

Patterns and Scope of the Integration of Non-Citizens into the Athenian Civic Community

Cristina Carusi

Università di Parma

ORCID: 0000-0002-8694-3469

DOI: 10.54103/milanoup.292.c750

ABSTRACT:

This chapter provides an overview of the various ways in which non-citizens were integrated into the Athenian civic community, ranging from the economic domain to the military, fiscal, judicial and religious spheres. Based on this overview, the chapter reflects on the dynamics that prompted these forms of integration and assesses their social and political scope. Finally, it concludes by briefly considering some of the short- and long-term impact that the close interaction of citizens and non-citizens in various non-institutional centers of *polis* life may have had on the Athenian civic community.

KEYWORDS: free spaces; metics; foreigners; *timai*; *diapsephisis*.

1. Introduction

The impulse for this study comes from a well-known article by Kostas Vlassopoulos entitled “Free Spaces: Identity, Experience and Democracy in Classical Athens”.¹ In this article, the author points out how difficult it was to establish a distinction between citizens, metics, and slaves in Classical Athens, as many of our sources suggest that defining people’s identity and civic status was often problematic² and that questions of identity were a source of debate,

1 Vlassopoulos 2007. All dates in this chapter are BCE.

2 Vlassopoulos (2007, 34-35) cites the following examples: Pankleon, who posed as a Plataean enfranchised as an Athenian citizen, despite most likely being a metic or even a slave (Lys. 23); two episodes in which bystanders could not tell the difference between a slave boy and the son of an Athenian citizen (Demosth. 47.61; 53.16); Pittalakos, whose status as a slave or a freedman is unclear (Aeschin. 1.54-64); the infamous Neaira (Demosth. 59); and Euxitheos’ difficulties in proving his Athenian and free status (Demosth. 57). However, on the role of written records in the identification of individuals in Classical Greece, see Faraguna 2014b, who notes that states were more interested in defining who was entitled to citizenship than in keeping complete records of all inhabitants. When written records came under scrutiny, as in the case of Euxitheos, proving one’s descent became crucial (on the importance of witnesses

anxiety, and disagreement. Space played an important role in this phenomenon: because of the size of the city and its territory, with residential centers scattered across a vast region, most people did not know one another; changes of residence and internal migration to Athens and Piraeus meant that belonging to a deme did not necessarily coincide with one's social life. In addition to citizens, there was a large non-citizen population: metics were registered in their deme of residence, but slaves could work in a different deme than their masters; furthermore, Athens was a cosmopolitan center, frequented by many foreigners for various reasons.³ In this context, to ensure order, social peace, and the continued exchange of goods and people, a certain degree of tolerance was necessary. The Old Oligarch is a vocal critic of this tolerance, claiming that in Athens it is not possible to immediately identify a citizen as opposed to a non-citizen, whether a metic or a slave, to the extent that the law prohibits beating slaves and metics precisely in order to prevent an Athenian citizen from being beaten by mistake ([Xen.] *Ath. Pol.* 1.10).⁴

In terms of space, however, Vlassopoulos calls attention to what he terms, drawing from the sociological tradition, “free spaces”,⁵ *i.e.* spaces (such as the *agora*, the workplace, the tavern, the house, the trireme, and the cemetery) that brought together citizens, metics, slaves, and women, creating shared experiences and interactions and giving rise to new forms of identity. For the author, the spaces of the Athenian democracy were not limited to the assembly and the courts, *i.e.* the institutional spaces. Political life and discussion took place in a wide variety of contexts, such as the *agora*, where debate occurred outside of institutional frameworks. However, non-citizens were also present in these

in this respect, see Scafuro 1994). Thomsen 2023 addresses the issue of how foreign citizenship could be verified by hosting communities.

3 For Athens not being a face-to-face society, where individuals would have been unable to determine the civic status of others with whom they interacted in daily life, see Cohen 2000, 104-29.

4 [Xen.] *Ath. Pol.* 1.10: τῶν δούλων δ' αὖ καὶ τῶν μετοίκων πλείστη ἐστὶν Ἀθήνησιν ἀκολασία, καὶ οὔτε πατάξαι ἔξεστιν αὐτόθι οὔτε ὑπεκστήσεται σοι ὁ δοῦλος. οὐ δ' ἔνεκέν ἐστι τοῦτο ἐπιχώριον, ἐγὼ φράσω· εἰ νόμος ἦν τὸν δοῦλον ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐλευθέρου τύπεσθαι ἢ τὸν μέτοικον ἢ τὸν ἀπελευθέρων, πολλὰκις ἂν οἰθεῖς εἶναι τὸν Ἀθηναῖον δοῦλον ἐπάταξεν ἄν· ἐσθῆτά τε γὰρ οὐδὲν βελτίων ὁ δῆμος αὐτόθι ἢ οἱ δοῦλοι καὶ οἱ μέτοικοι, καὶ τὰ εἶδη οὐδὲν βελτίους εἰσὶν, “And again the slaves and the metics at Athens enjoy extreme license, and it is not possible to beat them there, nor will a slave step aside for you. Well, I shall tell you the reason why this is their local practice. If it were legal for the slave or the metic or the freedman to be beaten by a freeborn citizen, he would often beat an Athenian by mistake, thinking that he was a slave. For the *dēmos* there are no better dressed than the slaves and the metics, nor are they any better in their appearance”. On clothing as one of the symbolic elements that characterized the self-representation of the Athenian citizen, see Falco in this volume.

5 See Evans and Boyte 1986, where free spaces are characterized as voluntary associations occupying the intermediate level between the private sphere and formal political institutions; examples include 19th-century United States black churches, women's unions, and labor organizations, which the authors identify as the primary source of democratic change.

free spaces and would have participated in discussions. This means that politics extended also to non-citizens, although it remains unclear to what extent, if any, they were able to take advantage of the blurring of identities to participate directly in Athenian institutional life.⁶

According to Vlassopoulos, the confusion of identities in Athens stemmed from the peculiar nature of Athenian democracy, which permitted political participation not only by landowners but also by the significant proportion of citizens working as craftsmen and traders, *i.e.* the same sectors in which most metics and a large number of slaves were employed. In Athens, it was not possible to immediately determine whether a craftsman or trader was a citizen, a metic, or a slave. As craftsmen and traders could not be discriminated against, since many of them were citizens, a certain level of protection and freedom was also extended to non-citizens practicing the same trades. Thus, the inclusion of these groups in Athenian democracy had the unintended effect of “liberating” other categories, an effect that was most evident in free spaces such as the *agora*.⁷

Following this reading, which emphasizes the importance of the workplace, I decided to investigate the interactions between citizens and non-citizens in the economic sphere, with particular attention to the possible role of business partnerships (*koinōniai*) in blurring or minimizing the legal barriers between citizens and non-citizens.⁸ However, as economic integration is only one facet of non-citizens’ inclusion in the Athenian civic community, the first part of this chapter (§ 2) surveys the various areas in which this inclusion took place. In the second part (§ 3), I discuss the dynamics that, in my opinion, prompted these forms of integration and assess their social and political scope. Finally (§ 4), I conclude by briefly considering some of the short- and long-term impact that the close interaction of citizens and non-citizens in various non-institutional centers, or free spaces, of *polis* life may have had on the Athenian civic community.⁹

6 I will return to this topic later (§ 3).

7 See also Ober 2000, esp. 37–41, for the idea that, once Athenian democracy had allowed political participation beyond the circle of the wealthy and well-born, there was in that context a strong tendency for rights to be extended beyond the citizen body itself.

8 See Carusi 2025, to which I refer for a detailed discussion of *koinōniai* in Classical Athens, the main points of which I outline in the following pages.

9 This chapter provides an overview of the research carried out by the Parma unit as part of the PRIN 2020 project *Sharing in the community: citizenship and society in the Greek world (VII-II century BC)*. The research conducted by Ilaria Bultrighini and me aimed to investigate the permeability of the barriers between citizens and non-citizens in Classical Athens, as well as the ways in which non-citizens could overcome these barriers, whether legally or illegally. For the purposes of this study, “non-citizens” refers to foreigners in the broadest sense: temporary visitors, resident aliens (metics), and slaves (although their status had various nuances, freedmen still fell within the more general category of metics); nevertheless, many of the forms of integration discussed here primarily concerned metics (on this, see also Bultrighini 2025, 276–77).

2. Patterns of non-citizens' integration

In mapping the integration of non-citizens into the Athenian civic communities, I would like to begin with economic activity. My study of business partnerships in Classical Athens has clarified how certain mechanisms made it possible, or easier, for groups of *koinōnoi* to conduct transactions with individuals, other groups of *koinōnoi*, or public authorities, such as joint liability clauses and the prior determination of the quotas or portions for which each group member would be responsible in the case of public contracts. What is more relevant here, however, is that an examination of the literary and epigraphic evidence has allowed me to assess the presence of *koinōniai* in different sectors of the Athenian economy and the degree to which they involved interaction between citizens and non-citizens.

In the sphere of economic relations between private individuals, cases of *koinōniai* are numerous in the domain of the *emporía*, a context characterized by extensive interaction between citizens and non-citizens. After all, in a sector in which investments promised substantial gains but also entailed very high risks, it is not surprising that creditors and borrowers joined forces in order to minimize potential losses. The significant presence of non-citizens in maritime trade was also encouraged by the so-called “mercantile lawsuits” (*dikai emporikai*), a legal procedure concerning all disputes relating to sea voyages to and from Athens for trade purposes. This procedure could be initiated by, and involve, *emporoi* and *nauklēroi* regardless of whether they were citizens, metics or foreigners, as they were all treated equally under the law. In fact, it can be argued that several aspects of the *dikai emporikai*, including their expedited resolution, were designed with the awareness that most long-distance traders and shipowners were metics and foreigners. However, the swift and efficient settlement of trade disputes was intended to stimulate commercial exchange for the benefit of *emporoi* and *nauklēroi* as well as the *polis* itself, particularly with regard to the grain supply.¹⁰

For other types of loans not related to maritime trade, examples of *koinōniai* are attested, but the role of non-citizens appears to be more limited. Unlike commercial loans, in which the security usually consisted of movable property, in this sector securities, as attested by mortgage *boroi*, were often constituted by real estate. However, since the security had collateral value, *koinōniai* of creditors

10 Since the socio-economic profile of *emporoi* and *nauklēroi* in Athens and in the Greek world in general has been the subject of intense scholarly debate, the bibliography is extensive; see, among others, Millett 1983; Hansen 1984; Bresson 2003; Reed 2003. It suffices to note here that emphasizing the often downplayed role of citizens in maritime trade does not amount to denying the predominant presence of foreigners and metics. The bibliography on *dikai emporikai* is equally extensive: see, among others, Gernet 1955; Cohen 1973; Harris 2015; Maffi 2016. While there is no scholarly consensus on certain aspects of how the mercantile lawsuits functioned, it is broadly accepted that they were established to accommodate the primary actors of long-distance trade and thus promote trade itself.

could in principle have facilitated the participation of non-citizens in this form of investment. In the event of non-repayment of the loan, the property would have been sold and the creditors would have been paid the amount owed, thus circumventing the obstacle posed by the fact that non-citizens could not own real estate in Attica.¹¹ It is generally believed that this was the case with the *eranos* loan, a form of associative credit that, although it did not bear interest, could nevertheless be extended for productive purposes, and in which non-citizens could also be involved, probably both as borrowers and lenders.¹² Finally, in the banking sector, where non-citizens played a prominent role, joint ownership arrangements and leases could allow them to rely on the mediation of citizens—as co-owners or lessors—in order to circumvent the obstacles posed by their legal status.¹³

In the public sphere, non-citizens' participation in the leasing of real estate appears to have been quite limited, a fact that can partly be explained by their relatively low involvement in agriculture. However, since tenants were often required to provide personal security rather than real security, it remains unclear why metics so rarely appears as tenants of houses, given that *oikiai* were needed not only for living purposes but also for housing *ergastēria* and productive activities. Perhaps public leases were simply less flexible and less well suited to their needs than private ones.¹⁴ In the mining sector, by contrast, the establishment of *koinōniai* is quite common, even though formally the holder of each concession was usually a single individual.¹⁵ It is unclear whether, and to what extent, some non-citizens assumed this role, despite Xenophon's assertion that, at least from the mid-fourth century onward, the city allowed foreigners to exploit mines on the same terms as citizens (*Vect.* 4.12).¹⁶ It is possible that such participation took place precisely through the instrument of the *koinōniai*, which, according again to Xenophon (*Vect.* 4.32), may have spread in this sector no earlier than the

11 For the collateral value of security, see Harris 2013a, 107-42; for possible business partnerships in mortgage *boroi*, see Shipton 2000, 55-62.

12 For *eranos* loans, see Faraguna 2012; Thomsen 2015.

13 For the prominent role of non-citizens in the banking sector, see, among others, Cohen 1992; Shipton 2008; Deene 2014; De Martinis 2019.

14 For a catalogue of lessees of *polis*-controlled real estate, see Papazarkadas 2011, 299-325. In the author's opinion, since most of our evidence concerns sacred property, which would not have been available to foreigners for rental until the second half of the fourth century, ideological and traditional barriers may explain why metics are underrepresented even after that time. For more on the dynamics of private and public lease markets, see Osborne 1988, 289-90, 304-19.

15 On mine concessions, see Faraguna 2006. On the socio-economic profile of investors in the mining sector, see Shipton 2000; Bissa 2008.

16 *Vect.* 4.12: παρέχει γοῦν ἐπὶ ἰσοτελείᾳ καὶ τῶν ζένων τῷ βουλομένῳ ἐργάζεσθαι ἐν τοῖς μετάλλοις. Following Gauthier 1976, 134-36, I interpret ἐπὶ ἰσοτελείᾳ here as referring to fiscal privileges introduced by the *polis* to encourage mining, which were also granted to non-citizens.

mid-fourth century in order to distribute the risks inherent in the exploitation of mineral resources among several partners and thus reduce them.¹⁷

The presence of non-citizens was widespread in tax farming, both as official *telōnai* and as members of groups of contractors who, at least from a certain point onward, appear to have been officially admitted by the city, probably in order to broaden the pool of potential investors for the benefit of public revenue.¹⁸ As in many transactions conducted with private individuals, public authorities required tax farmers to provide citizens as guarantors so that the city could recover any unpaid dues from them. The high financial risk associated with this role likely led the institution to take on a professional character, functioning as a form of investment.¹⁹ Nevertheless, this did not limit the presence of non-citizens in the tax-farming sector but rather intensified economic relations between citizens and non-citizens. Similarly, in public building projects, the recruitment of groups of craftsmen—composed of both citizens and non-citizens—seems to have responded to comparable needs, namely to expand the pool of workers available for hire.²⁰ In essence, in both of these areas, the establishment of partnerships, in addition to offering more jobs or investment opportunities to those involved, appears to have provided the city with an opportunity to increase the monetary returns of tax farming on one hand and the efficiency of construction projects on the other.

At the end of this brief overview, it seems to me that the participation of non-citizens to business partnerships can be understood along the same lines as the introduction of the *dikai emporikai*. Just as the *dikai emporikai*, by resolving commercial disputes rapidly and efficiently, encouraged foreign *emporoi* and *naulkēroi* to conduct business in the Athenian market, thereby promoting trade for the benefit of the whole community, so too did the participation of non-citizens in business partnerships favor their integration into the economic fabric of the *polis*. This integration served the interest of both individual *politai* and the civic community as a whole, which could thus benefit from the entrepreneurial initiatives of non-citizens and from the investment of the wealth they

17 Having proposed that the Attic tribes should unite to open new mines, Xenophon suggests that private individuals should also join forces and pool their fortunes to reduce risk (*Vect.* 4.32: οἷον τε δὴ οὕτως καὶ ιδιώτας συνισταμένους καὶ κοινουμένους τὴν τύχην ἀσφαλέστερον κινδυνεύειν).

18 On tax farming in Athens, see the overview in Migeotte 2014, 453–58. The first attested case of groups of tax farmers being officially admitted by the Athenian *polis* is found in the well-known grain-tax law of 374/3 (*SEG* 48.96, ll. 31–36), on which see Stroud 1998, 65–67. Here the group of contractors that enters into a transaction with the city is called a *symmoria*; however, the members of the group were probably bound to one another by a private contract of *koinōnia*.

19 On these aspects of personal security, see Erdas 2010b.

20 On business partnerships in the construction sector, see also Carusi 2020, 510–14; Carusi 2021, 145–49.

had accumulated. This does not imply that business partnerships came into existence in order to encourage foreign investment in Athens. Rather, it suggests that the success of this institution—which, due to the nature of our sources, we find attested mainly from the mid-fourth century onward—was due not only to the advantages that *koinōniai* offered to their participants and to the public authorities that, in certain sectors, granted them access to public contracts. Their success was probably also due to the fact that by minimizing legal barriers between citizens and non-citizens, *koinōniai* allowed the latter to operate within the Athenian economic space without the constraints normally associated with their civic status, enabling them to invest in a wide range of activities, even in areas that were legally or traditionally open only to citizens.

Although the extent of the economic integration of non-citizens is clear, it is important to recognize that this integration was driven exclusively by the private and collective interests of Athenian citizens, within a purely utilitarian perspective. In this regard, if we turn once again to the Old Oligarch and his critical yet perceptive view of Athenian democracy, the author, in the passage following the one cited above, responds to a fictional observer who wonders why the Athenians allow their slaves to become wealthy and show no fear toward citizens ([Xen.] *Ath. Pol.* 1.11-12). According to him, this situation was inevitable in a naval power in which masters depended on the wealth of their slaves, and therefore had an interest in ensuring that they earned as much as possible without being extorted by others. The implication is that the need to maintain a large fleet, which required considerable financial resources, made it crucial for the Athenians to enrich themselves by employing their slaves in lucrative trades that generated substantial profits for their masters and, in turn, for the slaves themselves. Continuing along the same lines, the author argues that in Athens even metics and slaves were granted freedom of speech in the presence of citizens precisely because the city depended on them for the large number of trades (*technai*) involved in maintaining the fleet—and, one might add, the related industries.²¹

21 [Xen.] *Ath.* 1.11-12: εἰ δέ τις καὶ τοῦτο θαυμάζει, ὅτι ἐδώσι τοὺς δούλους τρυφᾶν αὐτόθι καὶ μεγαλοπρεπῶς διαιτᾶσθαι ἐνίοις, καὶ τοῦτο γνώμη φανείεν ἂν ποιοῦντες· ὅπου γὰρ ναυτικὴ δύναμις ἐστὶν ἀπὸ χρημάτων, ἀνάγκη τοῖς ἀνδραπόδοις δουλεύειν, ἵνα λαμβάνωμεν ὥς πράττει τὰς ἀποφοράς, καὶ ἐλευθέρους ἀφείναι. ἐν δὲ τῇ Λακεδαιμονίᾳ ὁ ἑμὸς δοῦλος σ' ἐδεδόκει. ἂν δὲ δεδίη ὁ σὸς δοῦλος ἐμέ, κινδυνεύσει καὶ τὰ χρήματα διδόναι τὰ ἑαυτοῦ ὥστε μὴ κινδυνεύειν περὶ ἑαυτοῦ. ὅπου δ' εἰσὶ πλούσιοι δοῦλοι, οὐκέτι ἐνταῦθα λυσιτελεῖ τὸν ἑμὸν δοῦλον σὲ δεδιέναι. διὰ τοῦτ' οὖν ἰσηγορίαν καὶ τοῖς δούλοις πρὸς τοὺς ἐλευθέρους ἐποιήσαμεν, καὶ τοῖς μετοίκους πρὸς τοὺς ἀστούς, διότι δεῖται ἡ πόλις μετοίκων διὰ τε τὸ πλῆθος τῶν τεχνῶν καὶ διὰ τὸ ναυτικόν· διὰ τοῦτο οὖν καὶ τοῖς μετοίκους εἰκότως τὴν ἰσηγορίαν ἐποιήσαμεν, “And if anyone is also surprised at the fact that they allow the slaves to live luxuriously there and, some of them, in a grand style, it will become clear that they do this too with good reason. For where there is a naval power based on money, it is necessary to be slaves to our own slaves in order to obtain our share of what they earn through their labor, and then set them free. But in Lacedaemon my slave fears you.

In line with this observation, it has been aptly noted that in the Greek world, for non-citizens—unlike for citizens—*technē* was the primary criterion for assessing their social value within the host community. While not all foreigners were equally desirable, it was the quality of their skills that rendered them useful and acceptable.²² This is particularly evident in Solon’s law on naturalized citizens (ὁ νόμος τῶν δημοποιήτων), which granted Athenian citizenship only to those who were permanently exiled from their homeland and “to those who relocated to Athens with their entire families to pursue a trade” (Plut. *Sol.* 24.4: πανεστίους Ἀθήναζε μετοικιζομένοις ἐπὶ τέχνῃ). In Classical Athens, where citizenship was granted on much stricter terms and most immigrants remained resident aliens (*metoikoi*), technical skills continued to be a key criterion for evaluating the worth of foreigners within the community. From the perspective of metics, the exercise of *technai* was a strongly identitarian element, one that is commonly emphasized on the funerary monuments of foreigners residing in Athens.²³ Significantly, this element of professional pride is relatively uncommon in the funerary monuments of citizens, who were more reluctant to highlight their occupations, given the social stigma attached to those citizens who had to work for a living.²⁴ Conversely, *technē*, both from the perspective of the *polis* and from that of foreigners themselves,

Yes, but if your slave fears me, there will be a risk that he will also offer me his money so as not to be in any danger. And where there are rich slaves it is no longer to my benefit as a master there that my slave should fear you. This is then the reason why we have established equality of free speech between slaves and free men; and also between metics and citizens, since the city needs metics because of the great number of their trades and the requirements of the fleet. So that is why we have, naturally, established equality of free speech for the metics too”. Cataldi 2020 emphasizes the socio-economic processes that, in the last quarter of the fifth century, minimized the boundaries between free people and slaves, as well as between citizens and metics. On the *parrhesia* of *xenoi* and *douloi* at Athens, see also Demosth. 9.3.

22 See Hom. *Od.* 17.382-387: τίς γάρ δὴ ξείνον καλεῖ ἄλλοθεν αὐτὸς ἐπελθὼν | ἄλλον γ’, εἰ μὴ τῶν οἷ δημοεργοὶ ἔασι, | μάντιν ἢ ἱητῆρα κακῶν ἢ τέκτονα δούρων, | ἢ καὶ θέσπιν ἀοιδόν, ὃ κεν τέρπῃσιν ἀείδων; | οὗτοι γὰρ κλητοὶ γε βροτῶν ἐπ’ ἀπειρώνα γαίαν | πτωχὸν δ’ οὐκ ἂν τις καλέοι τρύζοντα ἐκ αὐτόν, “Who of his own accord goes up to someone else, a stranger, and invites him from elsewhere, except for those who are public workers, a prophet, a healer of illnesses, a carpenter working on planks of wood, or an inspired minstrel, who gives delight with his singing? Among mankind these are the ones sought after over the boundless earth; no one would invite a beggar who is going to be an expense to himself”.

23 On the importance of occupations on foreigners’ funerary monuments, see also Ginesti Rosell 2013. Interestingly, this extended to immigrant women as well: see Kosmopoulou 2001; on working metic women, see also Kennedy 2014, 123-53.

24 On this, see Cecchet 2024a, 112-19, and, more in detail, Cecchet 2025b, according to whom the clear distinction in self-representation between citizens and non-citizens in private epigraphy may have been a means by which citizens distinguished themselves from other social groups. Although Guicharrousse (2022, 299-372) argues that the participation of foreigners in the Attic funerary space indicates their integration into the city community, Wijma (2024) has shown that the emphasis placed on ethnic origin and professional occupations in the funerary monuments and inscriptions of foreigners is an important element of their social identity, setting them apart from Athenian citizens. Similar conclusions can be drawn from the funerary monuments of non-Greek foreigners in Athens (see Bäßler 1998).

functioned as a means of integration into the civic community, whether or not it resulted in naturalization, as in the time of Solon.²⁵ Along these lines, it has been interestingly suggested that the annual *per capita* tax paid by resident aliens (*metoikion*) was more than merely a symbolic marker of their subordinate status. Although the amount was not particularly high, the tax may nevertheless have been intended to discourage low-income foreigners from settling in Athens if they were unable to support themselves and contribute to the well-being of the host community through their labor.²⁶

Similarly, Xenophon's *Poroi* must be considered in this context. The work's general aim is to increase the revenues of the *polis*, and to this end Xenophon proposes, among other measures, offering incentives, honors, and privileges to non-citizens who contributed to the Athenians' welfare, such as wealthy metics and major traders, shipowners, and investors. This, in turn, would encourage them to conduct business in Athens on a more or less permanent basis.²⁷ The most frequently cited statement reflecting Xenophon's utilitarian perspective is his claim that metics constitute one of the best sources of revenue, because, while supporting themselves and providing many services to the city, they do not receive state wages but instead pay a residence tax (2.1).²⁸ Indeed, in addition to putting their *technai* and financial resources to good use for the benefit of individual *politai* and the city as a whole, metics also made many other significant contributions to the *polis*, such as serving in the army, paying *eisphorai*, and performing liturgies.

As for military service, metics were required to enroll both in the Athenian army as hoplites and in the Athenian navy as rowers and sailors, although the methods of recruitment remain debated and probably varied between the fifth and fourth centuries.²⁹ Since they essentially bore the same obligations as citi-

25 I have closely followed here Marchiandi's work (2018, 105-13) on this topic, with which I fully agree. The author also highlights how, in Athenian official documents such as RO 4 and IG I³ 475-476, trade is what primarily defines non-citizens (p. 113-23).

26 See Valente 2021. According to Harp. *s.v.* μετοίκιον, the amount was 12 drachmas per year for men and 6 drachmas per year for (probably independent) women. Failure to pay the *metoikion* could result in enslavement (Demosth. 25.57; D.L. 4.14).

27 On Xenophon's *Poroi*, and in particular on Xenophon's proposals to attract metics (*Vect.* 2) and to foster *emporía* by favoring foreign merchants (*Vect.* 3) in order to increase state revenues, see Bodei Gigliani 1970, lvii-xc; Gauthier 1976, 56-109; Whitehead 105-65; Jansen 2012; De Martinis 2018a, 110-38. The context is that immediately following the Social War (357-355), which deprived Athens of merchants and metics (Isoc. 8.21) and reduced its revenues to an all-time low (Demosth. 10.37-38).

28 *Vect.* 2.1: εἰ δὲ πρὸς τοῖς αὐτοφυσῖν ἀγαθοῖς πρῶτον μὲν τῶν μετοίκων ἐπιμέλεια γένοιτο· αὕτη γάρ ἡ πρόσδοδος τῶν καλλίστων ἔμοιγε δοκεῖ εἶναι, ἐπεὶ περ αὐτοὺς τρέφοντες καὶ πολλὰ ὠφελοῦντες τὰς πόλεις οὐ λαμβάνουσι μισθόν, ἀλλὰ μετοίκιον προσφέρουσιν, "But to these indigenous advantages, we might first add the care of the metics. This source of revenue seems to me to be one of the very best, since while they support themselves and benefit the state in many ways, they receive no wage but pay a residence tax".

29 On the military service of metics, see Maffi 1973; Whitehead 1977, 82-86; Adak 2003, 67-72; De Martinis 2018b; Luppia 2023, 207-26. The exclusion of metics from the cavalry may have been lifted in the second half of the fourth century, either for wealthy metics in general

zens, it has rightly been observed that their military duties contradict the widespread principle in the Greek world that citizenship was tied to one's personal contribution to the defense of the *polis*.³⁰ Nevertheless, as far as we can tell, citizenship was offered as a reward for military service on only three occasions: the battle of Arginusae in 406, the civil war of 403, and the aftermath of Chaeronea in 338—each of these being an emergency situation, the outcomes of which are themselves subject to debate.³¹

Significantly, Daniela Marchiandi has found evidence that during the Peloponnesian War, and particularly in its final phase, Athens promoted an inclusive public image of itself by emphasizing solidarity and unity of purpose between citizens and their cohabitants in public discourse.³² This occurred at a critical moment for the survival of the *polis*, as illustrated by the well-known speech delivered by Nikias at Syracuse on the eve of the final battle (Th. 7.63.3-4). Addressing the *nautai* of the fleet, the *stratēgos* appeals to those “who have up to now been thought as Athenians, though they are not” (οἱ τέως Ἀθηναῖοι νομιζόμενοι, καὶ μὴ ὄντες), reminding them that they are admired throughout Greece for their command of the Attic language and their imitation of Athenian customs, and that they share in the advantages of the *archē* no less than the Athenians themselves. Therefore, they are rightly expected not to betray, in its moment of greatest need, that *archē* in which they alone are partners with the Athenians of their own free will (κοινωνοὶ μόνοι ἐλευθέρως ἡμῖν τῆς ἀρχῆς ὄντες).³³ In stark contrast to the Old Oligarch, foreigners are here praised precisely for being indistinguishable from Athenian citizens. Such rhetoric may have encouraged non-citizens to participate in large numbers in the movement that led to the fall of the Thirty, whether motivated by ideological conviction or mere opportunism.³⁴ However, even if some individuals were subsequently rewarded with naturalization, this did not lead to the emergence of a fundamentally different notion of citizenship, one based not exclusively on birthright but on civic virtue and devotion to the city's well-being, as articulated in certain speeches of Lysias.³⁵

or only for those who received *isoteleia*, whether or not this development was based on one of Xenophon's proposals (see De Martinis 2018b).

30 See Mavrogordatos 2014.

31 On the Arginusae and the aftermath of Chaeronea, see Osborne 1983, III, 33-37 (T 10) and 67-68 (T 67); on the civil war of 403, see Osborne 1981, I, 37-41 and II, 26-43 (D 6), with RO 4.

32 See Marchiandi 2018, 116-27.

33 For Nikias clearly referring to metics, see Hornblower 2008, 677-79; Pelling 2022b, 206-7. For language as a marker of civic inclusion in Classical Athens, see Falco 2025b, 231-44.

34 As Cinzia Bearzot (2007, 132-40) has pointed out, the metics represented in Lysias' speeches are characterized positively by their lack of involvement in public life and their commitment to providing financial support to the community (see also Eurip. *Supp.* 892-895); however, in line with the political climate of the time, they also exhibit a deep attachment to democratic ideals, often surpassing the citizens themselves in this respect.

35 See, for example, Lysias' *Against Philon*, a speech in which the behavior of metics who went beyond their duty to defend the democracy (31.29) is contrasted with that of the defendant,

As for liturgies and *eisphorai*, the extent and terms of metics' contributions in these areas also remain debated. Nevertheless, it has been noted that the *polis*' reliance on wealthy metics appears to have reached its height in the second half of the fourth century, as private wealth and euergetism became increasingly important to many aspects of communal life.³⁶ Here I will refer only to Ilaria Bultrighini's work on the particularly significant case of the trierarchy. Although it has often been doubted that metics could perform this liturgy, on the grounds that it involved not only financial contributions but also actual military command, Bultrighini's analysis presents a different picture. In the fourth century, as it became increasingly difficult to find sufficient numbers of citizens to perform liturgies, various reforms were introduced to spread the financial burden among a larger group of individuals, effectively separating the financial and military components of the trierarchy. In this context, it is hardly surprising that a liturgy traditionally reserved for citizens was also opened to the wealthiest metics.³⁷ From a utilitarian perspective, it appears that the Athenians did not hesitate to assign to non-citizens a role that was, in principle, reserved for citizens—a role that entailed both civic prestige and the holding of a public office.³⁸

who, although a member of the *dēmos*, abandoned his *polis* at a time of civil strife in pursuit exclusively of his own advantage. Lys 31.5-6: ἐγὼ γὰρ οὐκ ἄλλους τινὰς φημι δίκαιον εἶναι βουλευεῖν περὶ ἡμῶν, ἢ τοὺς πρὸς τῷ εἶναι πολίτας καὶ ἐπιθυμοῦντας τούτου. τούτοις μὲν γὰρ μεγάλα τὰ διαφέροντά ἐστιν εὖ τε πράττειν τὴν πόλιν τήνδε καὶ ἀνεπιτηδείως διὰ τὸ ἀναγκαῖον σφίσιν αὐτοῖς ἡγεῖσθαι εἶναι μετέχειν τὸ μέρος τῶν δεινῶν, ὥσπερ καὶ τῶν ἀγαθῶν μετέχουσι· οἱ δὲ φύσει μὲν πολῖταί εἰσι, γνώμη δὲ χρῶνται ὡς πᾶσα γῆ πατρὶς αὐτοῖς ἐστὶν ἐν ᾗ ἂν τὰ ἐπιτήδεια ἔχουσιν, οὗτοι δὴλοί εἰσιν ὅτι <ῥαδίως> ἂν παρέντες τὸ τῆς πόλεως κοινὸν ἀγαθὸν ἐπὶ τὸ ἑαυτῶν ἴδιον κέρδος ἔλθοιεν διὰ τὸ μὴ τὴν πόλιν ἀλλὰ τὴν οὐσίαν πατρίδα ἑαυτοῖς ἡγεῖσθαι, “My contention is that it is not right for anybody else to offer advice in our affairs, other than those who in addition to being citizens are also enthusiastic about their citizenship. For these people, it makes a great difference whether the city is prosperous or not, because they believe it is necessary for them to share in what is bad, just as they share in what is good. As for those who are citizens by birth, but who take the view that every place in which they possess anything is for them a fatherland, it is clear that such people would even discard the public good of the city and pursue their own private profit, because they regard not the city but their property as their fatherland (transl. by S.C. Todd)”. For the view that the period following the restoration of democracy in 403 witnessed the emergence of a more inclusive idea of citizenship, albeit short-lived and ultimately inconsequential, see Bakewell 1999.

36 See Adak 2003, 251-56. For the financial obligations of metics toward the civic community, see, on *eisphorai*, Whitehead 1977, 78-80; Adak 2003, 72-77; Lippa 2023, 237-40; on liturgies, Whitehead 1977, 80-82; Adak 2003, 77-94; Lippa 2023, 241-42.

37 See Bultrighini 2025, 289-304.

38 It should also be noted that even the *strategia* may have been exceptionally and occasionally opened to foreigners in the emergency situation of the last phase of the Peloponnesian War (see Bultrighini 2025, 283-85). Similarly, the possible inclusion of metics in the cavalry in the second half of the fourth century (see n. 29 above), may have been motivated by the difficulty of recruiting members of the upper classes who were either unable or unwilling to perform this service (Xen. *Hipp.* 1.2).

Beyond the economic, military, and fiscal integration of non-citizen, other dimensions must also be taken into account. With regard to the legal and judicial sphere, metics were probably granted, at least formally, judicial protection comparable to that enjoyed by citizens over the course of the fourth century, although it is impossible to determine whether, and to what extent, courts discriminated against them in practice. According to Alberto Maffi this protection was granted essentially because the city needed them.³⁹ A similar rationale seems to apply to the role of the *prostatēs*, that is, a citizen who acted as a kind of patron for a metic during registration in his deme of residence and in legal proceedings.⁴⁰ The most plausible scenario is that the relationship between a metic and his *prostatēs* remained in place for the duration of the metic's stay in Attica and that, until the mid-fourth century, *prostatai* were required for metics in legal proceedings, at least during the pre-trial stage of the *anakrisis* before the *polemarchos*, who was responsible for cases involving foreign residents. Over time, however, their role in the judicial sphere appears to have declined under the influence of the *dikai emporikai*, in which non-citizens in general, as mentioned above, were granted the right to act entirely independently.⁴¹

The religious sphere is also of primary importance, although the nature of metics' participation in this domain is more difficult to assess. There is no doubt that metics were included in certain public religious events, either through the elevation of foreign deities to the status of civic cults, as in the well-known case of the goddess Bendis,⁴² or through their direct involvement in specific Athenian festivals, such as the Panathenaic procession or the sacrifice of the *Hephaistia*.⁴³ However, since these forms of participation typically assigned foreign residents a limited or even subordinate role, it is difficult to determine whether the purpose was to underscore metics' integration into the civic community—albeit with the necessary distinctions—or to emphasize their outsider status. Interestingly, in either case it seems plausible that the inclusion of metics aimed to encourage their contribution in terms of wealth and support to the Athenian community.⁴⁴

39 See Maffi 1972. Patterson (2000) highlights the vulnerability of metics in Athenian courts due to their lack of an extensive kinship structure; in contrast, Luppa (2023, 307–30) challenges the notion that foreign residents were in a legally precarious position in Athens. Whitehead (1977, 89–96), emphasizes the restrictions imposed on the legal capacities of metics, above all noting that metics had access to the judicial system as plaintiffs and defendants, but never as judges, and thus were never judged by their peers.

40 On the figure of the *prostatēs* and his functions, see Tuci 2007, with a discussion of the ancient sources and a bibliographical overview.

41 For a thorough discussion of this issue, along with a comprehensive bibliography, see Tuci 2023.

42 For Bendis' inclusion among the civic cults, see Wijma 2014, 126–55; Guicharrouse 2022, 91–191.

43 See Wijma 2014, 37–64 on the Panathenaic procession, and 86–94 on the *Hephaistia*.

44 On the limited scope of these forms of inclusion, see Whitehead 1977, 86–89. Conversely, see Wijma 2014, 156–63, for metics' participation in Athenian festivals as a means of shaping their *polis* membership. Luppa (2023, 294–306) underscores the distinction between resident

The issue of land tenure, by contrast, is less controversial. As Michele Faraguna has recently pointed out, the ability to own real estate was closely tied to full membership in the civic community, with property functioning as a key factor of both inclusion and exclusion.⁴⁵ In this respect, there is little doubt that the Athenians were extremely reluctant to grant *enktesis*, that is, the right to own land and real estate in Attica, to non-citizens. Until the mid-fourth century, this privilege was conferred only rarely, primarily on non-resident foreigners who were registered as Athenian *proxenoi* and were expected to exercise such a right only potentially. From the 330s onward, when the institution of *proxenia* was increasingly employed to honor resident foreigners as well, metics were granted *enktesis* more frequently, although it remained an exceptional privilege, often accompanied by numerous restrictions that substantially limited both its practical effects and its economic value. The limitations of time and scope suggest that *enktesis* was inherently different from the property rights enjoyed by citizens.⁴⁶

3. The scope of non-citizens' integration

Taking all these aspects into consideration reveals a fundamental ambivalence regarding the position of foreign residents within the Athenian community. Indeed, depending on perspective and on how different arguments are weighed, modern scholarship appears to oscillate in its assessment of the role of metics, treating it either as a desirable status or as a disadvantaged position, and describing metics as either subaltern or integrated within the Athenian *polis*. In particular, the subordinate position of metics is downplayed in studies that emphasize the social rather than the political-institutional content of the concept of citizenship in the Greek world, and that locate its essence in religious participation and other aspects of the *polis*' social life rather than in the exercise of legal and political rights.⁴⁷

and non-resident foreigners created by these forms of participation. A critical reassessment of the level of inclusion enjoyed by foreigners in Athenian festivals was recently presented by Daniela Marchiandi at the international conference *Le poleis in festa. Discorsi, riti e spazi festivi nelle città greche dall'età classica alla tarda antichità*, University of Turin, 27-29 October 2025 ("Stranieri e feste (cittadine e non) ad Atene").

45 On land and citizenship in the Greek *polis*, see Faraguna 2024, with a thorough discussion of ancient sources, and Faraguna in this volume.

46 See Faguer 2021, whose analysis shows that of the approximately sixty grants of *enktesis* attested in Athens from the late fifth century to the mid-2nd century, only a small percentage appear to concern foreign residents. However, since most of the grantees were *proxenoi*, the number would be somewhat higher if one accepts, as Adak does (2003, 201-18), that this form of institutionalized friendship was not necessarily bestowed more often on non-resident foreigners than on resident foreigners.

47 The oscillation in modern scholarship—exemplified by the antinomy between the *Quasibürger* of Wilamowitz (1887) and the “anti-citizen” of Whitehead (1977)—is discussed

The fundamental ambivalence of the position of resident foreigners is well illustrated by what is probably the best-known literary metaphor for the relationship between citizens and foreigners. In the *Acharnians*, performed at the *Lenaia* festival in 425, when only citizens and residents were present in the audience, the author expresses the hope that he will not be accused of speaking ill of the city in front of foreigners, since “here it is only us alone, the cream of the crop, for in my opinion the metics are the bran of the citizens” (Ar. *Ach.* 507-508: ἀλλ’ ἐσμὲν αὐτοῖς νῦν γε περιεπιτισμένοι· τοὺς γὰρ μετοίκους ἄχυρα τῶν ἀστῶν λέγω). If we follow the metaphor, when the citizens at the *Lenaia* are cleansed of their husk, that is, the foreigners, they still retain the bran, namely the metics. Metics are thus part of the grain—in other words, they are closely linked to citizens—but they represent the least valuable part of the grain prior to sifting, a product of inferior worth.⁴⁸

Despite the diversity of viewpoints, however, a common thread seems to run through the various approaches: the idea that the position of metics within the civic community resulted from a kind of unwritten agreement between them and the *polis*, whereby “each side keeps its part... and looks to the other to do likewise”, as David Whitehead puts it.⁴⁹ Similarly, Marie-Françoise Baslez emphasizes the existence of a social contract (*contrat social*), whereby metics were granted certain rights and privileges in exchange for their economic contribution and services to the city.⁵⁰ According to Mustafa Adak, the relationship between citizens and metics was one of social reciprocity (*soziale Reziprozität*): in return for granting them *metoikia* status, citizens expected specific services from foreign residents, while metics, in turn, expected these services to be rewarded with certain privileges through a mechanism of compensation.⁵¹ Finally, Josine Blok likewise describes *metoikia* as “a framework set up by the Athenians in which the contributions of the numerous immigrants to the *polis* [...] were reciprocated in the form of certain *timai* [...]”. Such a framework, in which both parties knew what they might expect from each other in terms of money and work, legal and cultic rights and financial and military duties, may have worked as an incentive both for outsiders to settle at Athens and for the *polis* to live up to the rules of reciprocity”.⁵²

by Adak 2003, 29-39; Guicharrousse 2022, 12-24; Lupp 2023, 15-17; Tuci 2023, 102-3, 115-18; Bultrighini 2025, 277-83. For studies emphasizing the social and religious dimensions of community participation in evaluations of the boundaries between citizens and foreign residents, see Wijma 2014; Taylor, Vlassopoulos 2015; Guicharrousse 2022.

48 I follow here the excellent discussion by Tuci (2023, 120-22).

49 See Whitehead 1977, 57-60 (quotation from p. 58-59).

50 See Baslez 1984, esp. 127-49. As Guicharrousse (2022, 15-17) points out, this work follows in the tradition of Clerc’s (1893) economic contractualism, which takes a very positive view of the role of metics in the *polis* and interprets their integration primarily in economic and financial terms. See also Bearzot 2012, 153-54.

51 See Adak 2003, esp. 41-53.

52 See Blok 2017, 265-75 (quotation from p. 274).

In other words, it seems to me that the value non-citizens brought to the community better explains both the rights and privileges they enjoyed and the forms of integration that resulted from them than does the confusion of identities arising from the unique nature of Athenian democracy, as postulated by Vlassopoulos. This does not mean that their worth to the community was assessed exclusively in economic and financial terms, but it cannot be denied that, from the perspective of the available ancient sources, metics are often characterized as useful and valuable to the city, even though their presence was not necessarily desirable *per se*, and being a metic could itself be regarded as a distasteful condition.⁵³

It must also be taken into account that resident and non-resident foreigners could, in exchange for acts of *euergesia*, be granted honors extending to them rights and prerogatives (*timai*) comparable to those enjoyed by citizens, such as fiscal equality (*isoteleia*) and *enktesis*.⁵⁴ Indeed, within what may be defined as the “economy of public honors”, the *demos* secured the voluntary benefits and services of non-citizens (as well as citizens) precisely by awarding appropriate *timai*, which both rewarded past services and encouraged future ones, in accordance with the principle of reciprocity. The Athenians were clearly aware that the city’s financial, military, and political well-being depended on the effective functioning of the euergetic system and on the actions of generous benefactors, many of whom were non-citizens.⁵⁵

Unsurprisingly, the possession of wealth placed non-citizens in a better position to actively seek honors (*philotimesthai*) by lavishly expending their resources on acts of *euergesia* toward the city and reaping the corresponding benefits in terms of *timai*. Moreover, many scholars have observed that the formation of economic, cultural, and religious networks cutting across divisions of class and status, and involving both citizens and non-citizens, provided the latter with opportunities for social advancement and, in certain situations, for acquiring rights and prerogatives that lifted them beyond the formal limitations of their civic status. In

53 For an overview of the literary evidence, see Whitehead 1977, 34-60 and, especially on political thought, 125-36.

54 For an overview of the voluntary acts of *euergesia* that could be performed by resident and non-resident foreigners, ranging from financial and material support to diplomatic or military assistance, see Adak 2003, 95-193. In terms of the privileges that could be granted to them by the *polis*, on *isoteleia* (which could include the right to serve in the army and to pay *eisphorai* on the same footing as the Athenians), see Maffi 1973; Whitehead 1977, 11-12; Adak 2003, 218-32; Guicharrouse 2022, 51-54; Luppà 2023, 334-40; Bultrighini 2025, 280-82; on proxeny, see Whitehead 1977, 13-14; Adak 2003, 201-18; Luppà 2023, 351-58; on *enktesis*, see Adak 2003, 235-39; Faguer 2021; Luppà 2022, 344-51; on *ateleia*, see Adak 2003, 227-32; Luppà 340-44; on other honors, such as public praise, crowns, hospitality in the *prytaneion*, *proedria*, etc., see Adak 2003, 242-49.

55 Here I follow Canevaro’s (2016, 77-97) compelling discussion of the arguments raised by Demosthenes in his speech against Leptines in 355/4, with references to previous bibliography on the “economy of honors”.

some cases, this process even resulted in naturalization, the greatest *timē* of all, as illustrated by the well-known examples of bankers of foreign and servile origin.⁵⁶

At the same time, these scholars acknowledge that, despite the high socio-economic status and the attainment of honors that brought some of these individuals closer to citizenship, cases of actual naturalizations remained very limited.⁵⁷ Even Xenophon—whom Joseph Jansen characterizes as “progressive”, since his proposals “would have contributed significantly to the erosion of the status divide separating citizens from non-citizens”—never contemplated granting citizenship to the wealthy metics and entrepreneurs upon whom the city so heavily relied.⁵⁸ Those who did obtain citizenship by decree, the *demopoietoi*, were themselves subject to restrictions in both the political and religious spheres, as they were barred, at least in the first generation, from holding archonships and priesthoods.⁵⁹ Furthermore, naturalized citizens such as Apollodoros, the son of Pasion, appear to have experienced discrimination⁶⁰ and to have felt compelled to go above and beyond in their services to the city, “as men who are

56 For economic and professional relationships and networks involving citizens and non-citizens, see Shipton 2008; Ferrucci 2012; Deene 2014; Gabrielsen 2015; Tuci 2019; De Martinis 2019; Falco 2025a, 70-77; Marchiandi 2025. For religious and cultural networks and associations involving citizens and non-citizens, see Gabrielsen 2016; Gottesman 2014, esp. 44-76; Taylor 2015; Guicharrousse 2022, esp. 95-297; Lupp 2023, 260-68; however, see also Kierstead 2025 for a more critical view of the extent of mixing between citizens and non-citizens in associations of the Classical period. As modern scholarship on voluntary associations is too extensive to be cited here in full, please refer to the relevant bibliography in these studies.

57 According to Osborne (1983, IV, 206), grants that were not purely honorific (*i.e.* those given to individuals likely to implement them) were rare in the fifth and fourth centuries, while a certain increase occurred during the Lycurgan period, primarily concerning financiers and bankers; this development is consistent with the encouragement of private contributions to the state, a well-known facet of Lycorgos’ program.

58 See Jansen 2012 (quotation from p. 725-26). For further scholarship on the *Poroi*, see n. 27 above.

59 For limitations imposed on first-generation naturalized citizens, see Demosth. 59.92-93 and 106. On *politeia* as the greatest *timē* granted to non-citizens, see Adak 2003, 239-41; Lupp 2023, 358-66.

60 See, for instance, Demosth. 50.26: καὶ περὶ τῶν σκευῶν ἔφραζεν αὐτῷ ὅτι ἴδια ἔχοιμι καὶ δημόσιον οὐδέν: “ὥς οὖν”, ἔφη, “ἢ πείσω ἐκείνον διανοοῦ, ἢ σκεύη ἔχων σαντῷ ἀνάπλει. οἶμαι δέ σοι”, ἔφη, “αὐτὸν οὐδὲν διοίσασθαι. ὀφείλει γὰρ ἀργύριον ἐκεῖ, ὃ διαλύσαι βουλήσεται ἐκ τῆς τιμῆς τῶν σκευῶν”. ἀκούσας δὲ οὗτος ταῦτα τοῦ τ’ Εὐκτῆμονος καὶ τοῦ Δεινίου τοῦ κηδεστοῦ τοῦ ἐμοῦ, περὶ μὲν ὧν ἔλεγον αὐτῷ οὐδὲν αὐτοῖς ἀποκρίνεται, γελάσαντα δὲ ἔφασαν αὐτὸν εἰπεῖν “ἄρτι μὲς πίττης γεύεται· ἐβούλετο γὰρ Ἀθηναῖος εἶναι”, “Ectemon told to Polycles that I was using my own gear for the ship and had nothing from the city. ‘See whether you want to persuade him to sell you the gear, or get your own gear and sail off. I think’, he said, ‘Apollodorous will be agreeable, since he owes money there and will want to pay it back from the price of the gear’. When Polycles heard this from Euctemon and from my father-in-law Deinias, he gave no answer to what they had said to him; they reported that he laughed and said, ‘The mouse has just got a taste of pitch: he wanted, you see, to be an Athenian’ (transl. by V. Bers)”. See also Demosth. 36.30; 53.18.

returning a favor” (Demosth. 45.78).⁶¹ Ultimately, although the *timai* granted to non-citizens tended to approximate their status to that of *politai* by allowing them to act as citizens in certain domains, they nevertheless fell short of what was considered the core content of citizenship, namely access to political and judicial deliberation and to public office.⁶² Indeed, scholars who have addressed the nature of the *timai* conferred upon non-citizens have recognized—albeit with different emphases—that the *dēmos* could bestow rights, privileges, and even specific functions upon non-citizens without sharing political sovereignty with them⁶³ or creating a form of partial or quasi-citizenship.⁶⁴ In other words, the honors granted to non-citizens “seem to work under the level of the *timē* of citizens, approaching by small and partial increases citizen status (*timē*) and the attached prerogatives (*timai*)”.⁶⁵

In light of these considerations, I remain unconvinced that it was the unique nature of Athenian democracy that enabled a certain degree of protection and freedom to be extended to non-citizens. Nor do I believe that non-citizens could easily exploit this situation, and the perceived blurring of identities, in order to participate directly in Athenian institutional life. The examples cited by Vlassopoulos—who argues that the evidence is scarce because no one would

61 Demosth. 45.78: τὰ δ' εἰς τὴν πόλιν καὶ ὅς' εἰς ὑμᾶς, ὡς δύναμαι λαμπρότατα, ὡς ὑμεῖς σόνιστε, ποιῶ· οὐ γὰρ ἀγνοῶ τοῦθ' ὅτι τοῖς μὲν γένει πολίταις ὑμῖν ἱκανόν ἐστι λητουργεῖν ὡς οἱ νόμοι προστάττουσι, τοὺς δὲ ποιητοὺς ἡμᾶς ὡς ἀποδιδόντας χάριν, οὕτω προσήκει φαίνεσθαι λητουργοῦντας, “Whatever services concern the city, however, and all those that concern you, I carry out, as you know, with as much splendor as I can. For I'm not unaware that for you who are citizens by birth it's sufficient to carry out your public duties as the laws enjoin, but for those of us who are made citizens by decree it's appropriate to be seen carrying out these duties as men who are returning a favor (transl. by A.C. Scafuro)”. See also Eust. *Comm. Hom.* II. 9.648: πεπολιτογραφημένοι δὲ ὁμῶς τῶν ἰθαγενῶν ἐδευτέρουν, “even those who have been granted citizenship are nevertheless second to the natives of the place”.

62 For the view that political and judicial participation, without obliterating the religious and social dimensions, was central to the notion of Greek citizenship in the Classical Age—even beyond what Aristotle argued in his theory of citizenship—see Faraguna 2025a, 235–38. See also Canevaro in this volume, with reference to previous scholarship.

63 See Baslez 1984, esp. 204.

64 See Maffi 1973, esp. 962. According to Faguer 2021, 65, the honorary granting of *enktesis* cannot be equated with granting a portion of citizenship. Blok, who emphasizes the centrality of religious over political participation in the definition of Greek citizenship, also notes that equality in the sense of having the same *timai* as citizens did not apply in Athenian society, as status distinctions between citizens and non-citizens preceded the assignments of rights (2017, 275). See also Müller 2014a.

65 See Canevaro 2025, 99–103 (quotation from p. 100). On the *timai* of non-citizens, see also Rocchi 2022, 168–80. Bodei Giglioni (1970, lxii–lxv) had already noted that, for Xenophon, removing the *atimiai* affecting metics (*Vect.* 2.2) was tantamount to granting them positive rights and enabling them to share in the *timē* proper to citizens, from which they were normally excluded according to the Aristotelian definition (*Pol.* 3.5.1278a: μέτοικός ἐστιν ὁ τῶν τιμῶν μὴ μετέχειν). However, only those *atimiai* that were not useful to the *polis* should be removed, thereby never including citizenship itself.

have been foolish enough to advertise such behavior—are not particularly persuasive.⁶⁶ The case of Athenogenes, an Egyptian metic in Athens who was allegedly made a citizen in Troezen in 338 according to Hyperides (3.29-31), does not appear relevant here. The other two cases he adduces are equally problematic. In the *probolē* procedure employed by Demosthenes in 348 to secure an assembly vote condemning Meidias for disrupting the *Dionysia*, the defendant allegedly claimed, according to Demosthenes two years later, that the assembly was composed of cowards and deserters, and that he had been condemned by the votes of dancers, foreigners, and similar individuals (21.193).⁶⁷ However, Demosthenes's portrayal of Meidias's alleged contempt for the people should not be overinterpreted, as it was clearly designed to provoke indignation among the jurors. Likewise, Plutarch's assertion that the trial of Phocion in 318 took place before an assembly that granted free access to slaves, foreigners, *atimoi*, and women, and that any attempt to exclude strangers and slaves was met with outrage by the *polloi*, who perceived such proposals as oligarch and anti-democratic (*Phoc.* 34.2-4), is of questionable relevance.⁶⁸ Diodorus, for his part, raises no objection to the legality

66 See Vlassopoulos 2007, 46-47.

67 Demosth. 21.193: οἷμαι τοίνυν αὐτὸν οὐδὲ τοῦ δήμου κατηγορεῖν ὀκνήσειν οὐδὲ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, ἀλλ' ἅπερ τότ' ἐτόλμα λέγειν ὅτ' ἦν ἡ προβολή, ταῦτα καὶ νῦν ἐρεῖν, ὡς ὅσοι δέον ἐξέναι κατέμενον καὶ ὅσοι τὰ φρούρι' ἦσαν ἔρημα λελοιπότες, ἐξεκκλησίασαν, καὶ χορευταὶ καὶ ξένοι καὶ τοιοῦτοί τινες ἦσαν οἱ κατεχειροτόνησαν αὐτοῦ, "Now, I know that he will not hesitate to accuse both the people and the assembly but will repeat these charges that he dared to make when the *probolē* took place: the people who attended the assembly were all those who stayed behind when they should have marched out and all those who left the forts deserted, and those who voted against him were dancers and foreigners and men like that (transl. by E.M. Harris)".

68 Plut. *Phoc.* 34.2-4: καὶ προσῆν τὸ σχῆμα τῇ κομιδῇ λυπηρόν, ἐφ' ἀμάξαις κομιζόμενον αὐτῶν διὰ τοῦ Κεραμεικοῦ πρὸς τὸ θέατρον· ἐκεῖ γὰρ αὐτοὺς προσαγαγὼν ὁ Κλεῖτος συνέειχεν, ἄχρι οὗ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἐπλήρωσαν οἱ ἄρχοντες, οὐ δούλον, οὐ ξένον, οὐκ ἄτιμον ἀποκρίναντες, ἀλλὰ πᾶσι καὶ πάσαις ἀναπεπταμένον τὸ βῆμα καὶ τὸ θέατρον παρασχόντες. ἐπεὶ δὲ ἦ τ' ἐπιστολὴ τοῦ βασιλέως ἀνεγνώσθη, λέγοντος αὐτῷ μὲν ἐγνώσθαι προδότας γεγενῆσθαι τοὺς ἄνδρας, ἐκείνοις δὲ διδόναι τὴν κρίσιν ἐλευθέρους τε δὴ καὶ αὐτονόμοις οὖσι, καὶ τοὺς ἄνδρας ὁ Κλεῖτος εἰσήγαγεν, οἱ μὲν βέλτιστοι τῶν πολιτῶν ὀφθέντος τοῦ Φωκίωνος ἐνεκαλύψαντο καὶ κάτω κύψαντες ἐδάκρυον, εἷς δὲ ἀναστὰς ἐτόλμησεν εἰπεῖν ὅτι, τηλικαύτην κρίσιν ἐγκεχειρικότος τῷ δήμῳ τοῦ βασιλέως, καλῶς ἔχει τοὺς δούλους καὶ τοὺς ξένους ἀπελθεῖν ἐκ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, οὐκ ἀνασχομένων δὲ τῶν πολλῶν, ἀλλ' ἀνακραγόντων βάλλειν τοὺς ὀλιγαρχικοὺς καὶ μισοδήμους κτλ., "And besides, the manner of their return to the city was shameful, for they were carried on wagons through the Kerameikos to the theatre. For thither Cleitus brought them and there he kept them, until the magistrates had made up an assembly, from which they excluded neither slave, foreigner, nor disfranchised person, but allowed all alike, both men and women, free access to theatre and tribunal. After the letter of the king had been read aloud, in which he said that according to his judgement the men were traitors, but that their fellow citizens, who were freemen and self-governing, should pronounce sentence upon them, Cleitus led the men in. Then the best of the citizens, at sight of Phocion, covered their faces, bent their heads, and wept. One of them, however, rose up and had the courage to say that, since the king had put a case of such importance into the hands of the people, it were well that slaves and foreigners should leave

of the assembly in his account of the same episode (18.66.4–67.3).⁶⁹ Moreover, Plutarch was particularly keen to present Phocion's trial in the theatre as emblematic of the degeneration of Athenian democracy and its values.⁷⁰

The large-scale participation of metics and slaves in the movement that led to the overthrow of the Thirty in 403—also cited by Vlassopoulos as evidence of non-citizens' involvement in Athenian political life—certainly suggests that non-citizens could engage in political discussion within the so-called “free spaces” through their everyday interactions with citizens, and could develop an interest in the affairs of the city upon which their well-being, or even their survival, depended. Such engagement, however, does not amount to clandestine participation in the political and judicial arenas that were strictly reserved for *politai*—assuming, of all things, that non-citizens would have been willing to incur the risks associated with such forms of clandestine participation.⁷¹ Ultimately, while non-citizens may have contributed informally to political discussion and perhaps exerted some influence within specific social and cultural circles,⁷² there is no evidence that they were ever involved in decision-making processes in Classical Athens, even at the local level.⁷³

the assembly. This the multitude would not tolerate, but cried out to stone the oligarchs and haters of the people etc. (transl. by B. Perrin)”.

- 69 For Phocion's trial, see Bearzot 1985a, 227–35. Plutarch's *atimoi* must be identified with the Athenian citizens who were disenfranchised during Antipater's rule and then returned to Athens when democracy was restored (in fact, D.S. 18.66.4 mentions only exiles and Phocion's political opponents).
- 70 As Dubreuil (2018, 271) points out, by decrying as oligarchic the Athenian ideal of an exclusive citizen right to political participation, Plutarch's *polloi* reveal their inability to properly understand the fundamental values of their city.
- 71 For the risks involved in usurping citizenship rights, see n. 78 below. For foreign residents being more interested in maintaining strong ties with their own community and enjoying citizenship there, while also benefitting from the rights and privileges granted by the host community, see Thomsen 2023 (see also Maffi 1972, 185, on the ties between metics and their homeland).
- 72 On the informal participation of non-citizens in Athenian politics, see Luppa (2023, 280–94), who nonetheless emphasizes the restraint with which non-citizens were expected to behave in this area. On the significance of extra-institutional informal communication within the Athenian democracy, and the importance of spaces, networks, and associations in which people of different statuses socialized in relation to the enactment of institutional decisions, see Gottesman 2014, esp. 26–76.
- 73 According to Gabrielsen (2016), in Athens private and voluntary associations that included both citizen and non-citizens, and whose inclusiveness challenged the primacy of citizenship in communal decision-making processes, emerged in the early fourth century and were not exclusively characteristic of the Hellenistic age. However, see Kierstead 2025 for the view that the inclusion of non-citizens in Athenian associations was primarily a Hellenistic rather than a Classical phenomenon, particularly in the case of associations whose membership was linked to descent and thus to citizenship. The earliest secure example of a deme decree incorporating all its residents, whether Athenians or foreigners, into its formal decision-making process, dates to 236/5 (*I.Rhamnous* 17).

Overall, the scholarly emphasis on the religious and social dimensions of citizenship mentioned earlier has fostered the view that political exclusion should not be the sole criterion for assessing the position of non-citizens within the civic community, since social rank was not determined exclusively by political and institutional barriers. According to this perspective, social inclusion and political exclusion in Athens were complementary rather than contradictory, and exclusion from citizenship should not be equated with social marginalization.⁷⁴ If we conceive of the *polis* both as a human society encompassing all inhabitants of a given territory and as an institutionalized community granting full citizenship rights to a select group,⁷⁵ political exclusion can indeed coexist with social integration. Building on precisely these considerations, Stefano Ferrucci has shown that other centers of *polis* life alternative to the political space—such as religious cults, economic activities, and cultural interactions—partly reshuffled the hierarchies of the political sphere. Within these contexts, a high degree of integration could be achieved without undermining the decisive distinction between citizens and non-citizens.⁷⁶ Needless to say, the situations of non-citizens varied widely, with access to financial resources and the quality of social relationships acting as key factors enabling those who possessed them to attain higher levels of integration.⁷⁷ Nevertheless, even if there were contexts in which status differences and political exclusion were temporarily irrelevant, the distinction between citizens and non-citizens was always ultimately enforced through legally defined boundaries.⁷⁸ Even if some degree of permeability existed, there is no evidence that it was tolerated—let alone sanctioned—by the *polis*.

74 See again Adak 2003, esp. 29-39; Guicharrousse 2022, esp. 88-90.

75 On this aspect, see Ober 1993; Giangiulio 2001, esp. 63-65, 90-92.

76 See Ferrucci 2008, esp. 514-16.

77 This topic is emphasized in particular by Luppa (2023, 279-80), who focuses on the degree of social inclusion enjoyed by different groups of non-citizens.

78 The insurmountable divide between citizens and non-citizens is clearly indicated by the severe penalties imposed on those found guilty of illegally crossing it in various ways. Sale into slavery was enforced not only for pretending to be a citizen (Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 42.1), but also for marrying an Athenian (Lys. 34.3; Demosth. 59.16), for failing to pay the *metoikion* tax (Demosth. 25.57; D.L. 4.14; Harp. *s.v.* μετοίκιον), and perhaps also for failing to appoint a *prostatēs* (Poll. 3.56). Another case in point is that of rich and autonomous slaves who appear to interact on an equal footing even with high-ranking citizens; ultimately, however, the complete legal incapacity of slaves, coupled with their subjection to the absolute power of their owners, meant that this apparent equality could be dissolved at any moment (on this, see Ferrucci 2012, 106-7; Ismard 2025, 109-11). The burden of slave status and the limitations it imposed on social relations were recently discussed by Stefano Ferrucci at the international conference *Networks and Norms of Civic Engagement in the Ancient Mediterranean: Everyday Life, Subaltern Perspectives, and Gender Dynamics in Greek and Roman Societies*, University of Bologna, 13-14 November 2025 (“Sosias, Eumathes e gli altri. Identità economiche e visibilità sociale degli schiavi ad Atene”).

4. Final remarks: the impact of non-citizens' integration

Having considered the dynamics that led to the integration of non-citizens into Athenian civic life, as well as the limits of this integration, I wish to conclude this chapter by briefly discussing some possible impacts these developments may have had on the Athenian community.

My first observation is prompted by Nick Fisher's study of the *diapsēphisis* of 346/5, one of the episodes that most vividly illustrate Athenian anxiety surrounding citizen status. Fisher rightly emphasizes the political and social context in which the assembly, following a proposal by a certain Demophilos, voted to carry out a review of the lists of citizens held by the demes—a process which resulted in expulsions, disputes, and much animosity. In short, the political climate dominated by the setbacks following the peace of Philokrates likely brought deep concerns about civic identity to a head, producing a measure intended to clean up allegedly corrupt or lax institutions, whether out of genuine conviction or as a mere pretext⁷⁹. However, as Fisher notes, “whatever problems it [the *diapsēphisis*] may have been designed to solve, it is likely to have exacerbated rather than assuaged tensions”⁸⁰.

Following this line of reasoning, it seems to me that the theme of illegitimate citizenship—and of allegedly illegitimate citizens leading the city toward danger and ruin⁸¹—emerges with particular force in Athenian public discourse in the

79 See Fisher 2023, esp. 369–71 and 380–81, who eloquently summarizes the initiative's aim in the motto “make Athens great again”. Ancient sources on the *diapsēphisis*: Androt. *FGrHist* 324 F 52 and Philoch. *FGrHist* 328 F 52 *apud* Harp. *s.v.* διαψήφισις; Aeschin. 1.77–78; 2.181–182; Dion. Hal. *Isae.* 16.4; Demosth. 57 (with Libanius' *hypothesis*). On this episode, see Fantasia and Carusi (2004), who also highlight the Athenian political context and what little is known of Demophilos' political biography as a backdrop to the initiative (p. 199–201).

80 Quotation from Fisher 2023, 369.

81 As exemplified by Aeschines' outburst three years later, in which he vehemently denounced the alleged illegitimate citizenship of current politicians (2.177): *κάνταυθα ἀναφύντος τοῦ δήμου καὶ πάλιν ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἰσχύσαντος, ἄνθρωποι παρέγγραπτοι γεγεννημένοι πολῖται, καὶ τὸ νοσοῦν τῆς πόλεως ἀεὶ προσαγόμενοι, καὶ πόλεμον ἐκ πολέμου πολιτευόμενοι, ἐν μὲν εἰρήνῃ τὰ δεινὰ τῷ λόγῳ προορώμενοι, καὶ τὰς ψυχὰς τὰς φιλοτίμους καὶ λίαν ὀξείας ἐρεθίζοντες, ἐν δὲ τοῖς πολέμοις ὅπλων οὐχ ἀπτόμενοι, ἐξετασταὶ δὲ καὶ ἀποστολεῖς γιγνόμενοι, παιδοποιοῦμενοι δὲ ἐξ ἐταίρων, ἅτιμοι δ' ἐκ συκοφαντίας, εἰς τοὺς ἐσχάτους κινδύνους τὴν πόλιν καθιστάσι, τὸ μὲν τῆς δημοκρατίας ὄνομα οὐ τοῖς ἥθεσιν, ἀλλὰ τῇ κολακείᾳ θεραπεύοντες, καταλύοντες δὲ τὴν εἰρήνην, ἐξ ἧς ἡ δημοκρατία σφύζεται, συναγωνιζόμενοι δὲ τοῖς πολέμοις, ἐξ ὧν ὁ δῆμος καταλύεται*. “At this point, when the democracy had sprung up afresh and recovered its original strength, persons who had themselves fraudulently enrolled as citizens constantly attracted to themselves the corrupt element in the city and pursued a policy of war and more war. In peace they spoke of danger they foresaw and tried to stir up ambitious and over-hasty minds, while in war they never lifted a weapon but got themselves made army auditors and naval inspectors. These are men who father children on their mistresses, men disfranchised for malicious prosecution. And they are placing the city in extreme danger. They support the name of democracy not with their

years surrounding, and especially following, this episode.⁸² In other words, the tensions provoked by the *diapsephisis*, although certainly rooted in a long-standing tradition of slanderous and unfounded accusations concerning the foreign origins of prominent politicians,⁸³ appear to have injected a new kind of paranoia into contemporary public discourse.

Concerns about citizenship may, of course, have been triggered by specific scandals. However, I would argue that the broader socio-economic context is more significant. What I mean is that the various forms of integration of non-citizens surveyed in this chapter are likely to have generated deep anxieties about civic identity. The close interaction of citizens and non-citizens in numerous and important economic sectors; the existence of institutions such as *eranos* loans and *koinōniai*, which facilitated the economic activities of non-citizens; the extension of forms of judicial protection regardless of civic status, as attested by the *dikai emporikai*; the opening of certain military roles, and even important liturgies, such as the trierarchy, to metics; the growing number and value of *timai* granted to foreigners⁸⁴; the proliferation of associations and networks in which citizens and non-citizens shared everyday experiences; and, more generally, the utilitarian approach through which the Athenians promoted the integration of non-citizens into the *polis* community—all these dynamics may have prompted Demophilos to exploit fears that increasingly closer interaction between citizens and non-citizens could lead to the illegitimate infiltration of Athenian citizenship.⁸⁵ In short, it seems to me that these dynamics, rather than facilitating non-citizens' exploitation of blurred identities to participate in Athenian institutional life, instead provoked a disproportionate—and perhaps largely unjustified—reaction against such a possibility.

If I may venture a perhaps imperfect parallel, we might ask whether, in the United States, fears and alarms concerning alleged non-citizen voting are fueled

conduct but with flattering words; they are trying to destroy the peace that keeps democracy safe, while they champion the wars that destroy democracy (transl. by C. Carey)".

82 For an overview of the rhetoric of citizenship breaches in this period, see Fisher 2023, 371-75. See also Cook 2023, who notes, among other things, that while Aeschines attacked Demosthenes' character in many ways in 346/5, his alleged foreign ancestry was not raised at the time but became a prominent issue in the 343 trial. As part of the Parma unit's contribution to the PRIN 2020 project, Ilaria Bultrighini is conducting a thorough study of the illegal infiltrations of non-citizens into the citizen body attested in the Classical period.

83 See Cook 2023, esp. 402-3. The topic of alleged servile and foreign origins used as insults is more broadly discussed by Lape 2010, esp. 61-94 and 186-239; Kamen 2020, esp. 36-86.

84 For an overview of Athenian decrees honoring foreigners between 352/1 and 322/1, see Lambert 2012, 93-183.

85 The possible fears raised by some of these dynamics are also highlighted by Maffi 1973, 963-64, and Fisher 2023, esp. 378. I continue to subscribe to the idea put forward by Fantasia and Carusi (2004) that the fear of sharing, and thereby diminishing, the value of the material benefits associated with Athenian citizenship, including the recently reinvigorated distributions of money from the festival fund (*theorikon*), was a contributing factor to the *diapsephisis*.

by a widespread empirical phenomenon or rather by anxieties generated by the massive and structural presence of immigrants, whether legal or undocumented, in the country.⁸⁶ In reality, according to voting-rights organizations, despite the negligible number of proved cases of non-citizen voting, measures intended to address this issue may instead result in the removal of legally entitled voters—primarily naturalized citizens—from electoral rolls, as well as in legislation that makes voting more difficult for disadvantaged groups.⁸⁷ Returning to Classical Athens, my impression is that the sharing of too many pieces of what it meant to be a citizen, and of what should ideally and practically distinguish a citizen from a non-citizen, did not lead to the tacit erosion of the boundaries between the two groups. Rather, it prompted a decisive reaction in defense of the privileges of citizenship, whether such a reaction was warranted or not.

My final observation concerns the long-term impact of these dynamics. In the Hellenistic age, we observe a significant increase in the practice of granting citizenship to individuals as a reward for benefactions to the city. This development does not imply that the barriers between citizens and non-citizens became more permeable, nor that the distinction between them lost its meaning. Rather, exclusive citizenship was, so to speak, relaxed, and citizenship grants based on wealth became increasingly more common.⁸⁸ However, as Christel Müller has pointed out, the second and first centuries should not necessarily be regarded as the moment when the rules governing integration into the civic body became decidedly more flexible, since these dynamics were probably already taking shape as early as the fourth or third centuries.⁸⁹ In this respect, it seems

86 On the negligible phenomenon of non-citizens voting, see the recent report by the non-profit organization *The Center for Election Innovation and Research*: <https://electioninnovation.org/research/noncitizen-analysis/> (consulted on 30.11.2025).

87 On actions aimed at preventing voter purges, see the recent report by the non-profit organization *Campaign Legal Center*: <https://campaignlegal.org/cases-actions/protecting-all-americans-illegal-voter-purges-and-wrongful-voter-challenges> (consulted on 30.11.2025).

88 As shown by Osborne (1983, IV, 204-5), Athenian citizenship was granted with great liberality by the first century, and by the latter part of the century it was effectively being sold; however, a more open policy toward naturalization emerges already from the early 220s onward. As Niku (2007, 13-58 and 145-52) points out, while these developments did not erase the distinction between citizens and non-citizens, they did weaken it considerably as wealth replaced citizenship as the primary factor in determining an individual's status; also *metoikia*, as a comprehensive system regulating the official status of foreign residents in Athens, was progressively undermined during the third century and had probably disappeared by c. 229. For some adjustments to Osborne's argument, see Oliver 2007a.

89 See Müller 2023c, esp. 499-501, for the factors that contributed to the evolution of the concept of citizenship in Hellenistic *poleis*. It is also worth noting that by the late 2nd century, power in the Athenian constitution had shifted from officials chosen by lot and the popular assembly to elite institutions, such as elected magistrates and the Areopagus (see Habicht 1997, 315-28); this meant that political activity lost much of its broad participatory character and that citizenship no longer necessarily entailed direct involvement in the city's governing institutions.

to me that the impetus gained by the utilitarian approach to the integration of non-citizens into the *polis* community in the second half of the fourth century may be identified as one of the factors that, over time, contributed to a different evaluation of the credentials granting access to citizenship.