλάδος οὐδενὶ τῶν ἄλλων ὁρίζεται μᾶλλον ἡ τῷ μετέχειν κρίσεως καὶ ἀρχῆς.
Having attempted to rescue Aristotle from the accusation of "alleged" enfranchisements in order to "control" history, we still have the facts to deal with. I believe that there were no admissions to citizenship at this time — or none at any rate that we know of —, that Aristotle did not fabricate these facts but found them in his sources, and that the enigma has a plausible explanation.

Elsewhere we have considered the legal position of the metic. It was no mere series of fortuitous accretions but a scrupulously defined status. Deme-membership, choice of a demesman for patron, rights similar to those of the citizen, all reveal an intimate connection between the metic and Kleisthenic democracy. Chronologically the word \textit{metoikos} appears for the first time in Aischylos' \textit{Suppliants}. Since we know of no constitutional reforms after those of Kleisthenes that changed the basic

9 Day and Chambers 115.

10 Now dated by some to 466 or 463. See H. J. Mette, \textit{Der Verlorene Aischylos} (Berlin 1963) 50. At 609 is the verb \textit{μετοικεῖν} and at 994 \textit{μέτοικος} (πᾶς δ' ἐν μετοίκῳ γυάσσαν εὔτυκτον φέρει καὶ ἐκεῖνον). At 963 the king declares himself \textit{προστάτης} (protector) of the Danaides. The reference must reflect contemporary Athenian usage. The earliest epigraphic reference to the metic is \textit{IG I² 188} (ca. 460), a decree of the deme of Skambonidai. According to Wilamowitz' restoration ("Demotika," 254), after the sacrifice to the hero Leon every demesman and every metic is to receive a part of the sacred meat.
nature of the democracy or explicitly concerned the metic, it is logical to date his status to 508. Reputedly Solon and Peisistratos had both encouraged immigration, so that by 510 the alien population might have been considerable. I believe that Kleisthenes then gave the former xenoi a definite place in his constitution. Why should this tradition not have been echoed, even recorded in one of Aristotle's sources?

Let us consider the peculiar wording of the quoted portion of the Politics, which has invited frequent emendation. Kleisthenes, we are told, ἐφυλέτευε many aliens and δούλους μετοίκους. If Aristotle meant freedmen, he knew a perfectly good word (ἀπελευθερος), well authenticated in the orators and found in the Politics itself. "Slave metics" is a contradiction in

11 Plutarch, Solon 24 and Ath. Pol. 13.5. The former states that Solon offered citizenship to certain classes of aliens. But both references have occasioned considerable dispute. See, e.g., the discussion in Hignett 111-112 on the διαψηφισμός. I accept the tradition that both Solon and the Peisistratidai encouraged immigration for the sake of trade, industry, and, in the case of the latter, public works.

12 E.g., Day and Chambers 117 omit μετοίκους altogether and translate, "Kleisthenes enfranchised many foreigners and slaves."

13 LSJ⁹ (s.v. ἀπελευθερία, II). It is found for the first time in this sense in Pseudo-Xenophon, Constitution of the Athenians 1.10, and frequently in Plato's Laws. Aristotle uses it in the Politics 1278a 2.
terms. Φυλασσω, moreover, is unique. Need it refer to the tribes? One scholar has recently suggested a more general translation, "to form into a separate phyle (class or category)." While I do not accept Oliver's main argument, which depends on a lacuna in the Politics, I find his treatment of φυλασσω intriguing. Aristotle, in my opinion, copied this unusual expression from a source that had recorded that "Kleisthenes enrolled aliens and slaves as metics in the tribal groups (i.e., the demes)." The slaves were, perhaps, ἀπελευθεροί, the legal term for which is late, only increasingly common from the end of the fifth century, when manumissions were relatively frequent. Instead of understanding the word μετοικος as applicable to both categories, Aristotle accepted it as proof of enfranchisements. We need not be surprised at Aristotle's close adherence to his sources on occasion. Both Wade-Gery and Day and Chambers have discussed his similar use of Androtion and Herodotos. Thus, Aristotle's confusion of citizenship with the enrolment of metics in the deme structure is at the heart of this seemingly insoluble problem.

14 J. H. Oliver, "The Reforms of Kleisthenes," Historia 9 (1960) 504-505. He does not believe that Aristotle intended either passage to refer to enfranchisements. The troublesome "new citizens" he translates as "citizens of the new community." This involves a semantic quibble quite foreign to Aristotle.

15 Wade-Gery 136-139 and Day and Chambers 8.

16 For the argumentation in this Appendix I am indebted to Professor C. W. J. Eliot. It is based in its entirety on
2. Perikles' Citizenship Law.

...διὰ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν πολιτῶν Περικλέους εἰπόντος ἐγνώσαν μὴ μετέχειν τῆς πόλεως ὅσ ἐν μὴ ἐξ ἀμφοῖν ἀποτεῖν ἢ γεγονός (Ath. Pol. 26.4).

Perikles' citizenship law was passed in 451/0. Five years later, Plutarch tells us, when Psammetichos, king of Egypt, presented Athens with a gift of 40,000 measures of corn for public distribution, a scrutiny was held and nearly 5,000 persons prosecuted as nothoi were sold into slavery. Those who retained their citizenship, he continues, numbered 14,040. The figures are, of course, absurd. It is inconceivable that 25% of the Athenian populace was sold into slavery on this one occasion. Possibly Plutarch derived the punishment from known fourth-century examples of the graphe ξενιάς. Unrealistic as are the details of his account, however, the tradition of a scrutiny and certain disbarments from the citizen-lists at this time does ring true and cannot be rejected.

suggestions which he made during a discussion of Aristotle's Ath. Pol. at a graduate seminar in Greek History.

17 Plutarch, Perikles 37 and Philochoros (FGrH 3b, 328 F119).

18 F. Jacoby, FGrH 3b (Supplement) 1.470 writes: "The facts which alone remain (apart from the tradition about the Egyptian gift) are the law of 451/0 B.C., the usage of the demes (and phratries) conforming with its new regulations about determining the quality of citizenship, and perhaps a number of γραφὴν ξενιάς brought on the basis of the law during those years."
A more important question is why the Athenians chose this occasion to pass a law restricting citizenship. Before 450 a number of their most prominent leaders had been the children of "mixed marriages," among them Kleisthenes, Themistokles, and Kimon. In the briefest of preambles Aristotle explains the law as "due to the number of the citizens." Modern authorities have generally accepted this reason, since there is ample evidence that Athens did experience a problem of excess population in the 440's as witnessed by the cleruchies and colonies sent out after 450. Other motives have been suggested. E. M. Walker, for instance, states that "the real motive of the measures was to enhance the value of the lucrative privileges attaching to the franchise, by limiting the number of those entitled to share in them." Gomme attributes it to fear lest a continuing increase in population should eventually "make the constitution unworkable." Others have seen it as an appeal to prejudice aimed at

Cf. E. M. Walker, CAH 5, 102-103; F. E. Adcock, ibid. 167-168; and A. W. Gomme, Essays in Greek History and Literature (Oxford 1937) 86-88. All accept the law and general tradition.

19 Plutarch, Perikles 11. For a discussion of colonies and cleruchies and, in particular, the epigraphic evidence for them, see B. D. Meritt, H. T. Wade-Gery, and M. F. McGregor, The Athenian Tribute Lists, Vol. 3 (Princeton 1950) 282-297. There were, of course, other reasons besides overpopulation.

20 102.

21 87.
preserving racial purity.

While each of the above explanations may well contain an element of truth, I prefer to link the citizenship law very closely with contemporary events. In 454 the treasury of the Delian League was transferred to Athens. Confident of Athens' hegemony, Perikles convoked the Panhellenic Congress and, despite its failure, by 447 had begun work on the Parthenon. These same years saw a period of truce between Athens and the Peloponnese and with it the return of thousands of sailors and hoplites after ten years of continual campaigning. If once again we are to believe Plutarch, the object of Perikles' projects during this decade - the public works, cleruchies, naval reserve training - was to keep these citizens from idleness in Athens. Thus, whether or not there was an absolute increase in population, Athens did face a very real problem of numbers, which, I suggest, the restrictions of 451 were designed to face.

It goes deeper, however. A question of principle was bound

22 E.g., Hignett, Athenian Constitution 343-347. For others, see Day and Chambers 31. Again the two authors devote considerable effort to proving that Aristotle's account is mainly surmise based on political theory. Surmise or not, in the end they are themselves forced to admit that population was a problem in the mid-fifth century.

23 The chronology is that proposed by ATL 3.298-300. In actual fact, military campaigns had never ceased since 479, the end of the Persian Wars.

24 Plutarch, loc. cit.
to arise with the "responsibilities of empire." Was Athens to continue her relative laxity towards intermarriage? The alien population was increasing, with foreign sailors and subject allies constantly in the Peiraeus, many perhaps hoping to remain as permanent residents. What of the Athenian cleruchs? Were they to integrate themselves with the natives of their respective settlements? Unlike Rome in the first century B.C., Athens decided against sharing her hegemony. Perhaps it is for this reason that Adcock terms the law "a menace to Athens' future."

Although we shall not go so far as to say that "lucrative privileges" inspired the law, by 445 exclusiveness was already beginning to unite with the motive of material gain. For in that year Athens established, or perhaps tested, her strict definition of citizenship by refusing its privileges to those of impure descent.

B. A Brief Chronological Table.

508/7 Kleisthenes' reforms. The beginning of the status of metic.

466/3 Aischylos' Suppliants. The first literary reference to metoikos.

c. 460 IG I²188. The first epigraphic reference to metoikos.

25 168.
454 Treasury of the Delian Confederacy transferred from Delos to Athens.

451/0 Perikles' citizenship law.

449 Convocation of the Panhellenic Congress. Perikles institutes a plan to make Athens the cultural and religious centre of the Greek world. It includes the attraction of aliens (intellectuals, artists, craftsmen, and "businessmen") such as Kephalos of Syracuse.

447 Building of Parthenon begun.

443 Foundation of Thourioi.

431 First year of the Second Peloponnesian War.

Perikles' funeral oration. Metic hoplites employed as a reserve garrison and as part of the invading force into the Megarid.

424 Battle of Delion. The first important campaign in which metic hoplites are employed abroad. Aristophanes' *Knights*, which mentions for the first time jury-pay of three obols.

ca. 424 Pseudo-Xenophon's *Constitution of the Athenians*.

415/3 Athenian expeditions to Sicily.

413 Nikias' speech to metic sailors.

409-406 Building accounts for the Erechtheion.


26 Lysias 12.4

27 Lysias 12.6.
403 Thrasyboulos' promise of *isoteleia* to metics and aliens. Seizure of Peiraeus. IG II²10, enfranchisements of aliens and slaves who had helped restore the democracy. Lysias' oration Against Eratosthenes (12).


c. 400 Agyrrhios institutes the Theorikon.

393 Aristophanes' *Ekklesiazousai*. Pay of three obols for attendance at the assembly.

378/7 Archonship of Nausinikos. Second Athenian Confederacy. Beginning of the new taxation system based on *symmoriai* with a separate group for metics.

371/0 Death of Pasion the banker.

361/0 Naturalization of Phormion the banker.

Metics desert Athens during period of incessant warfare.

355 Isokrates' *On the Peace* (8). Xenophon's *Revenues*.


c. 351 Demosthenes' *On Organization* (13).
346/5 Decree of Demophilos. Removal of aliens from demes.

Reverberations in Aischines' Against Timarchos (1) and Demosthenes' Against Luboulides (57).

340 Demosthenes' Against Neaira (59).

338 Battle of Chaironeia. Proposal of Hypereides to enfranchise slaves and metics in order that they might defend Athens.

Beginning of Lykourgos' administration during which the mines flourish, revenues increase, and the metic population grows.

330 Manumission inscriptions.

329-326 Eleusinian building accounts.

ca.325 Aristotle's Ath. Pol.

322 Change in the Athenian constitution imposed by Antipatros.

With the decline of Athens and Peiraeus the metics move to other more prosperous centres.

28 Hypereides, Against Aristogeiton (fragment 18); Lykourgos, Against Leokrates 41; Plutarch, Lives of the Ten Orators 849 A. According to the latter Hypereides was prosecuted for his proposal by Aristogeiton but acquitted.
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