Susan Lape
Work in Progress

Before Race: Theorizing Athenian Citizen Identity

Who are the citizens?

Did racialism or race ideologies exist in the classical Greek world? Did the ancient Greeks believe that there were hereditary or quasi-biological differences between people or groups? And if they did, did they attach moral or political weight to these differences? Although it is not possible to answer these questions for the ancient Greeks as a whole, there is strong evidence that Athenian citizens embraced a race ideology that worked to validate the political status of citizens and to differentiate them from everyone else, i.e., from all non-citizens. Although this is an admittedly contentious claim, it is solidly grounded in the sources: Athenian oratory of all varieties and cultural productions like tragedy and comedy. But rather than launching into an elaboration of precisely what it means to claim that Athenian citizen identity was defined in part with reference to a race ideology, I want to begin by considering the conditions that led to its production.

The historical emergence of Athenian citizenship as both an institution and an ethos or identity has been well demonstrated by scholars in the last generation or so.[i] The passage of laws defining the privileges and protections of all free male inhabitants of Attica, religious rituals, and hoplite warfare were integral to this process. These domains offered practical and symbolic resources through which individuals could identify as citizens and, at the same time, provided activities that served to define citizenship itself. Yet, while military, politico-legal, and religious practices are important for the evolving history of Athenian citizen identity, they offer only part of the story. They tell us 'what makes the citizen' or 'what the citizen does', but they do not tell us *who* the citizens are. In Athens, competence and ability were never decisive factors in identifying the citizen. In all historical periods - with the possible exception of the Cleisthenic revolution – there was a stark discrepancy between the number of residents in Attica capable of fulfilling at least some of the duties associated with citizenship and the actual number of citizens.[ii] This

disparity was in no way regarded as an aberration or a problem. In Athens and elsewhere in the Greek world, citizenship was expected to be exclusive rather than inclusive.[iii]

From the beginning of citizenship (roughly the seventh century), the Athenians used birth norms to identify the citizens and to bound the citizen body. These birth norms, however, were defined differently in different historical periods. In chronological order, the birth criteria for citizenship shift from 'free birth from an Athenian father' to 'free legitimate birth from an Athenian father ' to 'free legitimate birth from an Athenian father and an Athenian mother.' Over time, these criteria - along with the beliefs they fostered and the cultural practices they required -became central to the on-going process of democratic citizen identity. To put it another way, the criteria for citizenship became inflected with the values and ideology of the political community to which they delineated access, despite the fact that democracy's ancient critics as well as many modern historians deny the political salience of birth – however it is defined.[iv] Rather than leaving their birth identities behind upon entering the political domain, the Athenians viewed the circumstances of their birth as intimately connected to their identity, and eventually to their competence, as democratic citizens.

Law, Ethnic Nationalism, and the Emergence of Athenian citizen identity

What were the basic reference points of Athenian citizen identity? What stories encouraged individuals to recognize themselves first and foremost as Athenian (and eventually) democratic citizens? There is a growing body of work that seeks to answer these questions by taking seriously at least some Athenian invocations of birth and ancestry.[v] In different ways, this work links Athenian citizen identity to what might be called ethnic-nationalism, suggesting that processes of ethnic and/or national identity worked together to create and maintain citizen identity.[vi] Accordingly, I begin by building on this work, reviewing the rise of ethnic nationalist components of Athenian citizen identity in the fifth and sixth centuries. In so doing, I aim to show not only that

processes of ethnic nationalism were important to citizen identity – in ways that have yet to be fully explored and appreciated – but also to point to the limits of such models when we consider the evidence dating from after the passage of Periclean citizenship law in 451/0. This law tightened the birth requirements for citizenship, mandating that citizens have two Athenian parents (rather than one) and hence drew attention to the circumstances of the citizen's birth and the implications of his parentage. In so doing, the law encouraged hereditarian narratives that, I argue, articulate a racialized conception of citizen identity.

To begin then, what is ethnic nationalism? For present purposes, I use this phrase as a shorthand to characterize various modern views linking citizen identity to ethnic identity, nationalist processes, and/or a combination of the two.[vii] Ethnic and national identities appear to have much in common: both are defined with reference to a belief in shared ancestry and an association with a specific territory (inter alia).[viii] In addition, both recruit kinship ideology to figure the individual's connection and obligation to the larger collectivity.[ix] The difference between the ethnic and national identities can be viewed as a matter of emphasis: whereas ethnic identities attach more weight to the element of common descent, national identities often give priority to the element of territory (although it is usually figured in terms of kinship, i.e., the mother- or fatherland) and, in some cases, to public and/or political institutions.[x] Some scholars, however, explicitly oppose ethnic and national identities to political identities like citizenship. They point out that political identities are defined politically, that is, by legal rules, a political culture, and in some cases, a presumed compact among members.[xi] Accordingly, they see the emphasis on common descent associated with ethnic nationalism as, by definition, non-political. The problem with this distinction, however, is that it begs the question by assuming the existence of the political entity in question. As soon as we attempt to identify who the citizens are, we are brought back to notionally non-political considerations of birth and to the domain of ethnic nationalism, at least in the ancient Athenian context.[xii]

From the beginning, Athenian citizen identity had something to do with nationalist processes and probably with ethnicity as well, although the evidence is too sparse to be certain here. The first written law code at Athens was passed by Drakon in about 622/1 in response to the Kylonian crisis. For a variety of reasons, scholars have seen the passage of this code as pivotal to the development of citizenship at Athens. Their arguments, however, have necessarily had to be speculative since all that survives of the code, if indeed it was a fully elaborated code, is part of the homicide law. Moreover, the extant portion of the law does not contain the word for citizen.[xiii] In describing the penalty for the unjust killing of a man accused of involuntary murder, the law states "if anyone kills the killer or is responsible for his death, as long as he stays away from the frontier markets, games, and Amphiktyonic sacrifices, he shall be liable to the same treatment as one who kills an Athenian."[xiv] Significantly, the law employs the national or polis designation *Athênaios* – where we might have expected a term for citizen – perhaps *politis*.[xv] This suggests that the citizen was identified and came into being as an ethnic national.[xvi] At the same time, however, the law code itself probably had a hand in creating and consolidating Athenianness as a collective identity for residents of Attica. These suppositions are supported by the fact that archaic laws are usually couched in the language of status, establishing rules and procedures specifically for freemen and slaves (rather than for ethnic nationals).[xvii] Accordingly, with the apparently innovative use of the term *Athênaios* to designate the fully entitled resident of Attika, the Drakonian law appears to be adumbrating a conception of citizenship.

We are on much firmer ground in tracing the genesis of citizen identity about a generation later when Solon passed a new set of laws for the Athenians. Due to civil unrest, Solon had been invited to act as an arbiter to reconcile the disparate factions in the community. To this end, he passed new legislation, replacing all of Drakon's provisions except the homicide law. Solon's laws are important in numerous ways for the formation and consolidation of citizen identity. Just as Solon described himself as a boundary stone between the powerful and the weak, his laws created and formalized spatial, legal, and psychological boundaries that gave greater definition to the city and its citizens.[xviii] Solon's law abolishing loans on the body of the citizen was most important in

this regard.[xix] By distinguishing citizens and slaves on the basis of the alienability of their bodies, the law implicitly created a right of bodily freedom for the citizen, thereby giving new substance to the emerging institution of citizenship.[xx] Yet, although the law and its privileges now provided a source of citizen identity, this identity was not devoid of ethnic content. For the practical effect of the law was to ensure that all slaves in Athens would be foreign and, conversely, that all citizens would be natives.[xxi] In implementing this provision, Solon insists that he brought back many Athenians who had been sold into slavery abroad, Athenians who no longer knew how to speak Attic Greek. People who lived abroad and no longer knew Attic Greek were presumably either sold as children or actually born in a place where Attic Greek was not the dominant language. We might question how such people were identified as Athenians. The most probable answer is that ancestry made one "Athenian", a national, and hence, a citizen.

Finally, Solon's laws also redefined the way birth and ancestry were understood for purposes of civic membership. In the Drakonian period, free native birth in Attika seems to have been sufficient to render one a citizen or fully entitled member of the community. This is clarified by the status distinctions articulated in the Drakonian provisions for justifiable homicide. An Athenian man could kill any man he found with his wife, mother, sister, daughter, or "concubine (*pallakê*) kept for producing free children (*eleutherois paisin*)" without fear of legal reprisal.[xxii] Although the law draws a distinction between the wife and the concubine, both women were able to bear socially viable offspring because the primary status distinction organizing social identity in the early polis was the distinction between free persons and slaves.[xxiii] In other words, what counted was freedom rather the legitimacy. Solon's laws, however, would permanently change this situation. They gave new political salience to legitimacy, making it a requirement for full membership in both the family and polis. [xxiv] In so doing, they excluded free Athenian bastards from citizenship and full family membership.

Cleisthenes' democratic reforms usher in the next stage in the evolving history of Athenian citizenship, although they do not actually change the Solonian kinship criteria. In his effort to remake the polis, Cleisthenes replaced the four traditional Ionian tribes

with ten new tribes named after native heroes (with the exception of Ajax).[xxv] Members of each tribe were styled as descendants of their eponymous tribal hero.[xxvi] According to some theories, Cleisthenes reinvented the Athenian tribes to dissociate Athens from the Ionian cities in Asia Minor.[xxvii] Although Athens would continue to be known as an Ionian city, a fact the Athenians exploited for imperial ends in the fifth century, the tribal reform did take hold, giving the city a new ethnic-national identity that distinguished Athenians from all other Greeks.

Cleisthenes also divided the Attic territory into 139 demes based on traditional local centers and neighborhoods. Although Cleisthenes did not change the criteria for citizenship, he put citizenship on a more formal basis by establishing new procedures to regulate it at the deme level. Thereafter, admission to the deme became the formal mark of citizenship. Although this might seem like a new territorial definition of citizenship, the territorial ingredient was prioritized only in the initial foundation of the system. Thereafter, deme membership became hereditary.[xxviii] In keeping with the deme's new importance, Cleisthenes also changed the system of Athenian naming. Traditionally, the Athenians used patronymics, taking their last name from their fathers' first name. After Cleisthenes, citizens were to be named "x of deme y," although in reality deme names coexisted with, rather than replaced, patronymics.[xxix] The change in nomenclature is often linked to the tradition that Cleisthenes enrolled foreigners, metics, and slaves into the new tribes.[xxx] According to this view, the new names offered a way to disguise the servile and foreign origins of the new citizens.

This remaking of the citizen body was part of a one-time revolutionary event.[xxxi] The criteria for citizenship continued to be legitimate free birth from an Athenian father of like standing. In other words, the enfranchisement of slaves and other foreigners did not disturb the traditional norms of citizenship. In fact, during the first half of the fifth century the Athenians began to more strongly emphasize their ethnic unity and civic solidarity by promoting the myth of autochthony - the story that Athenian citizens were descended from one or more autochthonous beings. Already in the archaic period, the Athenians are associated with autochthonous deities (Cecrops and Erechtheus). At some

unknown time, however, these deities were reconceived as human autochthonous beings, the first two Athenian kings. Erechtheus, the more important figure for the political manifestations of the autochthony story, appears as one of Cleisthenes' new eponymous tribal heroes. This implies that he was viewed as the ancestor of one Athenian tribe, of one-tenth of the citizen population. By the first half of the fifth century, however, evidence from the visual arts shows that Erechtheus was reinvented as a common ancestor for all Athenian citizens.[xxxii]

During the same period, the autochthonous ancestry of Athenian citizens was also elaborated as a political discourse. The public funeral was instituted in Athens around 470 to commemorate the war dead at the end of each year of fighting. One of the central elements of the funeral was the public oration delivered by prominent citizen to a gathering of citizens and non-citizens.[xxxiii] Although we do not have any extant specimens of early funeral oratory, praise of the autochthonous origins of the citizen body is formulaic in fourth-century specimens of the genre.[xxxiv] Judging from the evidence of Herodotus and tragedy attesting that many formulaic elements of fourth-century funeral oratory were current in the fifth century, it seems reasonable to suppose the emphasis on citizen's autochthonous ancestry was also elaborated in fifth-century funeral oratory.

The myth of autochthony became the founding fiction of democratic citizen identity in part because it supplied a highly useful identity narrative, offering an explanation for Athenian military and imperial practices, a way of differentiating Athens from other cities, a way of differentiating men from women, and a rationale for democratic political equality (inter alia).[xxxv] In the wake of Persian Wars, autochthony gave the Athenians a way to conceptualize their identity as citizens that retrospectively explained their remarkable military successes. That is to say, the Athenians could account for their victories by pointing to the innate martial prowess that autochthonous ancestry was thought to provide. As the Athenians became an imperial power in their own right during the 460's, the discourse of autochthony supplied a narrative that not only explained but also justified the city's new imperial practices. According to the myth, when seeking to rape the goddess Athena, the god Hephaestus accidentally ejaculated on her thigh. His

seed subsequently fell to the ground, impregnating the earth. When Erechtheus was born as a result, Athena oversaw the infant's care, entrusting him to the daughters of Cecrops. By emphasizing this side of the myth, the Athenians could portray themselves as favorites of the gods and as a chosen people whose imperial mission had divine approval.[xxxvi] In the international context, autochthony also gave the Athenians a way to differentiate themselves from both their allies and enemies. In contrast to the Spartans and Thebans, the Athenians could trumpet pure Hellenic lineage, that they were unmixed with barbarians. [xxxvii] At the same, by pointing out that they did not win their land by bloody conquest, like the Spartans and Thebans, they also emphasized their freedom from hereditary blood stains.[xxxviii] Finally, in the domestic contest, autochthony supplied a means to conceptualize the citizen's democratic political identity: equality of birth offered a foundation for political equality.[xxxix]

Transforming Myth into Law

Clearly, autochthony was good to think with. It hardly seems accidental that within a generation or so of the rise of this political myth, the Athenians passed a new citizenship law symbolically expressing and reinforcing its nativist ideology.[xl] In 451/0, on Pericles' proposal, the Athenians passed the first formal citizenship law (that we know of), stipulating that candidates for citizenship have a native mother and a native father. [xli] Although the language of the law as we have it does not mention marriage, the majority of scholars see marriage as standing behind the law.[xlii] This is because there was no way, apart from legitimate marriage, that Athenian men could gain legitimate sexual access to Athenian daughters. Before discussing the meaning and impact of the law in greater detail, it should be emphasized that the law established criteria for citizenship that proved to be enduring, lasting throughout the history of the democracy. The only occasion when the Athenians actually relaxed the law seems to have occurred toward the end of the Peloponnesian War after the disaster in Sicily. Because of the acute shortage of citizen men, the Athenians passed a measure (c. 413) allowing an Athenian citizen to produce

children with a native woman and with an additional woman (D.L. 2.26).[xliii] The language in which this provision is reported suggests that the concession was against monogamous marriage rather than the nativity requirement per se. That is, the law seems to have allowed an Athenian man to father legitimate children with two Athenian women. However, the concession was short-lived. After the oligarchic rule of the Thirty tyrants and the civil war that brought them down, the Athenians re-founded the democracy, passing two decrees that reinstated the Periclean citizenship system.[xliv] Athenaeus provides the following account of one of the laws:

> In the archonship of Eucleides, Aristophon the orator proposed a law that whoever was not born from a native woman (*astês*) should be a bastard (*nothos*), was himself represented by the comic poet Kalliades/Kallias as having produced children by the hetaira Choregis, as Carystius records (Ath. 577bc = *FGrH* 358 F 11). [xlv]

By using the term bastard to designate the non-citizen, this law underlines the connections between citizenship, marriage, and legitimacy.[xlvi] In the fourth century, the Athenians passed additional laws more explicitly emphasizing the role of marriage as an institution of citizenship. The *graphê xenias* criminalized mixed marriages, defining the illegal alien as a male or female who fraudulently entered into marriage with a citizen.[xlvii] Although the Periclean law had implicitly prohibited this practice, the new law established a formal penalty for transgressors. Thereafter, male citizens whose wives were found to be aliens would be fined one-thousand drachmas, while their sham wives were sold into slavery.[xlviii] An additional law passed in the fourth century targeted Athenian men who attempted to pass off non-citizen women in legitimate marriages to unsuspecting citizens.[xlix] Citizens convicted of this offense suffered disfranchisement (*atimia*) and the loss of all their property.

The reenactment of the Periclean system after the civil war and the additional legislation passed during the fourth century underlines that the Periclean law established a de facto ban on mixed (inter-polis) marriage. Although the Periclean law did not prevent men

from living in informal unions with foreign women in Athens, it did prohibit them from marrying these women. This restriction was a significant disincentive because any children issuing from mixed unions would be excluded from full heirship and from citizenship; in other words, they would be outsiders in family and state. Although we do not know exactly what prompted the Athenians to pass a law that effectively forbid mixed marriages in 451/0, many scholars contend that it was directed against aristocrats.[l] This is because the Athenian men most likely to marry foreign women were aristocrats, figures who traditionally used marriage as a vehicle to forge ties and seal alliances across polis lines.[li] Whether or not the law was intended to eliminate aristocratic interpolis marriage exchange, it did achieve this effect. But some scholars point out that the age of aristocratic marriage exchange actually ended generations earlier.[lii] They argue that there was no need for the polis to pass a law to curtail a practice that Athenians had mostly given up on their own. Although the evidence does not permit us to do more than speculate about the aims and purposes behind the law, it seems reasonable to consider not only what the law forbid but also what it encouraged. For the banning of mixed marriages is simply the converse of a tacit injunction to make unmixed Athenian marriages.

The passage of a law requiring future citizens to have Athenian mothers and fathers, i.e. unmixed parentage, rather obviously dovetails with the political myth of autochthony and its emphasis on the unmixed ancestry that all citizens were presumed to possess. That is, the law seems to translate the ethnic national foundation of citizen identity encapsulated in the myth into a new legal and political reality. Yet, it would be hasty to presume that the operation of the law served only to express a pre-existing ideology. By requiring that citizens have two Athenian parents, the law fostered the belief that both parents contributed something to the Athenianness of their children and, conversely, that having a foreign parent made a person 'foreign' by nature to the city and its democracy. In so doing, the operation of the law changed the way Athenians thought about their birth and their identity as citizens.

Before the passage of the Periclean citizenship law, there is no evidence that citizens with known foreign ancestry were perceived to be a threat to the polis or its democracy.

Indeed, the children of Thracian (and hence barbarian) women served as prominent politicians and generals during the first half of the fifth century. In a generation or so after the law's passage, however, such children were not only barred from citizenship, but were also viewed as incapable of genuine patriotism and democratic loyalty. The evidence for this new strain of hereditarian thought derives mainly from Old Comedy and Attic oratory. For instance, Aristophanes' *Frogs* mocks Kleophon, a democratic leader, for his Thracian speech and barbarian origins.[liii] In the fourth century, Aeschines explains why this is so bad: he describes Kleophon as an illegally enrolled citizen who corrupted the demos with monetary distributions and who threatened to kill anyone who advised peace with Sparta (2.76). The logic is clear: compromised birth leads to corrupt policies and loyalties.[liv]

Although having the right birth and bloodlines were never all that was needed to be a good citizen, not having the requisite ancestry came to be viewed as an insurmountable barrier to good citizenship. For instance, in the fourth century we find the idea that it is impossible for those with mixed bloodlines to impersonate good citizens. In his speech *Against Meidias*, Demosthenes explains that Meidias was bought by a female citizen and raised as a legitimate citizen's son. He emphasizes, however, that despite acquiring the cultural education of a democratic citizen, Meidias cannot pass as a citizen because his barbarian nature constantly shows through in his anti-democratic conduct.[lv] It seems that assimilation is impossible because genuine mixing is impossible. Any amount of foreign ancestry trumps native descent, at least as far as Athenian comic poets and orators are concerned. Whereas Herodotus can speak of a people as ethnically mixed, as for instance *Hellenoskuthai* (4.17), such a conception is unknown in the context of Athenian civic discourse. When Demosthenes' political opponents attribute his traitorous conduct to his maternal Scythian ancestry, they do not refer him to him as ethnically mixed (as a *Hellenoskuth*) but rather as a "Greek-speaking barbarian" (3.173).

Accordingly, the legal emphasis on bilateral Athenian nativity was a two-way street, emphasizing both the purity and the vulnerability of Athenian bloodlines. This is clear

from the nature of the attacks directed against politicians in oratory and comedy, from the existence of trials for *xenia*, and from the periodic scrutinies the Athenians conducted to weed out aliens feared to be passing as citizens.[lvi] This fear also reshaped the traditional discourse of autochthony. Although the myth might seem to have implied that citizen bloodlines were vulnerable from the beginning, its initial reliance on traditional aristocratic ideology preempted any such concerns.

The Athenian discourse of autochthony borrowed heavily from the prior aristocratic tradition, appropriating its language of noble birth and, crucially for present purposes, its mystified form of inheritance.[lvii] The Greek aristocrat's claim to fame was having *eugeneia* – noble birth - which was precisely what autochthonous ancestry secured for all Athenians.[lviii] To lay claim to *eugeneia,* the aristocrat needed to possess a mother or a father with a recognized claim to *eugeneia*.[lix] Practically speaking, this meant having a parent who hailed from a family with a heroic or divine family founder. Although genealogical information might seem to have been necessary to verify aristocratic identity, Rosalind Thomas has shown that aristocratic genealogies usually extended back no more than three or four generations.[lx] These genealogies link a contemporary figure to a noble or heroic family founder, but elide the middle figures in the line of descent in a telescoping characteristic of genealogical practice in oral cultures.[lxi] In the ancient Greek context, there was no need to construct complete vertical genealogies because the original family founder or primogenitor was believed to possess "enough power and strength to sustain the family and to fix its value once and for all without any possible doubt."[lxii] This conceit rendered the complete vertical genealogy irrelevant. At the same time, it also diminished the significance of horizontal genealogy and bilateral affiliation. That is, it did not matter who an aristocrat propagated with because his or her child would inevitably be an aristocrat.[lxiii] The power of the family founder precluded the possibility of diluted or tainted aristocratic bloodlines.[lxiv]

These are precisely the assumptions that the discourse of autochthony appropriated and capitalized on. All citizens could be described as having a nobility derived from the possession of one or more autochthonous ancestors, despite the fact that the generational

links between the autochthonous past and political present were unknown and uninvestigated. The intervening links simply did not matter because the ancestral potency was imagined to be conveyed in tact through the generations. The operation of the Periclean citizenship law, however, appears to have altered this perception. In ~ 418, Euripides produced a new version of the autochthony story emphasizing that Athenian bloodlines were always pure or free from foreign influence.[lxv] His *Ion* dramatizes the transition from the mythic domain of autochthonous beings to the historical time of sexual reproduction. By presenting Kreousa as Erechtheus' only child to bear children, Euripides highlights her role in the transmission of autochthonous ancestry.[lxvi] The problem, however, is that in the conventional myth Kreousa was given in marriage to Xouthos, a foreigner, to repay him for giving key military assistance to the Athenians. Accordingly, Ion, their child, had mixed parentage. Although this was not problematic in the context of the traditional myth, after the passage of the Periclean law it suggested that Athenian bloodlines were tainted almost from the beginning. Euripides plays on this tension by projecting the citizenship laws back into this mythic past. Kreousa's attendants repeatedly disparage her husband as an outsider and interloper in the pure city.[lxvii] And when Ion is told that Xouthos is his father, he refuses to come to Athens because he knows he will be stigmatized as the son of a foreigner, a bastard in the familial language of Athenian citizenship (589-92, 673-75). Simply put, Kreousa must have a child to transmit her autochthonous ancestry but her foreign husband cannot actually father that child. Euripides solves the problem by changing the myth, making the god Apollo rather than Xouthos Ion's true parent.[lxviii] Although this portrayal is not without its own complications and irony, the important point is that by 418 it has apparently become natural and obvious to view autochthony through the contemporary rules of Athenian citizenship.

Athenian Racialism: After Ethnicity and *Before* Race

Even from this necessarily truncated account of the history of Athenian citizen identity, it is clear that the operation of the Periclean citizenship law not only changed the criteria

for citizenship but also fundamentally changed the way citizen identity was conceived. The question, then, centers on how to characterize this new paradigm or narrative. The core proposition fostered by the law is the notion that citizens inherit politically meaningful traits from their parents. With a slight shift in emphasis, the concept of racialism or race ideology (terms I use as synonyms) captures this new quasi-biological conception.[lxix] Anthony Appiah's defines racialism as the view "that there are heritable characteristics, possessed by members of our species, that allow us to divide them into a small set of races, in such a way that all the members of these races share certain traits and tendencies with each other that they do not share with members of any other race."[lxx] Rather than dividing the human species into races, Athenian race ideology drew the distinction between citizens and non-citizens.

According to Appiah, racialism only becomes pernicious when a group's supposed inherited traits are given political or moral salience.[lxxi] Political weighting is obviously involved in the Athenian case since racialism operates in the context of an explicitly political group, i.e., the citizens. Citizens were thought to inherit love and loyalty for the polis, piety toward its gods, and a commitment to its distinctive democratic form of government.[lxxii] The evidence for this hereditarian thinking serves as an important counter to conventional arguments that race and racialism were lacking in the classical Greek world. For instance, in a recent study George Fredrickson argues that racism and proto-racism were absent from the classical Greek world because the Greeks tended to attribute human differences to environmental factors rather than to heredity.[lxxiii] Although many Greeks did in fact endorse ecological views of human diversity, Athenian citizens ascribed their own difference and distinction to heredity, birth, and bloodlines. One might object that many Greeks understood their identity in vague hereditarian terms (e.g., aristocrats, Spartans) but that this understanding was not tied to a race ideology. At this juncture, we need to draw a distinction between individual and group inheritance. In *Race Mixture Among the Greeks*, A. Diller argues that the problem of inborn qualities presented itself to the Greeks in the individual aspect much more vividly than in the collective or racial aspect.[lxxiv] Most of the evidence supports this claim. The hereditarian beliefs associated with aristocratic ideology are based on what the individual was

presumed to have received from the original family founder. In other words, Greek aristocrats were not united by the belief that they shared a group inheritance. Similarly, although Spartan practices imply various hereditarian beliefs, they are geared to producing the best possible genetic endowment for individual Spartans. In other words, Spartan reproductive practices are eugenic rather than racial in orientation. By contrast, Athenian civic discourse often expresses a conception of collective inheritance. For instance, Athenian funeral oratory not only transvalues the previously aristocratic concept of *eugeneia*, but it also the collectivizes the conception of inheritance it assumes; that is, Athenian civic discourse makes *eugeneia* the property of the citizen group rather than of individual aristocrats. To cite one example, Hyperides explicitly casts autochthony as a source of collective inheritance:

> Shall I trace the descent (g°now) of each [of the dead]? To do so would, I think, be foolish. Granted, when praising certain other men who, though originating in various different locales, gathered together to live in a single polis, each one contributing his own bloodline (g°now), one must trace each man's separate genealogy. But in making speeches concerning Athenian men, autochthonous and sharing in common a lineage of unsurpassed nobility (eÈg°neian), I believe that to praise ancestry on an individual level (fid€a[i tå] g°nh)is unnecessary (6.6-7).

****

Although there is abundant evidence linking Athenian citizen identity to a belief in the group inheritance of special characteristics, the use of the term racialism to describe it might nevertheless appear controversial. The concept of ethnicity (with slight modification) might seem equally applicable. For ethnic identities are often elaborated from an insider's perspective and are thus concerned with a sense of 'us-ness', precisely the vantage point from which I am analyzing Athenian citizen identity. By contrast, race ideologies often target outsiders, focusing on exclusion rather than inclusion.[lxxv] This suggests that the representation of various outsiders in the Athenian polis might be a

profitable site for investigating racialism. We know that the Athenians and the Greeks in general habitually defined themselves against others imagined to embody who and what and what they were not.[lxxvi] In a recent study, however, Christopher Tuplin argues that the classical Greek world had too many targets for racism, too many 'others' to characterize any one group in racial terms.[lxxvii] Whether or not this conclusion is warranted, it is important to notice that what Tuplin labels as racism is the altero-referential variety most common in contemporary cultures. But race ideologies can also be primarily auto-referential in orientation. That is, they can focus on the positive qualities and characteristics possessed by members of a dominant group to justify their power, privilege, or entitlements.[lxxviii] In other words, race ideologies can articulate the sense of 'us-ness' that Micheal Banton associates with ethnic identities while operating in the context of power relations traditionally associated with race ideologies rather than ethnic identities.[lxxix] Accordingly, one reason for employing racialism rather than ethnicity in the Athenian context is because we are explicitly dealing with power dynamics, with the ideological strategies and institutional structures deployed by a dominant group to justify its position.

At this juncture, I should note that the definition of ethnicity has recently been undergoing an expansion to encompass what was considered 'racial' before 1945.[lxxx] This move has allowed academics and others to emphasize the social construction of identities and to distance themselves from the essentialist and biological claims associated with race. To a certain extent, classical scholars have followed this trend, focusing on ethnic identities and eschewing the racial.[lxxxi] But this turn to ethnicity is not without difficulties. First, it seems to equate analyzing an identity constructed in biological and essentialist terms with endorsing an essentialist conception of identity. It is obviously possible to investigate how the Athenians constructed their identities as citizens without validating their claims or assumptions. Second, Denise McCosky cautions that classicists have construed ethnic identity so broadly that it may fail to capture key facets of ancient ideologies.[lxxxii] In other words, expanding the definition of ethnicity risks reducing its analytic value for studying identity.

Perhaps what is most surprising, however, is that the strategic deployment of ethnicity to present collective identities in constructionist terms has had little, if any, impact on the perceptions of ethnic actors. Anthropologists and cognitive psychologists have shown that social actors continue to understand both ethnic and racial identities in essentialist terms despite scientific evidence to the contrary and despite the efforts of academics.[lxxxiii] One of the leading theories proposed to explain the tenacity of both racial and ethnic essentialism in the modern world is the view that such ideologies recruit a basic human bias for essentialist reasoning.[lxxxiv] According to this view, human beings have a cognitive tendency to infer that certain kinds of things have essences: "an underlying reality or true nature, shared by members of a category, that one cannot observe directly but that gives an object its identity and is responsible for other similarities that category members share."[lxxxv] The easiest way to see essentialist reasoning at work to consider the case of natural kinds. In contrast to nominal kinds, which include things like pencils and other artifacts, natural kinds, animals, plants, and natural substances like gold, seem to be discovered in the world rather than arbitrarily created or stipulated. In addition, we reason about natural kinds differently than we reason about artifact categories. We assume that members of a natural kind share hidden non-obvious properties, in other words, an essence.

According to this theory, efforts to classify people according to race ideologies (and ethnicity) often succeed because they tap into a cognitive predisposition for making essentialist assumptions about natural kinds. In some cases, this transference is explicit, as when the Athenians and other Greeks liken human social groups to natural species kinds. To cite one pertinent example, in Aristophanes' *Wasps* the chorus of citizens are cast as wasps. The citizens embrace this identity because wasps were thought to be autochthonous (just like Athenians) and because wasps were imagined to possess the ideal characteristics of democratic citizens. They were regarded as exceptionally manly and especially quick to retaliate when provoked (1089-90, 1076-77, 1105). This example obviously does not prove that an essentialist reasoning system geared to process natural kinds was deployed to create a 'race' of citizens. Such metaphors are ubiquitous in many

cultures and show only that people draw on natural kind essentialism to make spurious essentialist claims about humans. Nevertheless, the relatively common occurrence of natural kind thinking in the context of Athenian civic ideology alerts us to an effort to essentialize the citizen group.

The connection between racialism and essentialism allows us to sidestep what might seem to be the most significant obstacle to applying the concept of racialism in the classical world, namely the modern folk concept of race as colored-coded.[lxxxvi] When race is construed mainly in terms of skin color, it easy to conclude that race and racism were absent in the classical world.[lxxxvii] Critical race theorists, however, argue that the marks of race and racial identities shift and change over time; in other words, they do not privilege skin color as the primary sign of race.[lxxxviii] Moreover, although race is commonly defined in terms of visible features today, the visible serves to index race's hidden essence. In many modern cases, (emblematized most dramatically in the one-drop rule that held sway in the American South) it is a person's putative insides, their invisible usually inherited essence that makes them a member of given race and justifies their special treatment – whether positive or negative.

Identity Matters

Using the concept of racialism offers the precision needed to render accurately one component of Athenian citizen identity and it opens up the possibility of comparative work. That is, Athenian race ideology may provide insight into the formation of race ideologies in other times and places and, conversely, race ideologies from other periods may shed light on the Athenian case. For instance, historians and sociologists argue that egalitarian ideologies in the Modern period have facilitated the rise of racism and race ideologies. In his recent history of racism and race ideology, George Fredrickson states:

> The fact that pre-Darwinian scientific racism flowered in France and the US more
> than in England may derive to some extent, paradoxical as it may seem, from the

revolutionary legacies of nation states premised on the equal rights of all citizens. Egalitarian norms required special reasons for exclusion.[lxxxix]

In modern Western societies, all individuals are theoretically born free and equal. In reality, however, inequality tends to be the rule. Race ideologies have helped reconcile the discrepancy between egalitarian ideals and existing inequalities by providing an implicit explanation for inequality and hierarchy. According to this logic, some people deserve unequal treatment because they are in their very being unequal, that is, racially inferior.

Upon initial consideration, the connection between racial and egalitarian ideologies might not seem to be relevant to classical Athens because its race ideology assisted in constituting an egalitarian political body; in other words, it was not deployed (altero-referentially) to stigmatize some people as less than human or less deserving of equality than others. Nevertheless, I would argue that the egalitarian connection is relevant to understanding the tenacity of Athenian racialism because of the particular problems political equality posed in the classical context. Although political equality was the norm in Athens, it never achieved the status of a given, something obvious, automatic, and in need of no justification.[xc] The notion that equality needs a foundation or justification may not immediately resonate with inhabitants of modern Western states because the ideals of human equality have for so long been authorized by the Christian tradition.[xci] But in the pre-Christian world of classical Athens, there was no divinely sanctioned universalizing story about fundamental human equality on which to base political equality. Democrats, oligarchs, and aristocrats agreed with the principle of political equality.[xcii] But no one in a position of political power claimed that "all men were created equal." Rather, they sought to determine the characteristic or "one best thing" on which to base political equality.[xciii] Although the Athenians selected native birth as the one best thing, elite writers insisted that they were wrong to extrapolate from birth equality to political equality.[xciv] Race ideology helped solve this problem because it specifically associated the right kind of birth with the inheritance of politically salient qualities. At the same time, it emphasized a package of core qualities that all citizens could be said to share and

share equally, thereby providing a foundation for the strong principle of equality that pervaded Athenian political culture.[xcv]

Ideologically speaking, Athenian racialism did double duty in supporting democratic political equality and at the same time, in deflecting attention away from the stark economic inequalities between citizens. In contrast to citizens elsewhere in the Greek world, the Athenians never clamored for the state to redistribute the land on egalitarian terms. Although wealth was concentrated in the hands of the very few, the many could take comfort in belonging to a privileged class, namely the citizen body.[xcvi] In other words, their relative poverty was offset by their possession of a racialized political status that was inaccessible to foreigners, resident aliens, slaves, and women. The terms in which Euxitheos' defends his citizenship in Demosthenes' *Against Eubulides* suggest precisely this process. As one of the strikes against Euxitheos' citizenship, his opponents charge that his mother worked as a ribbon seller in the agora, an occupation associated with poor foreigners. Although Euxitheos readily admits to his family's poverty, he deflects the accusations against his status by insisting on his *eugeneia*, (the specific nobility of citizenship), pointing out that he was chosen to draw lots for the priesthood of Heracles (57.46). He argues that if there were any cloud on his birth, someone would have surely blocked his nomination to prevent an alien from sacrificing on behalf of the citizens (57.47).

The case of Euxitheos suggests that the racial narrative of citizen identity was powerful because it performed important ideological work in papering over the stark discrepancy between the political equality and economic inequality in the Athenian polis. This may help explain the remarkable tenacity of Athenian race ideology. Although the Athenians did discuss revising the birth norms of citizenship in moments of military crisis, they were unable to take such a step when they were most threatened by a foreign power. According to one prominent politician, the very idea that the Athenians considered giving up on their autochthonous bloodlines after a major military defeat was both shameful and tragic. This strain of Athenian thinking seems to bear out the connection between identity and action, that what an individual or group can do intentionally hinges on who

they think they are.[xcvii] Athenian race ideology enabled and encouraged political participation by making it the birth right of all citizens, irrespective of traditional considerations of wealth or family background. At the same time, however, this ideology seems to have meant that the Athenians had to keep being who they were...

Partial Bibliography

Anderson, B. (1983). *Imagined communities : reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism.* London.

Anderson, G. (2003). *The Athenian experiment : building an imagined political community in ancient Attica, 508-490 B.C.* Ann Arbor.

Appiah, K. A. (2005). *The ethics of identity*. Princeton.

_____. (1990). "Racisms." *Anatomy of racism*. D. T. Goldberg. Minneapolis: 3-17.

Arnheim, M. T. W. (1977). *Aristocracy in Greek society*. Boulder.

Atran, S. (1998). "Folk biology and the Anthropology of Science: Cognitive Universals and Cultural Particulars." *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* **21**: 547-609.

Badian, E. (2000). "Back to Kleisthenic chronology. *Polis & politics*." P. Flensted-Jensen, T. H. Nielsen and L. Rubinstein. Copenhagen**:** 447-462.

Balibar, E. and I. M. Wallerstein (1991). *Race, nation, class: ambiguous identities*. London and New York.

Banton, M. and J. Harwood (1975). *The Race Concept*. New York.

Banton, M. P. (1998). *Racial theories*. Cambridge.

_____. (1983). *Racial and Ethnic Competition*. Cambridge.

Bracken, H. (1973). "Essence, Accident, and Race." *Hermathena* **116**: 81-96.

_____. (1978). "Philosophy and Racism." *Philosophia* **8**(2): 81-96.

Broadbent, M. (1968). *Studies in Greek genealogy*. Leiden.

Carawan, E.M. 1998. *Rhetoric and the Law of Draco*. Oxford

Cartledge, P. (1996). "Comparatively Equal." *Demokratia: A Conversation on Democracies, Ancient and Modern*. J. Ober and C. Hedrick. Princeton**:** 175-185.

Cohen, B. 2001. "Ethnic Identity in Democratic Athens and the Visual Vocabulary of Male Costume." I. Malkin, ed., *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity*. Washington, D. C.:235-274.

Cohen, E. E. (2000). *The Athenian Nation*. Princeton.

Connor, W. (1994*). Ethnonationalism : the quest for understanding*. Princeton.

Connor, W. R. (1993). "The Ionian era of Athenian civic identity." *PaPhS* **137**: 194-206.

_____. (1994). "The Problem of Athenian Civic Identity. *Athenian Identity and Civic Ideology*. A. Boegehold and A. Scafuro. Baltimore and London**:** 34-44.

Dahl, R. 1989. *Democracy and Its Critics*. New Haven.

Davies, J. K. (1977/78). "Athenian Citizenship: the Descent Group and its Alternatives." *CJ* **73**: 105-21.

Detienne, M. (2003). "Being Born Impure in the City of Cadmus and Oedipus." *Arion* **10.3**: 35-47.

Detienne, M. (2003). Comment ãetre autochtone : du pur Athâenien au Fran*ĉ*ais racinâe. Paris.

Diller, A. (1937). *Race mixture among the Greeks before Alexander*. Urbana.

Donlan, W. (1999). *The aristocratic ideal and selected papers*. Wauconda.

Dougherty, C. (1996). "Democratic Contradictions and the Synoptic Illusions of Euripides' Ion." *Demokratia: A Conversation on Democracies, Ancient and Modern.* J. Ober and C. Hedrick. Princeton**:** 249-70.

Dover, K. J. (1974). *Greek popular morality in the time of Plato and Aristotle*. Oxford.

Eriksen, T. H. (1993). *Ethnicity and nationalism : anthropological perspectives*. London.

Euben, P. J. (1978). Political Equality and the Greek Polis. *Liberalism and the Modern Polity: Essays in Contemporary Political Theory*. M. J. G. McGrath. New York, Demand**:** 207-228.

Farenga, V. 2006. *Citizen and Self in Ancient Greece; Individuals Performing Justice and the Law*. Cambridge.

Finley, M. I. (1978). "The Fifth Century Athenian Empire: A Balance Sheet." *Imperialism in the Ancient World*. P. D. A. Garnsey and C. R. Whittaker. Cambridge**:** 103-26.

_____. 1959. "Was Greek Civilization Based on Slave Labor?" *Historia* 8: 145-64.

Fisher, N. R. E. (1992). *Hybris*. Warminster.

_____. (1995). "Hybris, status, and slavery." *The Greek World*. A. Powell. London and New York, Routledge**:** 44-84.

Fowler, R. (1998). "Genealogical Thinking, Hesiod's Catalogue, and Creation of the Hellenes." *PCPH* **44**: 1-19.

Fredrickson, G. M. (2002). *Racism : a short history*. Princeton.

Frost, F. J. (1994). "Aspects of Early Athenian Citizenship." *Athenian Identity and Civic Ideology*. A. L. Boegehold and A. C. Scafuro. Baltimore**:** 45-56.

Gagarin, M. (1981). *Drakon and early Athenian homicide law*. New Haven.

_____. (1986). *Early Greek law*. Berkeley.

Gelman, S. A. (2003). *The essential child : origins of essentialism in everyday thought*. Oxford.

Geertz, C. 1973. *The Interpretation of Cultures: Essays in Interpretative Anthropology.* New York.

Gil-White, F. (2001). "Are Ethnic Groups Biological "Species" to the Human Brain?" *Current Anthropology* **42**(4): 515-554.

Goldberg, D. T. (2002). *The racial state*. Malden.

_____. (1993). *Racist culture philosophy and the politics of meaning*. Oxford.

Gotteland, S. (2001). L' origine des cités grecques dans les discours athéniens. <u>Origines Gentium</u>. V. Fromentin and S. Gotteland. Bordeaux, Ausonius.

Grace, E. (1973). "Status Distinctions in the Draconian Law." *Eirene* **11**: 5-30.

Guillaumin, C. (1995). *Racism, sexism, power, and ideology*. London.

Gutmann, A. (2003). *Identity in democracy*. Princeton.

Hacking, I. (1986). "Making up People." *Reconstructing Individualism: Autonomy, Individuality, and the Self in Western Thought*. T. Heller, M. Sousa and D. Wellbery. Stanford**:** 222-237.

_____. (1999). *The social construction of what?* Cambridge.

Hall, E. (1989). *Inventing the barbarian : Greek self-definition through tragedy*. Oxford.

Hall, J. M. (1997). *Ethnic Identity in Greek antiquity*. Cambridge.

_____. (2002). *Hellenicity : between ethnicity and culture*. Chicago.

Hannaford, I. (1996). *Race : the history of an idea in the West*. Washington, D.C.

Hansen, M. H. (1986). *Demography and democracy : the number of Athenian citizens in the fourth century B.C.* Herning.

Hanson, V._____. (1996). "Hoplites into Democrats: The Changing Ideology of the Athenian Infantry." *Demokratia: A Conversation on Democracies, Ancient and Modern*. J. Ober and C. Hedrick. Princeton**:** 289-312.

Harrison, A. R. W. (1968-71). *The law of Athens*. 2 vols. Oxford, Clarendon.

Hartog, F. c. (1988). *The mirror of Herodotus : the representation of the other in the writing of history*. Berkeley.

Harvey, F. D. (1965). "Two Kinds of Equality." *Classica et mediaevalia* **26**: 101-46.

Havelock, E. A. (1957). *The liberal temper in Greek politics*. New Haven.

Herman, G. (1987). *Ritualised friendship and the Greek city*. Cambridge.

Humphreys, S. C. (1974). "The Nothoi of Kynosarges." *JHS* **94**: 88-95.

_____. (1993). *The Family, Women , and Death*, Ann Arbor.

Ignatieff, M. (1995). *Blood and belonging : journeys into the new nationalism*. New York.

Isaac, B. H. (2004). *The invention of racism in classical antiquity*. Princeton.

Isaacs, H. R. (1975). *Idols of the tribe : group identity and political change*. New York.

Jenkins, R. (1997). *Rethinking ethnicity : arguments and explorations*. London.

Kapparis, K. (1999). *Apollodorus, 'Against Neaira' [D. 59]*. Berlin.

Kassel, R. and C. Austin, eds. 1983-. *Poetae Comici Graeci*. Berlin.

Kearns, E. (1989). *The heroes of Attica*. London.

Kierdorf, W. (1966). *Erlebnis und Darstelling der Perserkriege*. Gottingen.

Konstan, D. (2001c). :To Hellenikon ethnos: Ethnicity and the Construction of Ancient Greek Identity." *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity*. I. Malkin. Washington, DC, Center for Hellenic Studies**:** 29-50.

Kurke, L. (1991). *The traffic in praise : Pindar and the poetics of social economy*. Ithaca.

Lape, S. (2002/03). "Solon and the Institution of the Democratic Family Form." *CJ* **98**(2): 117-39.

_____. 2003. "Racializing Democracy: The Politics of Sexual Reproduction in Classical Athens." *Parallax*. Special Volume. "Declassifying Hellenism: Cultural Studies and the Classics. " eds. Karen Bassi and Peter Euben.

Loenen, D. (1926). "De nobilitate apud Athenienses." *Mnemosyne* **54**: 206-223.

Loraux, N. (1986). *The invention of Athens : the funeral oration in the classical city*. Cambridge.

_____. (1993). *The children of Athena : Athenian ideas about citizenship and the division between the sexes*. Princeton, N.J., Princeton University Press.

_____. (2000). *Born of the earth : myth and politics in Athens*. Ithaca.

Lotze, D. (1981). " "Zwischen Politen und Metöken: Passivbürger im klassichen Athen?"" *Klio* **63**: 159-178.

MacDowell, D. M. (1990). *Demosthenes, against Meidias (oration 21)*. Oxford.

_____. (1978). *The law in classical Athens*. Ithaca.

_____. (1976). "Bastards as Athenian Citizens." *CQ* **26**: 88-91.

_____. (1993). "Foreign Birth and Athenian citizenship in Aristophanes." *Tragedy, Comedy, and the Polis: Papers from the Greek Drama Conference*. A. H. Sommerstein, S. Halliwell, J. Henderson and B. Zimmermann. Bari**:** 359-372.

Manville, P. B. (1990). *The origins of citizenship in ancient Athens*. Princeton.

Manville, P. B. (1994). "Toward a New Paradigm of Athenian Citizenship." *Athenian Identity and Civic Ideology*. A. A. Boegehold and A. C. Scafuro. Baltimore**:** 21-33.

McCosky, D. E. (2003). "By Any Other Name: Ethnicity and the Study of Ancient Identity." *CB* **79.1**: 93-109.

Mehta, U. S. (1999). *Liberalism and empire : a study in nineteenth-century British liberal thought*. Chicago.

Mills, C. (1997). *The Racial Contract*. Ithaca, Cornell.

_____. (2000). "Race and the Social Contract Tradition." *Social Identities* **6**: 441-62.

Montanari, E. (1981). *Il mito dell'autoctonia : linee di una dinamica mitico-politica ateniese*. Rome.

Morris, I. (2000). *Archaeology as cultural history : words and things in Iron Age Greece*. Malden.

_____. (1996). "The Strong Principle of Equality and the Archaic Origins of Greek Democracy." *Dêmokratia: A Conversation on Democracies, Ancient and Modern*. J. Ober and C. Hedrick. Princeton**:** 19-48.

Mossé, C. 1991. "La Place de la *pallaké* dans la famille athénienne." In M. Gagarin, ed., *Symposium 1990: Vorträge zur griechischen und hellenistischen Rechtsgeschichte,* 273-9. Cologne.

Murray, O. (1980). *Early Greece*. Brighton.

Ober, J. (1989). *Mass and elite in democratic Athens : rhetoric, ideology, and the power of the people*. Princeton.

_____. (1996). *The Athenian revolution : essays on ancient Greek democracy and political theory*. Princeton.

_____. (1998). *Political dissent in democratic Athens : intellectual critics of popular rule*. Princeton.

Ober, J. and B. Strauss (1990). "Drama, Political Rhetoric, and the Discourse of Athenian Democracy." *Nothing to do with Dionysos?* J. J. W. a. F. I. Zeitlin. Princeton**:** 237-270.

Ogden, D. (1995). "Women and bastardy in ancient Greece and the Hellenistic World." *The Greek World*. A. Powell. London**:** 219-

244.

_____. (1996). *Greek bastardy in the classical and Hellenistic periods*. Oxford.

Osborne, R. (1997). "Law and the Representation of Women in Athens." *P&P* **155**: 3-33.

Ostwald, M. 2000. "Oligarchy and Oligarchs in Ancient Greece." In *Polis and Politics:*
    Studies in Ancient Greek History, eds., P.Flensted-Jensen, T. H. Nielsen, and L.

Rubinstein, 385-396. Copenhagen.

_____. 2000. "Popular Sovereignty and the Problem of Equality." *SCI* 19:1-13.

Parker, R. (2005). *Polytheism and society at Athens*. Oxford.

Patterson, C. (1981). *Pericles' Citizenship Law of 451-50 B.C*. New York.

_____. (1990). "Those Athenian Bastards." *CA* **9**: 39-73.

_____. (1991). "Marriage and Married Women in Athenian Law." *Women's History and Ancient History*. S. Pomeroy. Chapel Hill**:** 48-72.

_____. (1998). *The family in Greek history*. Cambridge.

Pomeroy, S. B. (1997). *Families in classical and Hellenistic Greece : representations and realities*. Oxford.

Raaflaub, K. A. (1996). "Equalities and Inequalities in Athenian Democracy."
Demokratia. J. Ober and C. Hedrick. Princeton**:** 139-174.

_____. (2004). *The discovery of freedom in ancient Greece*. Chicago.

Rhodes, P. J. (1981). *A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia*. Oxford.

Roberts, J. T. (1996). "Athenian Equality: A Constant Surrounded by Flux." *Demokratia*. J. Ober and C. Hedrick. Princeton**:** 187-202.

Robertson, B. G. (2000). "The Scrutiny of New Citizens at Athens." *Law and Social Status in Classical Athens*. V. Hunter and J. Edmondson. Oxford**:** 149-74.

Rosivach, V. (1987). "Autochthony and the Athenians." *CQ* **37**: 294-306.

Roussel, D. (1976). *Tribu et cité: études sur les groupes sociaux dans les cités grecques aux époques archaïque et classique*. Paris.

Sassi, M. M. (2001). *The science of man in ancient Greece*. Chicago.

Scafuro, A. (1994). "Witnessing and False Witnessing: Proving Citizenship and Kin Identity in Fourth Century Athens." *Athenian Identity and Civic Ideology*. A. Boegehold and A. Scafuro. Baltimore**:** 156-198.

Shapiro, H. A. (1998). "Autochthony and the visual arts in fifth-century Athens." *Democracy, empire, and the arts in fifth-century Athens*. D. Boedeker and K. Raaflaub. Cambridge**:** 127-51.

Smedley, A. (1999). *Race in North America : origin and evolution of a worldview*. Boulder.

Smith, A. D. (1991). *National Identity*. Reno.

Smith, A. D. (2000). *The nation in history : historiographical debates about ethnicity and nationalism*. Hanover.

Stevens, J. (1999). *Reproducing the state*. Princeton.

Strauss, B. S. (1986). *Athens after the Peloponnesian War : class, faction, and policy, 403-386 BC*. Ithaca.

Stoler, A. L. (1995). *Race and the education of desire : Foucault's History of sexuality and the colonial order of things*. Durham.

Thomas, R. (1989). *Oral Tradition and Written Record in Classical Athens*. Cambridge.

Tuplin, C. (1999). ""Greek racism?" Observations on the Character and Limits of Greek Ethnic Prejudice." *Ancient Greeks west and east*. G. R. Tsestkhladze. Leiden**:** 47-75.

Van Groningen, B. A. (1953). *In the Grip of the Past: An Essay on an Aspect of Greek Thought*. Leiden.

Vérilhac, A.-M. and C. Vial. 1998. *Le Mariage grec du vi^e siècle av. J. -C. à l'époque d'Auguste.* Paris.

Vernant, J. P. (1980). *Myth and Society in Ancient Greece*. T. b. J. Lloyd. Bristol.

Vlastos, G. (1953). "Isonomia." *American Journal of Philology* **74**: 337-66.

Waldron, J. (2002). *God, Locke, and equality : Christian foundations of John Locke's political thought*. New York.

Walsh, G. B. (1978). "The Rhetoric of Birthright and Race in Euripides' *Ion*." *Hermes* **106**: 301-15.

Whitehead, D. (1977). *The ideology of the Athenian metic*. Cambridge, Cambridge Philological Society.

_____. (1986). *The Demes of Attika 508/7-ca. - 250 BC: A Political and Social Study*. Princeton.

_____. (1991). Norms of Citizenship in Ancient Greece. *City states in classical antiquity and medieval Italy : Athens and Rome, Florence and Venice*. A. Molho, K. A. Raaflaub, J. Emlen. Ann Arbor: 135-54.

Winters, T. F. 1993. "Kleisthenes and Athenian nomenclature." *JHS* 103: 162-165.

Wolff, H. J. 1944. "Marriage Law and Family Organization in Ancient Athens: A Study of the Interrelation of Public and Private Law in the Greek City." *Traditio* 2: 43-95.

Yuval-Davis, N. and F. Anthias (1989). *Woman- nation- state*. New York.

[i] Manville 1990, Frost 1994, W. R. Connor 1994, Hansen 1996.

[ii] Hansen 1991 estimates that about ten percent of the inhabitants of Attika were citizens.

[iii] Ober and Strauss 1989.

[iv] Aristotle points out that just as there are many forms of constitution, so too there are many kinds of citizen (*Pol*. 1278a15-16).

[v] Smith 1991, 79-84. For Athenian citizen identity conceptualized as a form of ethnic-nationalism, see Loraux 1986, 1993, 2001, J. Hall 1997, E. Cohen 2002, B. Cohen 2002, W. R. Connor 1994.

[vi] A. D. Smith offers the following working definition of the nation: "a named human population occupying a historic territory or homeland and sharing common myths and memories; a mass public culture; a single economy, and common rights and duties for all members" (2000, 63). For present purposes, what is crucial is here is that Smith explicitly states that this definition can be applied to be premodern collective identities. For nationalism in the pre-modern period, see also Yuval-Davis and Anthias 1989, Stevens 1999, 104-110, E. Cohen 2002. For nationalism as distinctively modern, see Anderson 1991, W. Connor 1994.

[vii] For ethnicity and nationalism as two sides of the same coin, see Jenkins 1997, 142-146, Balibar 1991, 96. W. Connor coins the term 'ethnonationalism' to highlight this connection, defining nationalism as the love of the ethnic nation (1994, 212). See further Smith 2000.

[viii] According to Jonathan Hall "the definitional criteria or core elements which determine membership in an ethnic group are...a putative subscription to a myth of common descent and kinship, an association with a specific territory and a sense of shared history" (2002, 9).   For a belief in common ancestry/shared descent as a core feature of ethnic identities, see also Hall 1997, Smith 2000, 67, Weber 1922, W. Connor 1994, 74-78, Eriksen 1993, 12, Banks 1997.

[ix] For kinship ideologies and nationalism see Isaacs 1975, 38-39, Geertz 1973, 259, Smith 1986, Walzer 1983, 52.

[x] For ethnic versus civic nationalism, see, Ignatieff 1993, 3-6, Smith 2000, 65-67.

[xi] See Konstan 2001, 30.

[xii] Stevens 1999, Balibar 1991.

[xiii] The homicide law is partially preserved in an inscription and by citations in Demosthenes 23. See Stroud 1968, Gagarin 1981.

[xiv] Trans. Gagarin 1981, based on Stroud's reconstruction of lines 26-29 (IG^2 115). For the importance of territorial boundaries to the conception of polis identity and citizenship, see Manville 79-80.

[xv] On the implications of this designation for citizenship, see Manville 1990, 78-82, Gagarin 1986, 80.

[xvi] The national designation *Athênaios* is conventionally referred to as an ethnic in the literature on the Athenian name, see esp. Loraux 1993, 123-137. Although the name was obviously connected with Athena from early on, it is not clear that it carries an ethnic sense in this period, designating "citizens" as (foster) children of Athena.

[xvii] Jordan 1979, 39, Manville 1990, 81 n. 43. See also Grace 1973 for these distinctions in Drakonian law.

[xviii] For the concept of boundaries in Solon's legislation, see Murray 1980, 189-90, Manville 1990, 126-127, Ober 2006.

[xix] Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 6, 12.4, Plut. *Sol*. 15.2-16.4.

[xx] For the connection between citizenship and slavery in Solon's abolition of debt bondage, see Finely 1959, Manville 1990, 132-33, Fisher 1995, 64, Raaflaub 2004, 50-53, Ober 1989, 61.

[xxi] See Fisher 1995, Manville 1990, 133.

[xxii] Dem. 23.53. For the attribution of this law to Draco, see Carawan 1998, 78, n.80, 92-94. Sealey's argument that the word "free" in the phrase "concubine whom he has for producing free children" means "citizen" has been refuted by Patterson 1990 and Mossé 1991.

[xxiii] Cf. Just 1989, 53. For the importance of the distinction between slave and free in the homicide law, see Grace 1973. For the social context in which the law was introduced, see Humphreys 1991, 17-45.

[xxiv] For legitimacy as the new sine qua non of civic membership, see Humphreys 1974, 90, Davies 1978, 114-115, Ogden 1996, 43, and Wolff 1944, 77-79, Lape 2002/03. Solon's laws also made the status of the concubine kept for "producing free children" obsolete, see Lape 2002/03.

[xxv] For the new tribal heroes, see Kearns 1989.

[xxvi] For the tribal heroes as ancestors, see Demosthenes 60.

[xxvii] Hall 1997, W. R. Connor 1993.

[xxviii] Whitehead 1986.

[xxix] For the persistence of patronymics, see Winters 1993.

[xxx] Arist. *Pol*. 1275b34-37. Modern scholars accept this tradition, see Badian 2000, Strauss 1994, 259.

[xxxi] For the Cleisthenic "revolution", see Ober 1996.

[xxxii] For autochthony in the visual arts, see Shapiro 1998, Kron 1976. Vincent Rosivach adds that the use of patronymic -*Erechtheidai* –people or sons of Erechtheus – to refer to the Athenian people also encouraged the view that the Athenians were descendants of Erechtheus and hence heirs to autochthony (1987, 295).

[xxxiii] For the advent of the public funeral after the Persian Wars, ~ 470 BCE, see Kierdorf 1966, 93, Thomas 1989, 207-08, Clairmont 1983. Ziolkowski 1981, 13 points out that it is not clear whether there an actual oration accompanied the early public funerals.

[xxxiv] The political discourse, however, fails to mention Erechtheus. Instead it depicts the citizens as descended from one or more unnamed autochthonous beings, see Loraux 1993, 41, 49-52.

[xxxv] For the conflation of Erectheus and Erichthonios, see Loraux 1993.

[xxxvi] On the Athenians as a chosen people, see Shapiro 1987, 131, Loraux 1993. On Erectheus as autochthonous and the child of a god, see Euripides *Med.* 824. The myth also helped negotiate Athens' connection with the Ionian cities from whom they extracted tribute. The Ionians were cast as colonists of the Athenians, allowing Athenians to preserve a separate and superior autochthonous identity while placing the Ionians in a subordinate kinship position, Hall 1997, 56, Doughtery 1996.

[xxxvii] For autochthony and purity, see Isoc. Panath. 124, Hyp. 6.7, L. 2.17, Hall 1997, 54, Loraux 1986, 149, Rosivach 1987, 302, Detienne 2003a, 2003b, Lenfant 2001, Gotteland 2001, 80.

[xxxviii] On autochthony and innocence, see Isoc. Panath. 121-124, Menex. 245d, Detienne 2001, 2003, Gotteland 2001, 82, Loraux 2001, 124.

[xxxix] On autochthony and democratic equality, see Plato Men. 238e-239a, Montanari 1981, 54-55, L 1986, 332, P. 1987, 195, R. 1987, 303

[xl] Shapiro 1998, 131, Lenfant 2001, 62, Ogden 1996, 166. Like the myth of autochthony, the nativity requirements of the law protected the legitimacy and *eugeneia* of the citizen body. For autochthony and legitimacy, see D. 60.4, Ogden 1996, 168. For autochthony and nobility, see Pl. *Menex*. 237B, Hyp. 6.7, Ober 1989, 262-3, Walsh 1978, 301, Loraux 1986, 148-53.

[xli] [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 26.4, Plut. *Per*. 37.2-4. The evidence for the law and its history is assembled and discussed in Broadbent 1968, 167-74, Patterson 1981, Ogden 1996. The Periclean law refers to the citizen as an astos/astê, a native. For the contested meaning of this term, see Cohen 2002....

[xlii] For marriage as being implied by the law, see Humphreys 1974, 88-95, Rhodes 1981, 331-33, Patterson 1998, 110.

[xliii] Diogenes Laertius reports:

> fas‹ går boulhy°ntaw ÉAyhna€ouw diå
> tÚ leipandre›n sunauj∞sai tÚ pl∞yow, chf€sasyai game›n m¢n
> éstØn m€an, paidopoie›syai d¢ ka‹ §j •t°raw:

> For they say that the Athenians wished to increase their numbers because of the shortage of men, and decreed that a man might marry one native women and have children with another (2.26).

The most likely interpretation of the phrase "from another" (§j •t°raw) is from another native woman (*astês*), rather than from a foreign woman. Since there was a shortage of Athenian men not women, there would have been no need to allow Athenian men to take foreign concubines to increase the number of citizens. For the date of the measure and interpretation, see Strauss 1986, 74, Harrison 1968, 16-17, Pomeroy 1997, 39, Ogden 1996, 72-75.

[xliv] Ober states these laws reassert "the linkage between patriotism and citizen blood" (1989, 98).

[xlv] Nicomenes' decree further stipulated that "those [bastards] born before the archonship of Eucleides should be admitted to citizenship without scrutiny" (Scholiast Aeschin. 1.39 = Eumelus *FGrH* 77 F 2).

[xlvi] This law also explicitly directs attention to the role of the native woman or female citizen in producing citizens.

[xlvii] In his prosecution of Neaera, Apollodoros quotes the law as follows:

> If an alien man shall cohabit (`sunoikª`) [i.e. live in marriage] with a native woman (`éstª`) by any means or trick whatsoever, he may be indicted before the Thesmothetae by anyone who wishes from among the Athenians who have the right to do so. And if he be convicted, he shall be sold, himself and his property, and the third part shall belong to the one securing the conviction. The same principle shall hold if an alien woman shall live as wife with a native man (`ést"`), and the Athenian who lives as husband with an alien woman shall be fined one thousand drachmae (D. 59.16). Kapparis suggests that the most likely date for the law is in the 380's, 1999, 202. Diller 1932, Wolff 1944, and Carey 1992, however, argue for a later date in the 340's, linking the law to the scrutiny of 346.

[xlviii] Athenian women taken in the same offense, however, seem not to have been liable to the pecuniary punishment.

[xlix] D. 59. 52. Kapparis argues that this law is part of the *xenia* law Apollodoros quotes at 59.16 (1999, 198).

[l] Vernant 1980, Herman 1987, Gernet 1980, Kurke 1991.

[li] Vernant 1980.

[lii] Ogden 1996, Osborne 1997.

[liii] 678-82, 1532. A scholiast on the *Frogs* tells us the comic poet Platon portrayed Kleophon's mother speaking a foreign language (*barbarizousan*) to her son (60 K. –A.).

[liv] Kleophon was vulnerable to this form of political abuse or gossip because his father, a prominent general, had married a Thracian woman prior to the passage of the Periclean law, see Vanderpool 1952, 1968, Connor 1992, 158, MacDowell 1993, 370. Since the Periclean law was not applied retrospectively (the children of Athenian fathers and foreign mothers were grandfathered in) Kleophon's foreign ancestry was probably perfectly legal.

[lv] D. 21.149. Dover 1974, 85-86, states that this passage provides evidence for a belief in heredity, although he dismisses it as a joke.

[lvi] For the scrutiny (*diapsêphiseis*) of 346, see Demosthenes 57, with Libanius' hypothesis, Aes. 1.77-8, 86, 114, 2.182, the scholiast on Aeschines 1.77, Dilts 1992, 33, Isaeus 12, Harpocration, *s.v. diapsêphiseis* (= *FGrH* 324 F 52) Whitehead 1986, 106-9, Scafuro 1994.

[lvii] Loraux 1986, 148-49, 180-202, Ober 1989, 217-220, 259-60, 290-91, Anderson 2003, 154-55.

[lviii] For autochthony and *eugeneia*, see Pl. *Menex.* 237B, Hyp. 6.7, Ober 1989, 262-3, Walsh 1978, 301, Loraux 1986, 148-53, 1993, 203.

[lix] *Rhetoric* 1360b34-35, Dover 1974, 9, Loenen 1926, 206-23. For the importance of the single noble ancestor in aristocratic ideology, see also Turner 1983, 15, Thomas 1989,159.

[lx] 1989, 123-31, 169.

[lxi] Thomas 1989, Fowler 1998.

[lxii] 1953, 50. See also Donlan 1999, 98, Arnheim 1977.

[lxiii] Theognis' poetry constitutes a partial exception, esp. 183-192. However, his anxieties about inter-class marriage underline the point that aristocrats did not practice endogamy. See further below.

[lxiv] For example, Alexander III of Macedon was thought to have an especially propitious inheritance because on his father's side, he was a Heraclid and on his mother's he was an Aeacid (D.S. 17.1.5, Plut. *Alex*. 2).   This case clarifies that aristocratic ideology operated across ethnic boundaries and thus seems to have lacked contamination fears. Royal ideologies, however, express bastardy fears when succession is based on patrilineal descent, as in the Spartan case, see further below.

[lxv] There is uncertainty regarding when the play was first performed. Estimates range from as early as 421 to as late as 411, see Goosens 1962, 478, Walsh 1978, 308-09, Loraux 1993, 206.

[lxvi] Loraux 1993, 215-216.

[lxvii] *Ion* 290, 590, 813-814.

[lxviii] Ion, however, remains a bastard – in one sense – because his parents were not and could not be married. In fact, Apollo fathered him by raping Kreousa. From the standpoint of ideology, it was better to be the bastard son of a god than the bastard son of a foreigner.

[lxix] For the concept of racialism, see Appiah 1990, 4-5. For the study of race as an ideology, see Guillaumin 1995, Fredrickson 2002, 169.

[lxx] 1990, 4-5.

[lxxi] According to Appiah, this referencing leads to either intrinsic or extrinsic racism (1990, 5). Extrinsic racism is the belief that members of different races and groups differ in ways calling for differential, i.e. discriminatory, treatment. Intrinsic racism involves the belief that simply being of the same race is a reason for granting moral preference; it values the idea of shared race rather than shared racial characteristics.

[lxxii] See Aeschin. 3.172-76, Lape 2003, Ober 1989, 266, Parker 2005, 454.

[lxxiii] 2002, 17. See also Goldberg 1993, 21. Recent theorists have troubled the distinction between heredity and the environment, arguing that environmental or ecological views of diversity can also produce racism and racial categories, Sassi 2001, 24 n.102. Isaac 2004 passim.

[lxxiv] 1937, 16.

[lxxv] Banton 1983, 1-14, 1987, 49.

[lxxvi] Cartledge 1993, 11, see also E. Hall 1989, Hartzog 1988.

[lxxvii] 1999.

[lxxviii] For the distinction between auto-referential and hetero- or altero-referential racisms, see Guillaumin 1995, 50-52, Balibar 1991, 39.

[lxxix] Banton 1983, 10, Gilroy 1987, 38, Fredrickson 2002, 6.

[lxxx] Jenkins 1997, 22.

[lxxxi] J. Hall points out that "an ethnic group defined in terms of descent may appear alarmingly similar to a 'biological race' (Hall 2002, 13).

[lxxxii] 2003, 104.

[lxxxiii] Gil-White 2001, Cosmides and Tooby et al, 2003.

[lxxxiv] Atran 1998, Gil-White 2001, Gelman 2003, Cosmides and Tooby et al, 2003, Hirschfeld 1998.

[lxxxv] Gelman 2003, 8.

[lxxxvi] For essentialism as a key feature of race ideologies, see Balibar 1991, 164, 167, Appiah 1990, 276, Bracken 1973, 1978, Stoler 1995, Hirschfeld 1998.

[lxxxvii] Denise McCosky remarks "...it is distressing to see that when classicists allude to race at all, they by and large resort to outdated views that credit it with a solely biological source...(2003, 104).

[lxxxviii] McCosky 2003.

[lxxxix] Fredrickson 2002, 68, 47. See also Balibar, 1991, 49-50, Guillaumin, 1995, 33-5, 50. For the connection between liberalism and racism, see Stoler 1995, 36-37, Mills 1997, 2000, on liberal universalism and the generation of racial exclusions, see Mehta 1999, 46-76.

[xc] For equality in the Athenian democracy, see Raaflaub 1996, 139, Morris 1996, Cartledge 1996, Roberts 1996, Ostwald 2000.

[xci] For the Christianity and political equality, see Waldron 2002. For the role of nation states in promulgating the idea of equality, see Balibar 1994, 193.

[xcii] For political equality as implying that citizens are equal, see Vlastos 1953, 350.

[xciii] Aristotle *Pol*. 1282b20-25. For the elite distinction between arithmetic and geometric equality, see Harvey 1965. For elite criticisms of democratic equality and political practice, see Ober 1998, Euben 1978, Raaflaub 1996, 142.

[xciv] See Aristotle *Pol*. 1280a 7-25, Harvey 1966.

[xcv] For the strong principle of equality, see Dahl 1989, Morris 1996.

[xcvi] Davies 1971.

[xcvii] Appiah 2005, Hacking 1999.