

ARCTOS

ACTA PHILOLOGICA FENNICA

VOL. XXXVIII

HELSINKI 2004

INDEX

THOMAS GÄRTNER	<i>Mythologische Paradigmen für einen Achill in Frauenkleidern. Zu einer scheinbar unpassenden Gleichnisreihe in der statianischen Achilleis</i>	9
MIKA KAJAVA	<i>Theoktistos</i>	17
PETER KRUSCHWITZ	<i>Carmina latina epigraphica Pompeiana: Ein Dossier</i>	27
PASI LOMAN	<i>Travelling Female Entertainers of the Hellenistic Age</i>	59
MARIA NIKU	<i>When and Why Did the Athenian μετοικία system disappear? The Evidence of inscriptions</i>	75
JARI PAKKANEN	<i>The Temple of Zeus at Stratos: New Observations on the Building Design</i>	95
OLLI SALOMIES	<i>De titulis Coranis laudatis a Santho Lauriente in opere suo Historia Corana (1637)</i>	123
KAJ SANDBERG	<i>Consular Legislation in pre-Sullan Rome</i>	133
HEIKKI SOLIN	<i>Analecta epigraphica CCXVI–CCXXII</i>	163
STANISLAW STABRYLA	<i>The Realistic and Supernatural Order of the World Presented in Prudentius' Peristephanon</i>	207
DAVID WOODS	<i>Nero's Pet Hippopotamus (Suet. Nero 37,2)</i>	219
	<i>De novis libris iudicia</i>	223
	<i>Index librorum in hoc volumine recensorum</i>	279
	<i>Libri nobis missi</i>	283
	<i>Index scriptorum</i>	287

WHEN AND WHY DID THE ATHENIAN μετοικία SYSTEM DISAPPEAR? THE EVIDENCE OF INSCRIPTIONS

MARIA NIKU

Inscriptions are the primary source for the study of the Athenian μετοικία system¹ after the Classical period. They are evidence of both the official obligations of the resident foreigners (tax, military service) and issues that were important for the status of resident foreigners, such as naturalization. The most important are the state honorary decrees, but, for instance, the grave inscriptions of ἰσοτελεῖς are usable as well. Since references to aspects of the status of resident foreigners are frequent in epigraphic sources throughout the Classical period, their disappearance indicates the disappearance of μετοικία. The purpose of this paper is to examine how far into the Hellenistic period the epigraphic references to the different aspects of the official status of resident foreigners extend; in other words, how far into the Hellenistic period did μετοικία survive? Why did it eventually disappear?

1. Mixed marriage legal and the offspring of such unions legal citizens from 229/8²

The Athenian citizenship legislation since the law of Pericles (451/0) stipulated that in order for a child to become a full citizen, both parents must be citizens. The law was still in force in the 320s.³ The legislation did not

¹ From now on simply μετοικία.

² All dates in this paper are B.C.

³ Arist. *Ath.Pol.* 26,3; 42,1; *Pol.* 1275,b23–25. See also Plut. *Per.* 37,3; Ael. *VH.* 6,10; 13,24.

formally prohibit mixed marriage or make it illegal – in fact, it does not refer to marital issues at all. In practice however, it rendered mixed marriage invalid or at least extremely unattractive, because the children would not be enfranchised. The aim of the legislation was to limit access to citizenship.⁴ Mixed marriage was formally banned sometime in the 4th century,⁵ as seen in the Demosthenic speech *In Neaeram*:

"If an alien shall live as husband with an Athenian woman in any way or manner whatsoever, he may be indicted before the Thesmothetae by anyone who chooses to do so from among the Athenians having the right to bring charges. And if he be convicted, he shall be sold, himself and his property, and the third part shall belong to the one securing his conviction. The same principle shall hold also if an alien woman shall live as wife with an Athenian, and the Athenian who lives as husband with the alien woman so convicted shall be fined one thousand drachmae."⁶

The law would seem to prohibit any kind of cohabitation of citizens and foreigners. This cannot be, because concubinage was legal, whether with a foreign or slave woman, possibly also with a citizen woman.⁷ The speech is about γραφή ξενίας, public indictment for pretending to be a citizen.⁸ Apollodoros is trying to establish that Athenian Stephanus and the foreigner Neaera were living as in legal Athenian marriage and thus were

⁴ For instance D. M. MacDowell, *The Law in Classical Athens*, London 1978, 87; P. J. Rhodes, *A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia*, Oxford 1981, 332; D. Ogden, *Greek Bastardy in the Classical and Hellenistic periods*, Oxford 1996, 62.

⁵ See MacDowell (above n. 4) 87. Rhodes (above n. 4) 332; K. A. Kapparis (ed.), *Apollodoros 'Against Neaira' [D.59]*, Berlin and New York 1999, 27.

⁶ [Dem.] 59,16: Ἐὰν δὲ ξένος ἀστῆ συνοικῆ τέχνῃ ἢ μηχανῇ ἤτινιοῦν, γραφέσθω πρὸς τοὺς θεσμοθέτας Ἀθηναίων ὁ βουλόμενος οἷς ἔξεστιν. ἐὰν δὲ ἀλῶ, πεπράσθω καὶ αὐτὸς καὶ ἡ οὐσία αὐτοῦ, καὶ τὸ τρίτον μέρος ἔστω τοῦ ἐλόντος. ἔστω δὲ καὶ ἐὰν ἡ ξένη τῷ ἀστῶ συνοικῆ κατὰ ταῦτά, καὶ ὁ συνοικῶν τῇ ξένη τῇ ἀλούσῃ ὀφειλέτω χιλίας δραχμάς.

⁷ Walters, *Classical Antiquity* 2 (1983) 320–321. Kapparis (above n. 5) 8–13. The latter doubts the argument that concubinage with an Athenian woman was legal. He also notes that the phrase 'in any way or manner whatsoever' (τέχνῃ ἢ μηχανῇ ἤτινιοῦν), is simply a standard phrase used in legal texts aiming to eliminate any possibility of violation of the law, oath or treaty (p. 205).

⁸ S. C. Todd, *SYMPOSION 1993. Vorträge zur griechischen und hellenistischen Geschichtsgeschichte (Graz-Andritz 12.–16. September 1993)*, Köln, Weimar, Wien 1994, 134.

trying to pass off Neaera's daughter as an Athenian.⁹ In fact, the law dictated that the union of a citizen and a foreigner could not constitute a legal Athenian marriage, and that it was illegal to try to pass off such a union as Athenian marriage.¹⁰

The legislation on citizenship and marital issues had changed by 229/8. The evidence consists solely of inscriptions. Osborne notes that from ca. 229 onwards the naturalization decrees no longer specify that the descendants of the naturalized citizens shall also be citizens. This stipulation had been commonplace since the 380s and had been necessary to ensure citizenship for the children of foreign mothers, the wives the naturalized men had brought with them from their home state.¹¹ Ogden saw the omission of this stipulation as a sign of changes that made the children of Athenian male citizens and foreign women automatically citizens of full right.¹² Following Vatin, he presents three cases of citizen offspring of mixed marriage:¹³

IG II² 9975 (mid 2nd cent.): Μεθύλλιον Θεστίου Μυριναία, Ἡγεμάχου Λευκονοέως γυνή.

IG II² 2332, 38 (183/2): Ἡγέμαχος Λευκον[οεύ]ς.

IG II² 6720 (2nd/1st cent.): Ἀνδρέας Ἡγεμάχου Λευκονοεύς.

Hegemachos of the deme Leukonoe, also seen in a list of *epidosis* participants (2332), married Methyllion from the city of Myrrhine. They had a son called Andreas.

IG II² 9968 (2nd cent.): Κασταλία Δημητρίου Μιτυληναία, Ἐρμαγόρου Στειριέως γυνή.

IG II² 1011, 121–3 (106/5): τὸν γραμματέα Καλλιιάδην Ἐρμαγόρου Στειριά

Hermagoros of the deme Steiria married Castalia from Mytilene (9968). They had a son, Calliades, who was secretary of ephebes in the late 2nd century (1011).

IG II² 8581 (2nd cent.): Ἀρχιάνασσα Νικάνδρου Ἡρακλεῶτις, Λευκίππου Φρεαρρίου γυνή.

⁹ [Dem.] 59,72,122.

¹⁰ Walters (above n. 7) 320–321. Kapparis (above n. 5) 27–28, 205.

¹¹ M. J. Osborne, *Naturalization in Athens*, Brussel 1981–1983, IV, 152–153.

¹² Ogden (above n. 4) 82.

¹³ C. Vatin, *Recherches sur le mariage et la condition de la femme mariée à l'époque hellénistique*, Paris 1970, 125–6. Ogden (above n. 4) 81–82.

IG II² 7726 (2nd cent.): Νίκανδρος Λευκίππου Φρεάρριος.

IG II² 7721 (1st cent.): Ἀρχιάνασσα Νικάνδρου Φρεαρρίου θυγάτηρ, Ἀντιγόνου Κυδαθηναίως γυνή.

Vatin and Ogden interpreted these incorrectly. In their view Archianassa, daughter of Nicandros of Phrearria (7721), was the daughter of the earlier Archianassa of Heraclea and Leucippos of Phrearria (8581). This cannot be the case, since the latter Archianassa's father is Nicandros, not Leucippos. It seems that Vatin accidentally took Nicandros, the father of the earlier Archianassa, as her husband, and Ogden copied Vatin. In truth, here we seem to have three generations: Nicandros, son of Leucippos, of Phrearria in 7726 would be the offspring of the marriage of 8581, and the latter Archianassa of 7721 the daughter of this Nicandros. Kirchner noted the connection between these persons as well.

We must, of course, be careful not to make too far-reaching conclusions about the connections between the persons in the three cases cited above. However, connected with evidence of changes in naturalization practices, they seem convincing and would thus support Ogden's argument.

IG II² 8581, 9968 and 9975 are also evidence of mixed marriages. In all, there are over 50 Hellenistic grave inscriptions that display such marriages. All are grave *stelai* of foreign women married to Athenian men. The inscriptions are all in the same form as the example of *IG II² 9027*: Συνήθεα Διονυσίου Κ(ι)βυρᾶτις, Αἰσχίνου Φαληρέως γυνή. Occasionally the patronymic is omitted. γυνή has here certainly the meaning 'wife', since it is coupled with the husband's name which is in the genitive. A clear chronological pattern appears: in the 3rd century and at the turn of the 3rd and the 2nd century there are only five cases of mixed marriage, but in the 2nd century there are 20. The trend continues later: over 20 cases at the turn of the 2nd and the 1st century and in the 1st century. We can conclude, on the basis of [Dem.] 59,16–17, that in the Classical period the marriage of a citizen and a foreigner did not constitute a legal Athenian marriage. The significant growth in the cases of mixed marriage in 2nd century and later would indicate that at some point the union of citizens and foreigners gained the status of legal Athenian marriage.

In most cases grave inscriptions can only be dated to century. Thus we cannot pinpoint a specific date for this change. The most obvious connection would be the developments in naturalization and the status of the offspring of naturalized citizens: the main reason for prohibiting mixed

marriage was the status of the children. After 229 naturalization decrees no longer specify that the descendants of naturalized citizens shall also be eligible for citizenship. The specification was thereafter omitted because the children of mixed marriages were now citizens by right. The latter is indicated by the few cases in which we have evidence of both the marriage of an Athenian man and a foreign woman, and their children who appear to be citizens of full right.¹⁴ The specification of the citizen status of the descendants had been necessary to guarantee the citizenship of the children of foreign mothers: the wife remained a foreigner according to the law even after the husband's naturalization, so the children would not have had citizen status without the specification.¹⁵ Some mixed marriages do exist in the late 4th and 3rd centuries,¹⁶ but in these cases the husband would have been naturalized, the wife remaining a foreigner. Generally speaking, the marriage of an Athenian to a foreigner would have been considered concubinage, not a legal Athenian marriage. If mixed marriage became legal and the children were automatically citizens from 229 onwards, the significant increase in the attestations in the 2nd century and later is logical. The change of the children's civic status would have increased the willingness of Athenian men to marry foreign women.

2. οἰκῶν/οἰκοῦσα ἐν, μετοίκοι and μετοίκιον in Hellenistic inscriptions

The metic titles and terms found in epigraphic sources are important evidence of the continuity of μετοικία. The official metic denomination, οἰκῶν/οἰκοῦσα ἐν + deme of residence, is not seen after the 320s: the φιάλαι ἐξελευθερικαί texts.¹⁷

Another metic title was μέτοικος, which simply expressed the fact that the person was a foreign resident. μέτοικος appears in 306/5 or shortly later: *IG II² 554* praises Euxenides of Phaselis among other things for the scrupulous payment of all the εἰσφοράί the assembly had allotted to

¹⁴ See pp. 75–76.

¹⁵ Osborne (above n. 11) IV, 152–153.

¹⁶ *IG II² 8088, 8527, 8768, 8875* (late 4th cent.); 9027 (*SEG III 194*), 9152 (3rd cent.).

¹⁷ *IG II² 1553–1559, 1560–1578*. D. M. Lewis, *Hesperia* 28 (1959) 237. *Id.*, *Hesperia* 37 (1968) 376.

μέτοικοι (ll. 9–12).

The last attestation of the metic tax, μετοίκιον, is *IG II² 545* (privileges to Thessalian exiles). Kirchner dated the decree to the 310s. Later Pečirka connected the decree to the aftermath of the Lamian war (323/2–322/1), placing it ca. 321/0: the Thessalian cavalry played an important role in the battle of Crannon in 322, and after the Greek defeat, Antipater took revenge on his enemies.¹⁸ The reference to the metic tax is typical for inscriptions, found in the privilege granting exemption from the tax, ἀτέλεια τοῦ μετοικίου (sg.)/τῶν μετοικίων (pl.).

The terminology of the metic status indicates that μετοικία survived in the last two decades of the 4th century. Additional examples are ἰσοτέλεια decrees, grants of tax equality which included exemption from the metic tax.¹⁹ The fate of μετοικία after the 4th century is harder to trace. Fortunately, a few ἰσοτέλεια grants from the 3rd century have been preserved. The main question is whether or not ἰσοτέλεια still involved exemption from μετοίκιον.

3. The ἰσοτέλεια privilege, and thus μετοίκιον, survive until the satellite state period

The 3rd century evidence of ἰσοτέλεια decrees consists of three documents. *IG II² 715* (early 3rd cent.) awards one Hermaios the title of ἰσοτελής (ll. 15–16, [εἶναι δ' αὐτὸν ἰσ]οτ[ελῆ]). *IG II² 660*, of 285/4, is a reaffirmation (ll. 25–46) of a grant originally made sometime in the second half of the 4th century (ll. 1–24). Tenian exiles are given privileges that are to be valid only for the duration of their stay. The third decree *IG II² 768 + 802*, which awards ἰσοτέλεια to a citizen of Pergamon. The decree is from the very end of the 250s.²⁰ Here, however, the word ἰσοτέλεια is entirely restored

¹⁸ J. Pečirka, *The Formula for the Grant of Enktesis in Attic Inscriptions*, Prague 1966, 82–83.

¹⁹ *IG II² 505* (302/1), 516 (end of 4th cent.), 551 (before 309/8), 554 (306/5 or shortly after), 583 (end of 4th cent.).

²⁰ Different dates for the decree have been suggested, depending on whether the archon of the decree, Antimachos, is dated to the 250s or 233/2. The earlier dating: W. K. Pritchett, B. D. Meritt, *The Chronology of Hellenistic Athens*, Cambridge 1940, xxi, 99–100. D. Whitehead, *The Ideology of the Athenian Metic*, Cambridge 1977, 30. C. Habicht *Untersuchungen zur politischen Geschichte Athens in hellenistischer Zeit*,

(δεδόσθαι [αὐ]τῶι καὶ ἐγγ[όνοις ἰσοτέλειαν]), so a degree of caution is needed. Additionally there is *SEG* III 122 (262/1–255/4), a decree of ἰσοτελεῖς stationed in Rhamnus for their superiors. The soldiers were in Macedonian service and were granted the title on the exhortation of Antigonus Gonatas. Finally, there are the ἰσοτελεῖς found in lists and private grave *stelai*.²¹

Although *IG* II² 660 is a reaffirmation, it is usable as evidence for ἰσοτέλεια in the 280s. It is unlikely that the privilege would have been included in the reaffirmation, had it not been understood to be valid and to have practical justification in the still-existing μετοίκιον. Thus the metic tax and ἰσοτέλεια survived in Athens' new period of independence, which began in 287 with the successful storming of the Macedonian garrison on the Museum.²²

Athens' independence lasted until the end of the Chremonidean war in 262/1. The lack of ἰσοτέλεια grants, between 285/4 and 262/1, does not, in my view, mean that the privilege was no longer in active use. Changing the traditional practices may not have been the primary concern of the Athenian authorities. In the first few years after 287/6, Athens' resources were taken up by the efforts to secure its grain supply, the restoration of defences and diplomatic contacts.²³ After these immediate concerns, the situation was still

München 1979, 128–133. S.V. Tracy, *Hesperia* 57 (1988) 313, 320–321. M. J. Osborne & S. G. Byrne, *The Foreign Residents of Athens. An Annex to the Lexicon of Greek Personal Names: Attica*, Leuven 1996, 253, no. 5990. Kirchner gave the two parts of the decree the dates 257/6 and after mid-3rd century respectively. The dating 233/2: for instance A. S. Henry, *Honours and privileges in Athenian decrees. The principal formulae of Athenian honorary decrees*, New York 1983, 247. D. Whitehead, *PCPHs* 212 (1986) 153. Habicht came to his conclusion largely on the basis of prosopographical arguments. Tracy reached his dating in his research on the letter-cutters of the Attic inscriptions. The arguments of these two scholars seem the most convincing. Thus *IG* II² 768 + 802 should be dated to the late 250s.

²¹ In a list of donors, 240s: *IG* II² 791, col. II, l. 10. Grave *stelai*, 3rd cent.: *IG* II² 7870, 7871, 7874, *Agora* XVII 384; 3rd to 2nd cent.: *Agora* XVII 385; 2nd century: *IG* II² 7862, 7872, 7876; 2nd to 1st and 1st cent.: 7866, 7867, 7878.

²² The storming of the garrison: Paus. 1,26,1–2. *IG* II² 666, ll. 9–15. T. L. Shear, *Hesperia Supplement* 17 (1978) 2–4, 15. Osborne (above n. 11) II, 164. C. Habicht, *Athen. Die Geschichte der Stadt in hellenistischer Zeit*, München 1995, 102. The peace treaty that confirmed Athens' independence: Plut. *Dem.* 46,1–2; *Pyrr.* 12,4–5. Shear 22–24, 74–76. Habicht 101–103.

²³ References to the need of aid in securing the corn supply in the 280s: Shear (above n.

insecure: Macedonian troops held the fortresses of Attica.²⁴ A great part of the 260s was taken up by the war. The second reason is financial. The expressions of urgent need of aid in decrees shows that Athens' resources were limited. The *polis* had a considerable foreign population, and the tax paid by it was a valuable addition to the state treasury.²⁵ Thirdly, ideological considerations: the new government was firmly democratic, and holding on to the traditions of the *polis*, of the independent times of the Classical period, may have been important for emphasizing self-esteem.

As seen above, we have two references to ἰσοτέλεια in the period 262/1–229/8, when Athens was again controlled by Macedon. The references would seem to confirm the continued existence of the privilege but require detailed examination: *IG* II² 768 + 802 involves uncertainty in restoration and dating, *SEG* III 122 is an exceptional case.

Stephen V. Tracy restored the name of the Pergamenian honoured in *IG* II² 768 + 802 as [Aἰσχ]ίαις and identified him as member of a known Athenian family, suggesting that he, or his father, had received Pergamenian citizenship. Later, his native city honoured him for his contributions to safeguard it.²⁶ The date of the decree is the very end of the 250s.²⁷ The word

22) 2–4, ll. 24–27; *IG* II² 651 + *SEG* XXIV 122; 653 + *Addendum* p. 662; 654 + *Addendum* p. 662; 655; 657 (l. 31, failed attempt to secure aid from Lysimachos); 670 A + *SEG* XXV 91. Plut. *Mor.* 851 D ff. (cf. M. J. Osborne, *ZPE* 35 (1979) 190–191).

²⁴ *IG* II² 657, ll. 35–36. Shear (above n. 22) 79. C. Habicht (above n. 20) 96. Habicht (above n. 22) 101–103. Pausanias relates the achievements of Olympiodoros in 1,26,3, including the return of Piraeus to Athens' control among these. This is most commonly dated to 281/0. However, the question of the recovery of Piraeus and the interpretation of Pausanias' excerpt has been the subject of debate for a long time. On the basis of the available evidence, some scholars have held that Piraeus remained in Macedonian control continuously from 287 to 262/1 (and beyond), doubting the authenticity of the edition or Pausanias' tale, attempting to date the recovery of Piraeus to another time or suggesting alternative interpretations for 1,26,3. Other scholars have accepted Pausanias' story as such and concluded that Athens regained Piraeus in 281. Yet others have suggested that Piraeus changed hands *twice* between 287 and 270. For description of the available evidence and the debate, see Habicht (above n. 20) 96–102.

²⁵ The latest account of the number of metics in Athens is the census of Demetrius in the 310s: 10 000 (Ath. 6,272c). Although the size of the metic population varied, there is no reason to believe that something would have reduced it to insignificance by the 280s. Athens still seems to have attracted people, for instance due to the fame of its numerous philosophical schools.

²⁶ Tracy (above n. 20) 319. Tracy points out numerous relatives: Aischias son of Acrotimos of Icarion, perhaps grandfather, councillor in 304/3 (*Agora* XV, 61, l. 45);

ἰσοτέλεια is entirely restored δεδόσθαι [αὐ]τῶι καὶ ἐγγ[όνοις ἰσοτέλειαν]. Whitehead noted the necessity of caution, but other scholars have not questioned the restoration. The restoration of a word or a line can depend on factors like considerations of space, the number of letters per line in the inscription, the typical forms in this kind of honorary decree, or the typical combinations of honours. The language and phraseology of Athenian honorary decrees are fairly formulaic, and as a rule the lines of a particular decree have the same number of letters, so it is possible to suggest restorations with some likelihood.

Practically the only scholar who has examined the fate of μετοικία after the Classical period to the extent of trying to formulate a theory is Whitehead. He notes that the system survived into the 3rd century and suggests that Antigonos Gonatas might have abolished it in 262/1 specifically to humiliate Athens.²⁸ Whitehead examines *SEG* III 122: following Pouilloux,²⁹ he sees it as a sign of development which seems to have separated ἰσοτέλεια entirely from the sphere of resident foreigners in the earlier, polis-orientated sense. If I understand him correctly, in his view this meant the disappearance of the practical content or at least the diminishing of the importance of ἰσοτέλεια.

Whitehead makes too drastic a conclusion based on one single piece of evidence. The soldiers praise the archon for the fact that he ἐπε]μελήθη δὲ καὶ τῆς δοκιμασίας ὑπὲρ τῆς ἰσοτελείας, ὅπως [ἂν ὡς τάχιστα] ἐπικυρωθε[ῖ] τοῖς ἐγ 'Ραμνοῦντος ἢ δωρεὰ ἀκολούθως τῆι τοῦ [βασιλέως προ]αιρέσει.³⁰ The inscription is from the period 262/1–256/5, when Athens was controlled by royal governors, and the authority of the Athenian government organs was limited to daily routine administration. The Museum

Acrotimos son of Aischias of Icarion, proposer of a decree in 268/7? (*IG* II² 772, l. 8); Acrotimos of Icarion, paymaster and contributor to the Asclepieion ca. 245 (*IG* II² 1534B, ll. 266, 273); Acrotimos son of Aischias the Athenian, πρόξενος of the Aetolians in ca. 238 (*IG* IX² 1, 25, l. 73).

²⁷ See p. 7 and n. 20.

²⁸ Whitehead (above n. 20) 153.

²⁹ J. Pouilloux, *La forteresse de Rhamnonte: Étude de topographie et d'histoire*, Paris 1954, 118–120.

³⁰ Ll. 6–9: "he also saw to the judicial scrutiny of the ἰσοτέλεια, so that the award would be as speedily as possible received by those [*stationed*] in Rhamnous, following the king's request."

hill was again garrisoned and the Athenian troops submitted to the king.³¹ Obliging the Athenians to grant an important privilege to his soldiers was another tool Antigonos used to make clear Athens' suppressed position. Whitehead is partially correct in a way: in the case of our ἰσοτελεῖς soldiers, the privilege granted had no practical value at all, because they were in the service of the Macedonian king and would not have paid taxes to the Athenian state in any case. His conclusion of the significance of the document is, however, erroneous: it is not a sign of consistent development in the regulations and content of the privilege, but an exceptional case originating from exceptional circumstances.

An examination of the formulae of ἰσοτέλεια, grant clauses seems to support my argument. There are two variations. Either the privilege ἰσοτέλεια is granted (for instance *IG II² 505*, 51–52 (302/1): εἶναι δὲ αὐτοῖς κα[ὶ ἰ]σ[οτέλειαν]) or the title ἰσοτελής (for instance *IG II² 554*, 27–28 (306/5): εἶναι [αὐτὸ]ν ἰσοτελεῖν). It is likely that if the privilege had lost its practical importance, or this importance had diminished, the title form would have replaced the privilege form entirely, emphasizing the primarily honorary value. This did not happen. Both forms appear in Classical and Hellenistic period, and indeed our latest decree awarding ἰσοτέλεια – provided the restoration is correct – has the privilege form of the formula. If ἰσοτέλεια is restored here, it could only be in the privilege form: the preceding grant verb, δεδόσθαι, has survived intact. The word ἰσοτελής is an attribute of a person, literally 'paying equal tax'. It never appears as an object to be given. The choice between the title and privilege forms of the formula seems to have depended on whether there were one or more recipients. In the former case the title form was selected, in the latter the privilege form.

It is very unlikely that the king would have abolished μετοικία in order to humiliate Athens. However, the foreign residents could not participate in political decision making. They would not have become citizens and gained political rights even if μετοικία had been abolished. The system was not connected to how freely or restrictedly the citizens could exert their political influence. The taking away of freedom of participation

³¹ Apollodoros, *FGrHist* 244 F 44. Paus. 3,6,6. C. Habicht, *Studien zur Geschichte Athens in hellenistischer Zeit*, Göttingen 1982, 13. Habicht (above n. 22) 154–156, 161, 164.

in the care of public affairs, the practical definition of a citizen,³² was humiliating enough. The abolition of μετοικία would not have served Antigonus' purpose.

I would suggest the following: ἰσοτέλεια was still awarded in the satellite state period, at least in the 250s. Even if we do not accept the restoration in *IG II*² 768 + 802, *SEG III* 122 confirms this: its circumstances were exceptional, but this does not mean that ἰσοτέλεια had lost its original meaning. If we *do* accept the restoration in *IG II*² 768 + 802, it is evidence of ἰσοτέλεια in the 250s. After 229/8 ἰσοτέλεια grants were no longer made, because the foreigners who lived in Athens did not pay the metic tax anymore. The abolition of the tax was part of the development that changed the official status of the foreign residents, and the entire concept of status differentiation, in a significant way. After 229/8 the specific status of μέτοικος had, in practice, ceased to exist. The changes were caused by the realities of the circumstance. Foreign control in the satellite state period made it impossible for the Athenians to fully control matters that were connected to citizen status in the way they had been able to do when Athens was independent. This state of affairs lasted for such a long time that after the liberation of 229/8 the old practices were not restored. There were other, more pressing, matters to be resolved, so the state of status differentiation was left as it was.

At this point, one might ask: do not the ἰσοτελεῖς in the 2nd century and later grave inscriptions³³ make invalid the argument that ἰσοτέλεια grants were no longer made after 229/8? I do not think so. Although it is extremely unlikely that the families of all the ἰσοτελεῖς in Athenian grave inscriptions would have had a history of generations in Athens, there are only three ἰσοτελεῖς inscriptions from 2nd–1st century.³⁴ It is quite possible that these were exceptions where the family of the deceased had an unusually long history in Athens and the ἰσοτέλεια privilege, originally awarded before 229/8, had been in the family for generations. This could have been a matter of great pride and thus inscribed in the stele by the descendants of the deceased, even if the title did not have practical significance in 2nd century and later.

³² Arist. *Pol.* 1275a22–24.

³³ See p. 79, n. 21.

³⁴ *IG II*² 7866, 7867, 7878.

4. Differentiated εἰσφορά payment and military service disappear by 229/8

In the Classical period the εἰσφορά payment and military service obligations of citizens and metics were arranged differently. For εἰσφοράί, originally used for exceptional military expenses and eventually also for defence works and grain supply, the assembly decided the size of the tax on each occasion and payment took place in groups called συμμορίαί. Soon the προεισφορά practice was introduced: the 300 richest citizens paid the entire sum required and then collected the money from others.³⁵ This system was still in existence in the 320s.³⁶ Metics paid a sixth of the tax in each case in their own συμμορίαί.³⁷ Obligatory military service could be performed either in the navy or in the infantry. Citizens and metics served in different units: the latter were not taken on campaigns, but rather were used for defense at home.³⁸

In state honorary decrees the different εἰσφορά and military service obligations are manifested in the grants of the privilege of equal εἰσφορά and military service obligations.³⁹ This meant access to citizen συμμορίαί and military units. The basic formulation is τὰς στρατείας στρατεύεσθαι καὶ τὰς εἰσφορὰς εἰσφέρειν μετὰ Ἀθηναίων.⁴⁰ Survival of the privilege

³⁵ R. Thomsen, *Eisphora: a study of direct taxation in ancient Athens*, Copenhagen 1964, 205–206. M. Hakkarainen, in J. Frösén (ed.), *Early Hellenistic Athens. Symptoms of a Change* (Papers and Monographs of the Finnish Institute at Athens, vol. VI), Helsinki 1997, 11. Although there were rich metics in Athens, they could not be προεισφέροντες: wealth in this context was defined as the amount of land property, which metics could not own without special privilege. Land was the most important source of income in the antiquity. Thereby it was considered the ideal form of wealth, and 'property' was understood to mean land property. G.M.E. de Ste. Croix, *The Class Struggle in the Ancient Greek World*, London 1983, 78, 120–123.

³⁶ Thomsen (above n. 36) 212.

³⁷ Thomsen (above n. 36) 100, 225. Whitehead (above n. 20) 79.

³⁸ Whitehead (above n. 20) 82–85.

³⁹ Classical period (4th century) *IG II²* 218 (346/5), 237 (338/7), 287 (before 336/5), 351 + 624 (330/29), 360 (325/4). Hellenistic period: *IG II²* 505 (302/1), 516 (end of 4th cent.), *SEG XXIV* 117 (end of 4th cent.).

⁴⁰ There is some formulaic variation, such as that seen in *IG II²* 287, 4–7: τ[ὰς] εἰσφορὰς εἰσφέρειν καὶ τὰ τέλη τελεῖν καθάπερ Ἀθηναῖοι, καὶ τὰς στρατείας στρατ[εύ]εσθαι μετὰ Ἀθηναίων. The phrase τὰ τέλη τελεῖν καθάπερ Ἀθηναῖοι does not indicate difference in the content of the privilege but most likely simply emphasizes its

indicates survival of the traditional organization in the two obligations.

The epigraphic evidence of this privilege is scarce (see n. 41). The three Hellenistic decrees are from the end of the 4th century. The lack of grants later does not necessarily mean that the differentiated εἰσφορά and military service obligations disappeared. *IG II² 660* (285/4) awards privileges to Tenians who live in Athens and have already received the εἰσφορά and military service privilege earlier (ll. 7–9, 39). It is a reaffirmation (ll. 25–46) of an award from the second half of the 4th century (ll. 1–24). Although the requirements for an earlier grant of the privilege are featured in the original decree, I do not believe it would have been included in the reaffirmation had the obligations of citizens and foreign residents become identical and the privilege been rendered obsolete. Thus, I would accept the decree as indirect evidence of the survival of different εἰσφορά and military service obligations. Kirchner restored l. 39 στρατευόμενοις καὶ τε[λοῦσι τὰς εἰσφορὰς μετ' Ἀθηναίων]. Henry rejected Kirchner's [τελοῦσιν τὰς εἰσφορὰς] in ll. 8–9 and tentatively suggested Ἀθήνησ[ι, καὶ στρατεύεσθαι τὰς στρ]ατε[ίας]. For l. 39 he proposed καὶ τε[λοῦσιν τὰ τέλη καθάπερ Ἀθηναῖοι].⁴¹ Neither restoration seems to deny that l. 39 involved the εἰσφορά and military service privilege.

Did the different εἰσφορά and military service obligations survive beyond the 280s? When were these obligations of citizens and foreign residents standardized?

There are no references to the privilege or the payment of εἰσφορά in 285/4–229/8.⁴² A large number of the Hellenistic decrees have survived only in small fragments, so it is possible that some of these would have mentioned εἰσφορά. This possibility does not help us, however. The next time we encounter εἰσφορά is shortly after 229/8, when large sums were needed to pay off the soldiers of the Macedonian garrisons and to repair the

significance in εἰσφορά payment: it gave the recipient access to citizen συμμορίαὶ τὰ τέλη τελεῖν simply means 'to pay taxes, tolls, duties'. If the phrase had referred to some other tax privilege, it would most likely have been added after the εἰσφορά and military service formula rather than in the middle of it.

⁴¹ Henry (above n. 20) 259–260.

⁴² The references of the latter type from the third century *before* 285/4 are difficult to interpret: *IG II² 715*, 6–7 (beginning of 3rd cent.) refers to an earlier time and is partially restored. Little beyond the word itself survives of *IG II² 748* (beginning of 3rd cent.), so the context is difficult to decipher.

defences of the city and the ports:⁴³ *IG II² 834*, ll. 21–22 (for Eurycleides of Cephisia); 835, l. 7 (for foreigner Apollas).

A point to note is that in *IG II² 835* (l. 7) Apollas, established in Athens, pays *προεισφοραί*,⁴⁴ not *εἰσφοραί*. *προεισφοραί* were originally paid by 300 wealthiest citizens. Foreigners were excluded, not because there were no foreign residents wealthy enough, but because here wealth was measured as wealth in land.⁴⁵ The fact that Apollas pays *προεισφοραί* would imply that the *εἰσφορά* obligation of citizens and foreigners became identical at some point between 285/4 and 229/8. There is no similar evidence for military service. But since the two obligations were tied together in the same privilege and both had a connection to the military sphere, logically it could be assumed that one would not have been standardized without the other.

I think it unlikely that the standardization would have taken place in 287/6–262/1, partially for the same reasons that I argued for in the case of *ἰσοτέλεια* and the metic tax (p. 8). Altering the system of taxation may not have been the primary concern because of other, more pressing matters: in the first years after 287/6 there was the restoration of defences, grain supply and diplomatic contacts. Later, the continued presence of Macedonian troops in Attica remained a concern. The Chremonidean war in the 260s further complicated the situation.

Since *εἰσφοραί* were not regular taxes but were decreed by the assembly when the need arose,⁴⁶ the different arrangements in the payment according to civic status had practical significance only when a tax was actual. In these decades there certainly would have been occasions where *εἰσφοραί* could be used: defence works, preparation for war etc. However, judging by our evidence, alternative methods of financing seem to have been preferred: after 287/6 Athens sought and succeeded in gaining considerable aid on several occasions to secure the corn supply.⁴⁷ There is also some

⁴³ See Habicht (above n. 31) 79 ff.

⁴⁴ Also *IG II² 834*, of the same date and context, talks of *προεισφοραί* (l. 21).

⁴⁵ See n. 35.

⁴⁶ Occasionally, however, the need for *εἰσφοραί* was continuous, and they began to resemble a regular tax: the two metics honorands in *IG II² 505* are praised among other things for having paid *annual εἰσφοραί* during the years 347/6–323/2 (ll. 14–17).

⁴⁷ See n. 23.

evidence of ἐπιδόσεις,⁴⁸ (in theory) voluntary donations used for exceptional military expenses and, later, also for civil purposes such as building projects.⁴⁹ The significance of differently organized military service would have depended on circumstance too. The military units of foreign residents were not taken on campaigns abroad. However, after 287/6 the opportunity for military campaigning was limited. Athens' insecure position made defence the first priority, therefore the division of military units according to civic status was less important.

The importance of the traditional division of military units must have been dramatically reduced in 262/1–229/8 because of foreign control. Until the mid 250s Athens was not only in political but also strict military control: the garrison returned to the Museum, and while Athens' armed forces were not disbanded, the king reserved them for his own use and obliged the Athenians to follow him on campaigns.⁵⁰ The king seems also to have influenced the election of generals during these years.⁵¹ In mid 250s the garrison was drawn from the Museum, and Athens became juridically autonomous. However, Macedonian troops remained in the countryside fortresses.⁵² It is clear that the Athenians were not free to decide about the function of their armed forces or about military and defence issues in general. Undertaking an independent military campaign outside Attica was impossible. The division of military units according to civic status would have been purposeless if not completely impossible. There is no evidence of εἰσφοράι in 262/1–229/8, but some evidence of ἐπιδόσεις exists.⁵³ It is

⁴⁸ *IG II²* 682, 62–63 (referring to the 270s). A possible case is *IG II²* 744. It is very fragmentary. The honorand, Phaullos, in any case seems to have donated money for defence expenses: ... τῆ]ς [π]όλεως σω[τηρία ... Φάϋλλος μυρία[ς ... δραχμάς]... (l. 3–4). This cannot be the question of εἰσφορά, because the purpose the εἰσφορά is going to be used for is generally not explained. With the ἐπιδόσεις on the contrary, the purpose is usually expressed, and 'to safeguard the polis' appears often. What we have here must be either ἐπίδοσις or some other type of donation. Caution is needed, particularly because the section in question is for the most part restoration of the editor.

⁴⁹ Hakkarainen (above n. 35) 12–13.

⁵⁰ See p. 82 and n. 31.

⁵¹ *SEG III* 122, 2–3. Habicht (above n. 31) 52, 56–57. Habicht (above n. 22) 156.

⁵² Mercenaries in Macedonian service: *IG II²* 1286 (240s; foreign στρατιῶται and citizens), *SEG XLI* 87 (230s; Athenian and foreign κρυπτοί), *IG II²* 1299 (235/4, Athenian soldiers and ξένοι).

⁵³ *IG II²* 768 (l. 12, fragmented) praises [Aisch]ias for participation in ἐπίδοσις "for the

likely that εἰσφοραὶ were not used during this time simply because there were no opportunities for undertakings that might have required them. ἐπιδόσεις, on the other hand, had a wider range of usages, and thus occasions could arise where they were needed even in the circumstances of these decades.

The circumstances where Athens' freedom in military issues was limited, especially concerning expeditions, and where there were no occasions for εἰσφοραὶ, lasted for three decades. The traditional arrangements of εἰσφορὰ and military service obligations of citizens and foreigners fell out of practice, and *IG II² 835* indicates that when Athens became independent in 229/8 the arrangements were not restored.

5. The foreign residents of Athens after 229/8: foreigners but no longer μέτοικοι

After 229/8 the situation was as follows: The children of naturalized citizens were automatically citizens of full right, and the marriages of citizens and foreigners were legal Athenian marriages. It seems very likely that the foreigners who lived in Athens no longer paid μετοίκιον. The old system of different εἰσφοραὶ and military service obligations was no longer adhered to. The changes were the result of conditions in the πόλις. The years 262/1–229/8 were the decisive "final straw" because they were the longest time of continuous Macedonian control Athens had experienced so far. Direct, strict political control lasted for only the first 5–6 years, but Macedonian military control remained until 229/8. Athens, though juridically free, could not act against the king's wishes. The circumstance affected both the military sphere and taxation (εἰσφοραὶ). Since military service and the payment of taxes were the primary obligations of foreign residents to the state, the conditions must have greatly affected their official status as well. The changes were so extensive that after 229/8 the foreigners of Athens can no longer be said to have been μέτοικοι. They remained foreigners,⁵⁴ but the specific metic status had ceased to exist.

security of the *polis*" (late 250s). *IG II² 791*, an ἐπίδοσις decree with a list of participants, from the 240s. The list includes five foreigners, among them an ἰστοτελής (col. II, l. 10). (col. II, l. 10).

⁵⁴ Names with foreign ethnics survive in private grave inscriptions and other epigraphic

With the liberation of 229/8 the restrictions of freedom manifested by Macedonian control disappeared. In that sense, the Athenians could have restored μετοικία. Sources, primarily epigraphic, imply that they did not do this. This was, again, due to prevailing conditions.

εἰσφοραὶ disappear from the sources after the 220s, which implies that they permanently fell out of use. I believe this is connected to ἐπιδόσεις. These were originally used for similar purposes as the εἰσφοραὶ, to cover military expenses the πόλις was not prepared for, as well as for grain supply. The usage of ἐπιδόσεις expanded to civil purposes in the 3rd and 2nd centuries,⁵⁵ but that of εἰσφοραὶ remained the same. ἐπιδόσεις were used along with εἰσφοραὶ immediately after 229/8 when there was a great need for resources. Despite independence, Athens' position was far from secure. Liberty was achieved because Macedon was experiencing turbulence due to problems of inheritance. Athens' leaders chose a policy of neutrality and avoidance of anything that might anger Macedon,⁵⁶ but the defence of the πόλις needed to be as strong as was possible given the circumstances.⁵⁷ Athens' state resources were limited, as is noticed from the fact that the Long Walls were left unrepaired. While εἰσφοραὶ disappear from record, we have some evidence of ἐπιδόσεις from the first half of the 2nd century: two ἐπίδοσις decrees for construction projects.⁵⁸ It appears that in the 2nd century Athens had neither the resources nor opportunities for military undertakings of significant scale.⁵⁹ On the other hand, there was no need to take extensive measures to secure the grain supply and strengthen defence: in the wars waged in Greece (First and Second Macedonian War) Attica

sources for centuries after this date.

⁵⁵ Hakkarainen (above n. 35) 12–13.

⁵⁶ Habicht (above n. 22) 177–8. Polybios scolded this policy as quietist, opportunist and worthless: 5,106,6–8.

⁵⁷ The situation is reflected in numerous military inscriptions, which show strong activity especially in Rhamnous, a deme and fortress in north-east Attica facing the island of Euboeia, one of Antigonid strongpoints. The inscriptions from Rhamnous have been published by V. Petrakos: V. Petrakos, *Ὁ δῆμος τοῦ ῥαμνοῦντος. Σύνοψη τῶν ἀνασκαφῶν καὶ τῶν ἐρευνῶν (1813–1998)*. II: *Οἱ ἐπιγραφές*, Ἀθήναι 1999.

⁵⁸ *IG* II² 2332 (183/2), 2334 (ca. 150). The list of the former contains some 20 foreign names.

⁵⁹ For instance, in 200 Athens allied with Rome against Macedon, but the Athenians could not in practice wage war or even properly defend their own hinterland. Habicht (above n. 22) 201.

was, generally speaking, not threatened in a way that endangered the crops. Also, Athens was now also allied with Rome, which could provide defensive aid in a threatening situation.⁶⁰ Thus, if resources were primarily needed for civil purposes, like construction projects, then the disappearance of εἰσφοράι was natural. It would not have made sense to alter the εἰσφορό system by making the payment of these taxes voluntary, because of the ἐπιδόσεις.

The necessity of dividing citizens and foreigners in different military units was eliminated after 229/8 because of the small scale of Athens' military activity, the armed forces being mainly limited to guarding the city, the ports and the countryside. However, military service seems to have remained obligatory. There are several military inscriptions featuring Athenian⁶¹ and foreign soldiers.⁶² The Athenians are specifically termed citizen soldiers (στρατευόμενοι τῶν πολιτῶν). They are unlikely to be hired soldiers: state resources being limited, it would have been pointless to hire citizens if they could be obliged to military service. The same of course applies to foreigners who lived in Athens. However, it is likely that the foreign soldiers appearing in inscriptions in the last decades of the 3rd century were both foreigners who resided in Athens and mercenary soldiers recruited more recently. In fact, some decrees which honour a ξεναγός (mercenary commander) prove that Athens indeed had mercenary soldiers in its service during these times.⁶³ Even though there were probably enough citizens and resident foreigners who were fit to carry arms and could be obliged to military service, and even though Athens' resources were scarce, recruiting mercenary soldiers was necessary. By 229/8, the ἐφηβεία system

⁶⁰ To Roman side; declaration of war on Philip V and the reasons for it: Polyb. 26,16,9; Liv. 31,14,6 (citing Polybios); Liv. 31,15,5; 31,44,29; 41,23,1. Romans aiding the Athenians against Macedonian forces invading Athens: Polyb. 16,27,1–3; Liv. 31,16,2; 31,24,1–25,2. See also Habicht (above n. 22) 199 ff.

⁶¹ Sunium: *IG II²* 1302 (222/1), 1308 (end of 3rd cent.). Eleusis, Panacton, Phyle: 1303 (after 220/19), 1304 (shortly after 211/0), 1305 (end of 3rd cent.?), 1306–7 (ca. end of 3rd cent.). In Rhamnus: *IG II²* 1311 (ca. end of 3rd cent.); Petrakos (above n. 57) nos. 22 (229), 35 (222/1), 44 (after 216/5), 45 (after 229), 46 (214/13), 48 (210/9), 49 (207/6), 55 (2nd half of 3rd cent.).

⁶² Eleusis: *IG II²* 1958 (ca. 210). Rhamnus: *IG II²* 1304 (shortly after 211/0); Petrakos (above n. 56) no. 49. πάροικοι in Rhamnus: Petrakos (above n. 56) nos. 23, 27, 30, 38, 40–42, 43, 47, 50, 51.

⁶³ *IG II²* 1313; Petrakos (above n. 56) no. 57 (both end of 3rd cent.).

was no longer the two year training of the 4th century, obligatory to all Athenian youths and including extensive instruction in military skills, but simply a training club for the sons of wealthy families.⁶⁴ Only a minority of those fit to carry arms would have had real competence in military skills. Even fewer would have had experience in fighting. Professional soldiers, on the other hand, were likely to have this kind of experience and were therefore especially valuable at this time. The πάροικοι seen in Rhamnus in the last three decades of the century (n. 63) are most likely experienced mercenary soldiers. The fortress of Rhamnus was a focal point in the defence of Attica, because it faced Euboea, which was firmly in Antigonid control after 229. The most important city, Chalkis, on Euripus, was a strongly armed base of the Macedonian fleet. During the reign of Philip V, it formed one of the "bounds of Greece" along with the Acrocorinth (in Corinth) and Demetrias (in Magnesia).⁶⁵ The threat of the return of Macedonian control remained throughout these decades. This, it was essential to place the most experienced soldiers in Rhamnus, a critical defence point.

After 229/8 the foreigners established in Athens no longer had the limitations of metic status. They were free to marry Athenian citizens, and the children born of this marriage had full citizen rights. Some traditional obligations, most likely military service, survived, but the foreigners were no longer differentiated from Athenians on the basis of their non-citizen status in the sphere of these obligations. Two major limitations remained: foreigners still did not have political rights, and were not allowed to own land without a special privilege.⁶⁶

University of Oulu

⁶⁴ Habicht (above n. 22) 235–238.

⁶⁵ *Der Neue Pauly* 2 (1997) 1090–1091; 4 (1998) 207–210, 289; 6 (1999) 312.

⁶⁶ The right to own land, ἔγκτησις, is fairly common in προξενία decrees in the late 3rd and 2nd centuries.