

UC Riverside

UC Riverside Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Title

Studies in Classical Epigamia

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/9hg5r68x>

Author

Flores, Stacy Delicia

Publication Date

2023

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA  
RIVERSIDE

Studies in Classical *Epigamia*

A Thesis submitted in partial satisfaction of  
the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

History

by

Stacy Delicia Flores

December 2023

Thesis Committee:

Dr. Denver Graninger, Chairperson

Dr. Alexander B. Haskell

Dr. Danielle Kellogg

Copyright by  
Stacy Delicia Flores  
2023

The Thesis of Stacy Delicia Flores is approved:

---

---

---

Committee Chairperson

University of California, Riverside

Table of Contents:

Title Page.....	i
Copyright.....	ii
1. Introduction .....	1
1.2 Historiography .....	2
1.3 Methodology and Sources .....	7
2. Archaic Elite and the Practice of Intermarriage.....	9
2.1 Early, non-Greek implementation of <i>epigamia</i> .....	9
2.2 Archaic Greek Intermarriage.....	16
2.3 Perikles' Citizenship Law.....	20
3. Political and Philosophical Perspectives on <i>Epigamia</i> in the Classical period.....	25
4. Athens and <i>epigamia</i> .....	29
4.1 Athens, Plataea, and <i>epigamia</i> .....	29
4.2 Athens, Euboea, and <i>epigamia</i> .....	38
4.3 <i>Epigamia</i> received by Athens.....	46
4.4 <i>Epigamia</i> between Athens and Thebes? .....	53
5. Conclusion.....	58
Bibliography .....	62

## 1. Introduction

*Epigamia*, derived from the Greek term *gamos*, indicates the right of intermarriage granted by one *polis* to either select residents or all members of another *polis*.<sup>1</sup> The corresponding adjective, *epigamos*, describes someone being of marriageable age<sup>2</sup> but does not have a sense similar to intermarriage. Likewise, the verb *epigamo* refers to marrying in addition or to taking as a second wife.<sup>3</sup> *Epigamia*, *epigamos*, and *epigamo* do not appear in Greek texts before the fifth century BCE,<sup>4</sup> and despite being linguistically related and having in common a meaning related to an aspect of marriage, only the noun *epigamia* has this distinctive association with intermarriage as a granted right.

Scholars have understood *epigamia* as a right that is granted in a diplomatic sense as a way to ease interstate tensions. The connection between *epigamia* and agreements such as *sympoliteia* and *isopoliteia* has been stressed,<sup>5</sup> especially for the Hellenistic period. *Sympoliteia*, agreements that entail the merging of two or more communities in one, in the late fourth century seem to be promoted by kings or dynasts as a way of intervening in the social structure of a polis.<sup>6</sup> Saba explains that with *isopoliteia*, the grant of potential citizenship is rarely found together with *epigamia*, yet

---

<sup>1</sup> LSJ, *s.v.* ἐπιγαμία, 1, lists “additional marriage” and “connection by marriage” in later authors.

<sup>2</sup> LSJ, *s.v.* ἐπίγαμος, 8.

<sup>3</sup> LSJ, *s.v.* ἐπιγαμέω lists “marry besides,” “wed one after another,” “marry and set,” and “the second wife.”

<sup>4</sup> All dates mentioned from here will be BCE unless otherwise indicated.

<sup>5</sup> Sara Saba, “Epigamia in Hellenistic Interstate Treaties: Foreign and Family Policy” in *Ancient Society*, vol. 41, (2011:93–108). See also Anne-Marie Vérilhac and Claude Vial, *Le Mariage Grec: Du VI Siècle Av. J.C. à l'époque d'Auguste*, (Athènes: Ecole Française d'Athènes, 1998), 80.

<sup>6</sup> Saba, “Epigamia in Hellenistic Interstate Treaties”, 96-97.

the scholarship erroneously maintains this connection between the two.<sup>7</sup> Thus far, *epigamia* has been considered and oftentimes glossed over by scholars.

Further examination is necessary, however, to understand *epigamia* fully as more than a diplomatic tool to ease tensions.<sup>8</sup> Beyond this, *epigamia*, as a granted right of intermarriage, has far-reaching implications regarding the institution of ancient Greek marriage, citizenship, and identity. These are significant concepts that the practice of granting *epigamia* can affect, and it makes us wonder why this right was granted and how, if at all, it affected these essential notions, especially in Athens. It is important to note that this study is not a general study of Athenian intermarriage, that is, Athenians who contract marriages with non-Athenians, despite the legal consequences, but will look specifically at Athenian *epigamia*, the privilege granted by the state to non-citizens to contract marriages with Athenians.

### 1.1. Historiography

Fundamental to understanding the development of ancient Greek institutions, Fustel de Coulanges first argued in 1864 CE that it was only through an *epigamia* that marriage between residents of two cities could take place; without this, “the line of demarcation was so profound that one hardly imagined marriage between the inhabitants

---

<sup>7</sup> Saba, “Epigamia in Hellenistic Interstate Treaties”, 98. Saba notes that *epigamia* appears only thirteen times in interstate treaties and that *epigamia* and *isopolitieia* do appear more frequently together in Cretan documents.

<sup>8</sup> With the exception of works such as Vèrilhac and Vial, *Le mariage grec du VI<sup>e</sup> siècle av. J.C. à l'époque d'Auguste*; and Anabelle Oranges, “La Concessione Dell’Epigamia Agli Eubei” in C. Bearzot and F. Landucci *Tra Mare e Continente: l’isola d’Eubea*, (2013:173-189), and Saba’s work, the matter has been overlooked.

of two different cities. Such a union always appeared strange and was long considered illegal.”<sup>9</sup> Fustel recognized *epigamia* as a necessary measure for a legal marriage to take place between two different *poleis*. Although he offers no further discussion on the point, his statement draws on essential concepts related to *epigamia*. Fustel refers to these unions as “strange” because, as will be further discussed below, of the tendency towards endogamous marriages and “illegal” because of laws implied through citizenship regulations.

From a legal perspective, A.R.W. Harrison, in his work, *The Laws of Athens*, claims that *epigamia* is “exceptionally the right to contract marriages with Athenians” that became a common grant to citizens of another city by the time of Aristotle. This notion by scholars that *epigamia* is a common concession should be rejected, though, as it was seldom granted.<sup>10</sup> Harrison notes that there is evidence for an *epigamia* granted to Euboea and considers the grant of full citizenship to certain metics in 403<sup>11</sup> as the equivalent to *epigamia*.<sup>12</sup> Thus, Harrison assumes that when there is a granting of citizenship in our evidence, there is inherently a right to intermarriage. He is not wrong in considering citizenship grants as a way to deduce from texts that do not specifically mention marriage or *epigamia*; and in fact, the scholarship focused on citizenship, naturalization, and honorary grants is particularly important to the discussion of *epigamia*. By considering citizenship as a “bundle of rights and privileges,” Deborah

---

<sup>9</sup> Fustel de Coulanges, *The Ancient City: A Study on the Religion, Laws, and Institutions of Greece and Rome*. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1980), 194.

<sup>10</sup> Saba, “Epigamia in Hellenistic Treaties”, 106.

<sup>11</sup> A.R.W. Harrison, *The Law of Athens*, I (Oxford:1968), 29.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, 29.



Kamen's work understands status as a spectrum and challenges the rigid Athenian civic ideology that is often attested in literary sources."<sup>13</sup> During the fifth and fourth centuries, the granting of privileges to non-Athenians such as *enktesis* (right to own property), *isoteleia* (taxation equal to that of Athenian citizens), or the honorary title of *proxenia* (proxeny), as Kamen argues, would give those honored a higher social status.<sup>14</sup> Although Kamen briefly mentions *epigamia* amongst the list of grants as an exceptional privilege,<sup>15</sup> it is not fully discussed and deserves further attention since the consequence of such a privilege would legally integrate a non-citizen into the community through marriage.

It is not until A.M Vérhilac and C.Vial's, 1998 work, *Le Mariage Grec: Du VIe Siècle av. J.C. à l'époque d'Auguste*, that *epigamia* is seriously considered an unconventional phenomenon in regards to the endogamous marriage practices of Greek *poleis*.<sup>16</sup> The authors distinguish between civic and familial endogamy but emphasize the preference for civic endogamy as there was a tendency to require double filiation for citizenship.<sup>17</sup> Vérhilac and Vial argue in their discussion of the practice of civic exogamy

---

<sup>13</sup> Deborah Kamen, *Status in Classical Athens*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2013), 15-16. Kamen is working off of this idea of moving away from the idea of a tripartite classification (citizen, metics, slaves or privilege, unprivileged metics and unprivileged slaves and developing the idea of status as a spectrum as introduced to ancient Greek society by Moises Finley. Finley argued in his 1959 work "Was Greek Civilisation Based on Slave Labour?" that "If we think of ancient society as made up of a spectrum of statuses, with the free citizens at one end and the slave at the other, and with a considerable number of shades of dependence in between, we shall quickly discover different 'lines' on the spectrum".

<sup>14</sup> Kamen, *Status in Classical Athens*, 61.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid., 64. The case of *epigamia* between Euboea and Athens will be looked at further below, along with Kamen's comment on this grant.

<sup>16</sup> Vérhilac and Vial, *Le Mariage Grec: Du VIe Siècle av. J.C. à l'époque d'Auguste*, (Athènes: Ecole Française d'Athènes, 1998), 43,53,71.

<sup>17</sup> Ibid., 41-43, 71,80. Civic endogamy refers to marriage between members of an independent political unit or city, while civic exogamy is thus marriage outside a political unit or city.

and civic endogamy that although a community may grant *epigamia*, it remains endogamous<sup>18</sup> – that is when a city grants *epigamia*, “c'est vouloir certains citoyens deviennent des alliés, des parents et des amis des membre de l'autre ensemble, c'est décider que les destins des deux communautés ne pourront plus jamais être dissociés.”<sup>19</sup> But this view, I would argue, is most fully realized in the Hellenistic period and does not seem to apply to the Classical period, when *epigamia* should still be considered a form of state-granted civic exogamy. Vérhilac and Vial’s work elucidates the role of *epigamia* within exogamous and endogamous marriage practices and begins to consider its social implications for these ancient communities.

The examination of this topic remained undeveloped until scholars such as Saba further analyzed and defined the use of *epigamia*. Saba understands *epigamia* as an interstate diplomatic tool, which, although seldomly granted, was mainly employed in the Hellenistic period by members of a league familiar with such practices.<sup>20</sup> Saba argues that the rarity of *epigamia*, especially in the epigraphic evidence, is a testament to the standard endogamy practices and the resistance to exogamy in Greek society.<sup>21</sup> Annabella Oranges has also recently spotlighted *epigamia*, but concentrates on the case between Athens and Euboea using epigraphic and literary data. Oranges argues that this

---

<sup>18</sup> Ibid., 72.

<sup>19</sup> Ibid., 80: “it is to want certain citizens to become allies, relatives and friends of members of the other group, it means deciding that the destinies of the two communities can never again be separated.”

<sup>20</sup> Saba, “Epigamia in Hellenistic Interstate Treaties”, 106.

<sup>21</sup> Ibid., 95.

is the only attested case of *epigamia* granted by Athens in the fifth century<sup>22</sup>; she is primarily interested in dating when these events occurred and in reading Euripides's *Ion* as alluding to the contemporary social implications of *epigamia*. By using this case study approach to *epigamia*, Oranges moves beyond *epigamia* as a granted right and begins to look at its social aspects prior to the Hellenistic period.

With few exceptions, *epigamia* has not been fully conceived as a political and social phenomenon. While Saba is correct in emphasizing the role of *epigamia* found within *sympoliteia* and *isopoliteia* during the Hellenistic period as a tool to solve conflict,<sup>23</sup> however, the research to date has tended to focus on these aspects to the exclusion of all else and has not considered the purpose of *epigamia* during the Classical period. Although this specific matter has received little attention, scholars have developed the field of the ancient Greek family, especially during the Archaic and Classical periods, along with crucial concepts surrounding the family, such as kinship, marriage, citizenship, and inheritance. Scholars such as Sally Humphreys' monumental work, *Kinship in Ancient Athens*, or Cheryl Anne Cox's significant work, *Household Interests*, and Sarah Pomeroy's, *Families in Classical and Hellenistic Greece*, which focus on marriage, the household, and the family,<sup>24</sup> for example, frequently mention

---

<sup>22</sup> Anabella Oranges, "La Concessione Dell'Epigamia Agli Eubei" in C. Bearzot and F. Landucci *Tra Mare e Continente: l'isola d'Eubea*, (2013:173-189), 175. This case and claim will be further explored below.

<sup>23</sup> Saba, "Epigamia in Hellenistic Interstate Treaties," 98,102, 106.

<sup>24</sup> The works of scholars Sarah Pomeroy, in *Families in Classical and Hellenistic Greece*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press,1997) and Cheryl Anne Cox, *Household Interests: Property, Marriage Strategies, and Family Dynamics in Ancient Athens*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998) focus on the Greek household and family. Josine Blok's work, *Citizenship in Classical Athens* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2017) is exceptional for the topic of citizenship. Sally Humphreys' monumental work,

intermarriage as a deviation from the endogamous Greek tradition, but *epigamia* is not a particular concern of these major works. As a privilege and a grant that could affect the status of a non-citizen and that infringes on endogamous marriage tradition and the household, however, *epigamia* needs to be considered. Despite the recent development of scholars' attention to the complexities of the intersections of these spheres, little attention has been given to *epigamia*. Nevertheless, the works of Cox, Humphreys, and Pomeroy significantly challenge the oversimplification of ancient Greek institutions, and this work will look to extend further and develop the insights of these scholars into the area of *epigamia*.

## 1.2 Methodology and Sources

A comprehensive examination of *epigamia* will expand our knowledge of the historical, social, and political aspects of Greek intermarriage, its employment, development, and the ways to conduct it within and outside the *polis*. In this thesis, I offer a study on the historical, political, and social aspects of *epigamia*, with a focus on the fifth and fourth century Athenian context.

In order to understand the implications of *epigamia*, it is worthwhile to look at the Greek usage in the Classical period prior to the Hellenistic period, where it becomes more prevalent in epigraphical evidence. Contextualizing the meaning of *epigamia* will provide a different view of ancient intermarriage as a particular right that is bestowed on

---

*Kinship in Ancient Athens* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2018) on kinship is also important for an understanding of kinship as an integral structuring component and part of the process of the organization of ancient Greek society.

an individual or group, which differs from the intermarriage that occurs outside of state intervention. My aim in this thesis is threefold: first, to explore aspects of intermarriage amongst the Archaic elites into the Classical period; second, to examine *epigamia* as a contributing factor of state formation; and finally, to consider Athens's particular relationship with *epigamia* as a grant rewarded and not mutually reciprocated as a means to unifying city-states.

Athens is of particular interest not only because it is comparatively rich in source material for this period but also because, during the fifth century, the city began to grant honors and rewards to non-Athenians, which awards some scholars consider wholly symbolic and not put into practice. A further consideration that makes Athens a significant case study on the topic of *epigamia* is the Periklean Citizenship Law of 451/0, which will become fundamental to the discussion of the practice of granting citizenship and its relation to *epigamia*. Under what occasions do we encounter *epigamia* being utilized, and how is it implemented? How does *epigamia* articulate with these endogamous structures of marriage and developing notions of citizenship? In this study of *epigamia*, I will consider the use of *epigamia*, examining direct and indirect information on intermarriage in early Greek prose, philosophy, and legislative texts.<sup>25</sup> This study will also draw on myth and drama to examine a social perspective of *epigamia*. I suggest that *epigamia*, as a subset of a broader practice of intermarriage, is a state-granted form of civic-exogamy that, in the Athenian context, was granted on

---

<sup>25</sup> The use of both direct and indirect sources is used by VÉrilhac and Vials working with similar themes and genres in VÉrilhac and Vial,1998, 15-39.

different grounds than the diplomatic understandings of *epigamia* typical of the Hellenistic period. I further propose that *epigamia* in Athens became an honor due to the Periklean Citizenship law, and although *epigamia* was a rare privilege, it must have been put into effect in some cases as it could affect citizenship status.

## 2. Archaic Elites and the Practice of Inter-marriage

### 2.1 Early, non-Greek implementation of *epigamia*

The second book of Herodotus' *Histories* is devoted to a historical survey of Egypt with an interest in its geography, ethnography, and kings. In his inquiry, Herodotus is interested in showing similarities and differences in Egyptian practices, customs, and social organization compared to the Greeks. He explicitly states that this part of his narrative is a synthesis of Egyptian and non-Egyptian accounts, including what Herodotus has seen himself.<sup>26</sup> He especially relies on Greek reports, noting that Greeks settled in Egypt around the reign of Psammetichus I (664-610) and, therefore, would have knowledge of these events.<sup>27</sup> Although some of Herodotus' information is inaccurate regarding the Egyptian kings, A.B. Lloyd argues that there is some historical foundation to his accounts, and when they are not historical, "they are a part of the agenda of Egyptian kingship, i.e., the kind of things which Egyptians expected a king to

---

<sup>26</sup>Hdt., 2.147.1: Ταῦτα μὲν νῦν αὐτοὶ Αἰγύπτιοι λέγουσι· ὅσα δὲ οἱ τε ἄλλοι ἄνθρωποι καὶ Αἰγύπτιοι λέγουσι ὁμολογέοντες τοῖσι ἄλλοισι κατὰ ταύτην τὴν χώραν γενέσθαι, ταῦτ' ἤδη φράσω· προσέσται δὲ τι αὐτοῖσι καὶ τῆς ἐμῆς ὄψιος.

<sup>27</sup> Hdt.2.154.4: τούτων δὲ οἰκισθέντων ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ, οἱ Ἕλληνες οὕτω ἐπιμισγόμενοι τούτοις τὰ περὶ Αἴγυπτον γινόμενα ἀπὸ Ψαμμητίχου βασιλέως ἀρξάμενοι πάντα καὶ τὰ ὕστερον ἐπιστάμεθα ἀτρεκέως· πρῶτοι γὰρ οὗτοι ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ ἀλλόγλωσσοι κατοικίσθησαν.

do.”<sup>28</sup> One of the earliest appearances of the term *epigamia* is found within these accounts of the reigns of Egyptian rulers from c.664-529.<sup>29</sup>

Herodotus narrates the succession of these twelve kings during the seventh-sixth century and writes as follows:<sup>30</sup> and writes as follows:

After the priest of Hephaistus [Sethos] reigned, the Egyptians, having been freed – for not at any time were they able to live without a king – they set up twelve kings, after dividing all of Egypt into twelve portions. These men began to rule as kings after making a right of intermarriage (*epigamia*), and while using these following laws: to be the closest friends, neither to take down each other nor to seek to have more than the other.<sup>31</sup>

This is the first preserved mention in ancient Greek prose of the term *epigamia*. In this case, the rights of intermarriage occurred amongst the Egyptian kings who ruled separate territories during a period of authority and structural reorganization. *Epigamia* features as a part of the formation of how this new division of kingship was made possible. The intermarriage aspect is probably understood to indicate an exogamous practice as Egyptian kings married outside of their ruled territory into that of another Egyptian ruler. Lloyd comments on the *epigamia* that such political marriages were common in Egypt.<sup>32</sup> In this context, this Egyptian elite practice of *epigamia* is perceived by a Greek audience

---

<sup>28</sup> Alan B. Lloyd, “Egypt” in *Brill’s Companion to Herodotus*, ed. Egbert Bakker, Hans van Wee, J.F. de Jong, (Boston: Brill Publication: 2002), 425. For previous kings Min to Sethos, see Hdt. 2.99-142.

<sup>29</sup> Note that Hdt.2.99-142 covers the Egyptian rulers from Min to Sethos and 2.147-82 covers the reigns of kings Psammetichus I to Amasis.

<sup>30</sup> Hdt, 2.147. See A.B. Lloyd for the significance of this discussion on Egyptian history for describing the Saite Period of Egypt, around 664-529 BC in David Asheri, and Alan B. Lloyd, eds., *A Commentary on Herodotus Books I-IV*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007),413.

<sup>31</sup> 2.147.2-3: Ἐλευθερωθέντες Αἰγύπτιοι μετὰ τὸν Ἰρέα τοῦ Ἡφαίστου βασιλεύσαντα, οὐδένα γὰρ χρόνον οἰοί τε ἦσαν ἄνευ βασιλέος διαιτᾶσθαι, ἐστήσαντο δωδέκα βασιλέας, δωδέκα μοίρας δασάμενοι Αἴγυπτον πᾶσαν. οὗτοι ἐπιγαμίας ποιησάμενοι ἐβασίλευον νόμοισι τοῖσιδε χρεώμενοι, μήτε καταφρέεν ἀλλήλους μήτε πλέον τι δίκησθαι ἔχειν τὸν ἕτερον τοῦ ἑτέρου, εἶναι τε φίλους τὰ μάλιστα.

<sup>32</sup> Asheri and Lloyd, *A Commentary on Herodotus*, 347.

as a political marriage in a fashion, as we will see, an archaic Greek to how elite intermarriage would be perceived.

Herodotus only tells us of the highest position of Egyptian society within which a granted right of intermarriage was practiced, and there is no mention of this right extending to the common people. For those of lower status in Egypt who engage in a different practice of intermarriage, Herodotus does not use the term *epigamia*. In 2.47, Herodotus describes an exaggerated practice of intermarriage<sup>33</sup> amongst the swineherds of Egypt and states that although they are native Egyptians: “neither will anyone give their daughter to them nor take a wife from them, but the swineherds both give their daughters in marriage (ἐκδίδονται) and take a wife (ἄγονται) from one another,”<sup>34</sup> therefore intermarrying amongst themselves. This distinction reveals a different understanding and perception of intermarriage practices from the *epigamia* of the kings, which is respectable and even desirable.

Similar to how *epigamia* was intended to cease conflict in the later Hellenistic period, this *epigamia* intended to connect these kings through marriage ties, thus stabilizing tensions. At 2.152, however, we learn that one of the kings, Psammetichus I, deposes the others with the help of Ionians and Carians. As a result, he “gives them land to dwell in opposite to each other,” inhabiting that area until King Amasis.<sup>35</sup> Later, under

---

<sup>33</sup> A.B. Lloyd, “Herodotus on Egyptians and Libyans” in *Entretiens sur l’Antiquité classique* vol. 35 (1990: 215-253), 220. Lloyd states that these practices are exaggerated and oversimplified.

<sup>34</sup> Hdt. *Hist.* 2.47.1: οὐδέ σφι ἐκδίδοσθαι οὐδεὶς θυγατέρα ἐθέλει οὐδ’ ἄγεσθαι ἐξ αὐτῶν, ἀλλ’ ἐκδίδονταί τε οἱ συβῶνται καὶ ἄγονται ἐξ ἀλλήλων.

<sup>35</sup> Hdt. *Hist.* 2.152-154: δίδωσι χώρους ἐνοικῆσαι ἀντίους ἀλλήλων. Denise Demetriou in *Negotiating Identity in the Ancient Mediterranean* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 120, points out that the verb ἐνοικῆσαι does not imply the foundation of a city but residency.



Amasis' reign, the inhabitants of Stratopeda, including the Ionians and Carians, were moved to Memphis.<sup>36</sup> Herodotus does not speak of intermarriage amongst these mercenary groups, but a fragment of Aristagoras of Miletus mentions that: “Kariko, a special place in Memphis, where the Carians settled, having made a right of intermarriage (*epigamia*) with the Memphites, were called Caromemphites.”<sup>37</sup>

The material culture, especially inscriptions on Memphite stelae from the sixth century,<sup>38</sup> complements Herodotus' narrative of the settled mercenaries in Memphis and offers evidence for the interactions amongst these communities.<sup>39</sup> Epigraphical evidence from one of these stelae dating from ca.500-425, *SEG* 43.1119, indicates the name of a deceased Ionian female whom scholars hypothesize has Carian origins and thus belonging to the Caromemphites; the name of her husband has not been preserved.<sup>40</sup> Along with the Carian elements, there are some Egyptian features in the iconography. Scholars take these shared components, along with presumed familial relationships through the names on these inscribed stelae,<sup>41</sup> as an indication of the cultural interactions within these mixed settlements, even suggesting intermarriage amongst these

---

<sup>36</sup> Hdt. 2.154: τούτους μὲν δὴ χρόνῳ ὕστερον βασιλεὺς Ἄμασις ἐξαναστήσας ἐνθεῦτεν κατοίκησε ἐς Μέμφιν, φυλακὴν ἐαυτοῦ ποιούμενος πρὸς Αἰγυπτίων/

<sup>37</sup> *FGrHist608 F9*: Καρικόν· τόπος ἰδιάζων ἐν Μέμφιδι, ἔνθα Κᾶρες οἰκήσαντες, ἐπιγαμίας πρὸς Μεμφίτας ποιησάμενοι, Καρομεμφῖται ἐκλήθησαν. Lloyd also comments on *FGrHist608 F9* that these groups are half-caste, living a *modus vivendi*, in Asheri and Lloyd, *A Commentary on Herodotus*, 225.

<sup>38</sup> The collection of *stelae* were found at the necropolis at Saqqara.

<sup>39</sup> Masson, Oliver, “Les Cariens En Égypte”, *Bulletin de la Société Française d’Égyptologie*, no.56, (1969:25-36), 28.

<sup>40</sup> Gallo, Paolo and Masson, Oliver, “Une stèle “hellénomemphite” de l’ex-collection Nahman”, *BIFAO* 93 (1994:265-276), 272,276.

<sup>41</sup> *ibid.*, 271, n.19, for a list of other Memphite stelai; four other reliefs with Carian inscriptions of the Cariomemphite community.

communities.<sup>42</sup> Graeco-Egyptian relations have also been analyzed at Naukratis, although the evidence suggests that mainly Greeks resided there during the archaic and classical period, it is clear that the two groups were in constant contact with each other.<sup>43</sup>

We can see from these earlier texts that *epigamia* is used in various circumstances. In the Egyptian context, the evidence suggests *epigamia* was already used in a diplomatic sense between kings of the same status that was implemented as part of the structural reorganization of the kingdom. A second reference to an *epigamia* is also made as a practice between Carian, Ionians, and Memphis natives, perhaps granted by King Psammetichus as part of his promise of great rewards.<sup>44</sup>

A final example of an archaic *epigamia* is found in Xenophon's account of Cyrus the Elder, the Great Persian king, who was famed for his political and military leadership. Xenophon refers to another early non-Greek situation involving *epigamia* as part of peace proposals suggested by Cyrus between the King of Armenia and the Chaldaeans in the sixth century. Cyrus, in preparing for the war against the Assyrians, tries to recover the alliance with the Armenians, who had defected from Cyraxenes, the

---

<sup>42</sup> Frank Kammerzell, "Die Geschichte der karischen Minderheit in Ägypten." In *Naukratis: Die Beziehungen zu Ostgriechenland, Ägypten und Zypern in archaischer Zeit*, edited by Ursula Höckmann and Detlev Kreikenbom, (Möhnesee Bibliopolis; Publication, 2001), 236-41. Kammerzell reconstructs genealogies using the Carian stela, showing an assimilation of Carian descendants of those who immigrated to Egypt, which indicates mixed unions between Carian and Egyptians, such as the inscription of a certain Psmṭk-<sup>c</sup>wj-N.t (I) child of a Carian K'aria (or Naria) and an Egyptian W3ḥ-jb-R<sup>c</sup>w-nb-qn.t (II). See also McAnally, Jay. "Herodotus 2.61.2 and the *Mwdon*- of Caromemphitae" *Ancient Near Eastern Studies* vol.53 (2016:195–218), 204.

<sup>43</sup> Denise Demetriou. *Negotiating Identity in the Ancient Mediterranean*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012),118.

<sup>44</sup> Hdt. 2.152.5: ὁ δὲ μαθὼν τὸ χρηστήριον ἐπιτελούμενον φίλα τε τοῖσι Ἴωσι καὶ Καροῖ ποιέεται καὶ σφεας μεγάλα ὑπισχεύμενος πείθει μετ' ἑωυτοῦ γενέσθαι. See also Dorothy Thompson *Memphis Under the Ptolemies* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988), who argues that these foreign mercenary bands would have been expected to marry native women, 103.

King of the Medes.<sup>45</sup> The Armenian king had failed to pay tribute and to supply the Medes with troops.<sup>46</sup> Cyrus regains the Armenian king as an ally and helps them with their issues with the Chaldeans, who were plundering their land,<sup>47</sup> but Cyrus strategically does so to gain the high ground of the mountains for the Persians.<sup>48</sup> Mediating this dispute between these two neighboring territories, Cyrus proposes that “there be *epigamia* and rights of mutual tillage, and mutual rights of pasturage, and a defensive alliance if anyone wrongs either of the two sides.”<sup>49</sup> According to Xenophon, these agreements were still in place in the fourth century.<sup>50</sup> We do not hear any further details about this reciprocal *epigamia* and it is unclear who exactly is granted this right since the King of Armenia negotiates these rights with a group of Chaldeans. It is plausible that it was granted to the Chaldeans and the Armenians of these neighboring territories that exchanged loyalties.<sup>51</sup>

Although a part of Xenophon’s larger fabricated narrative in the *Cyropaedia*,<sup>52</sup> his aim is to provide exemplary leadership on how power should be exercised by using

---

<sup>45</sup> Xenophon, *Cyropaedia*, 4.2.12.

<sup>46</sup> Ibid., 4.2.22; 3.1.10.

<sup>47</sup> Ibid., 3.2.12

<sup>48</sup> Ibid., 3.2.4;3.2.22

<sup>49</sup> Ibid.,3.2.23: ἐπιγαμίας δ’ εἶναι καὶ ἐπεργασίας καὶ ἐπινομίας, καὶ ἐπιμαχίαν δὲ κοινήν, εἴ τις ἀδικοῖ ὀποτέρου.

<sup>50</sup> Ibid.,m 3.2.24: καὶ νῦν δὲ ἔτι οὕτω διαμένουσιν αἱ τότε γενόμεναι συνθήκαι Χαλδαίους καὶ τῷ τὴν Ἀρμενίαν ἔχοντι.

<sup>51</sup> Ibid.,3.2.23: Ὡς δ’ ἤκουσαν ταῦτα ἀμφοτέρω, ἐπήνεσαν καὶ ἔλεγον ὅτι οὕτως ἂν μόνως ἡ εἰρήνη βεβαία γένοιτο. καὶ ἐπὶ τούτοις ἔδοσαν καὶ ἔλαβον πάντες τὰ πιστά,

<sup>52</sup> Scholars such as Philip Stadter suggests it in “Fictional Narrative in the *Cyropaedia*”, *American Journal of Philology*, vol.112, no.4 (1991:461-91), that the *Cyropaedia* is a didactic narrative that is an idealized version of the historical events and figures within this historical setting. However, Christopher Whidden, in “The Account of Persia, and Cyrus’s Persian Education in Xenophon’s “*Cyropaedia*”, *The Review of Politics*, vol.69, no.4, (2007: 539-67), argues against such commentators and suggests that this

Cyrus, featured as a positive figure in Greek historiography.<sup>53</sup> Moreover, if we consider the *Cyropaedia* as didactic in conducting foreign policy,<sup>54</sup> *epigamia* may be regarded as part of good diplomacy. Xenophon, an Athenian aristocrat writing in 370 for a contemporary Greek audience, frames the practice of *epigamia* as a positive diplomatic measure utilized in the archaic past by an ideal version of Cyrus to reinforce alliances amongst non-Greeks. These insights into proper conduct in politics and foreign affairs should be considered against the background of Athenian political-social tensions and ideologies. We will return to Xenophon's political thoughts on *epigamia* after briefly looking at archaic intermarriage within the Greek mainland.

In short, the earliest example of *epigamia* appears in the sources of Greek authors who refer to a past revealing an archaic model of *epigamia* conducted by non-Greeks. The impression of *epigamia*, as expressed by Herodotus and Xenophon, is that of a strategic diplomatic effort to create political stability which resembles what we will see later in the Hellenistic period. The prominence of *epigamia* found in these early narratives associated with non-Greeks perhaps suggests that *epigamia* is something to be emulated amongst a certain status of Greeks.

---

work is a critique of empire. However, Xenophon engaged with other source traditions on Cyrus, as Frances Pownall in "Xenophon's *Cyropaedia* and Greek Historiography" in *Ancient Information on Persia Re-assessed: Xenophon's Cyropaedia*, edited by Bruno Jacobs, 3-18, (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2020), 3-4, points out that there are a number of sources, including Herodotus and fragmentary pieces on Persia and Cyrus from the fifth and fourth centuries accessible to Xenophon. While aspects of historical background may be fictional, there is nothing historically plausible about these alliances.

<sup>53</sup> Roberto Nicolai, "At the Boundary of Historiography" in *Between Thucydides and Polybius: the Golden Age of Greek Historiography* by Parmeggiani, Giovanni (Washington, D.C: Center for Hellenic Studies, 2014), 84. For examples of Cyrus as a positive model, see Xen. *Cyrop.* 1.1.3., Xen. *Oec.* 4.16-19, Plato *Laws* 694c-8, Isoc. 9.37-39.

<sup>54</sup> J.E Lendon, "Xenophon and the Alternative to Realist Foreign Policy: "Cyropaedia" 3.1.14-31, *The Journal of Hellenistic Studies*, vol.126 (2006:82-98), 82.

## 2.2 Archaic Greek Intermarriage

During the sixth and fifth century, *epigamia* is not attested within the context of Greek political measures. This is not to say that intermarriage was not practiced, but rather, the term is not expressly used to describe Greek political marriages amongst the aristocracy of Greek poleis. As Saba notes, “the standard and highly valued practice of Greek poleis in regard to marriage was endogamy,” and marrying outside the civic community was to transgress social traditions.<sup>55</sup> Although the tendency was for Athenians to marry social equals within the civic community, there are instances of leading Athenian citizens who made matrimonial alliances with foreign families. As Greek city-states faced tensions with tyranny along with factional strife amongst aristocratic families, alliances through marriages could be seen as an influential way to expand networks of allies. Marriages could be seen as advantageous, such as the one between Kylon and the daughter of Theagenes, tyrant of Megara,<sup>56</sup> whose support aided Kylon's attempt to tyranny in Athens, demonstrating that, as Cox argues, “loyalties could be directed away from Athens.”<sup>57</sup> Although there was no law against this type of matrimonial practice, Solon's legislation in the sixth century was already interested in the reorganization of the civic body, conspicuous display of wealth, legitimacy, and restricted admission to citizenship, albeit not to the same effect and extent as Pericles' citizenship law discussed below. Solon's matrimonial laws were concerned with

---

<sup>55</sup> Saba, “Epigamia in Hellenistic Interstate Treaties”, 94. Marriage within the citizen body or kin group.

<sup>56</sup> Thuc.1.126.3-5.

<sup>57</sup> C.A Cox, “The Social and Political Ramifications of Athenian Marriages Ca. 600-400 B.C. (Greece).” PhD diss., (Duke University, 1983),125. Cox argues that the early Archaic marriage of Kylon to a non-Athenian signifies the importance of foreign alliances for power in Athens.

restricting the display of the wedding, making rules regarding an *epikleros* (heiress), and laws of inheritance for illegitimate children, *nothoi*.<sup>58</sup> Marriage alliances in the Archaic period amongst the elites of Greek *poleis* were practiced and not legally prohibited.

In her discussion of the manipulation of kinship and political motivations of leading Athenians, Humphreys regards the following as political marriages where intermarriage occurs amongst the Archaic aristocrats: the Athenian Miltiades marrying the daughter of the King of Thrace and so a Thracian royal family; the Athenian Kylon marrying the daughter of the tyrant Theagenes of Megara; and the tyrant Pisistratos, who married an Argive woman, the daughter of Megakles.<sup>59</sup> These marriages were considered legitimate as leading elites would seek matrimonial alliances with other Greek city-states or abroad, but are not described in the sources as instances of *epigamia*.

The case of the betrothal of Agariste, the daughter of Cleisthenes, the Sicyonian tyrant in the sixth century to Athenian Megakles, will be considered an example of Greek intermarriage while reflecting on the absence of *epigamia*. Herodotus (6.127) tells us that suitors from all over, including Italy, Aetolia, Thessaly, the Peloponnese, and Athens, came to compete for Agariste's hand. While the intentions of the suitor or Cleisthenes are not mentioned, Stephanie West suggests that many of the suitors reflect a noteworthy quality that indicates the Sicyonian interest, with, for example, the Italian suitor's presence reflecting of trade interests of Sikyon.<sup>60</sup> J.W. Alexander argues that

---

<sup>58</sup> For a breakdown of Solon's legislations see, Sarah Humphreys, *Kinship in Ancient Athens: An Anthropological Analysis* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018), 18-50.

<sup>59</sup> Humphreys, Sarah C. *Kinship in Ancient Athens* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018), 449.

<sup>60</sup> West, Stephanie. "Agariste's Betrothal: The Adaptability of a Cautionary Tale" in *Lucida Intervalla* vol. 44 (2015:7-35), 15.

Cleisthenes would not have anything to gain by an alliance with a city, that is, Athens, that was torn by factional strife like Athens,<sup>61</sup> but some scholars suggest the opposite that Cleisthenes was in need of a successor.<sup>62</sup> Moreover, Megakles, the Alcmaeonid who marries Agariste, is said to have continued a friendship established by his father, Alcmeon, who is alleged to have aided Cleisthenes in the First Sacred War at Delphi.<sup>63</sup> Whatever the actual motivations were, Herodotus presents this marriage alliance with Cleisthenes as further elevating the Alcmaeonid clan's status.<sup>64</sup>

When Cleisthenes gives his daughter to Megakles, he does not mention that an *epigamia* was made but instead states: “and to you Megakles son of Alcmeon, I betroth my daughter Agariste by the laws of the Athenians.”<sup>65</sup> VÉrilhac and Vial argue that this union was celebrated in Sicyon as a legitimate marriage and think it is probable, that had this marriage not been accomplished in this fashion, it would not have been considered a valid marriage in Athens.<sup>66</sup> Since the laws regarding citizenship or naturalization were not as formally constituted at this time as later with the Perikles Citizenship Law, the legitimacy would not be questioned, given that there is at least one Athenian parent.

---

<sup>61</sup> J.W. Alexander, “The Marriage of Megacles”, *The Classical Journal*, vol.55, no.3, (1959:129-134), 134.

<sup>62</sup> West, “Agariste’s Betrothal”, 20. See also Louis Gernet’s chapter, “Marriage of Tyrants”, in *Anthropologie de la Grèce antique* by L. Gernet, (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1981),300.

<sup>63</sup> John K. Davies, *APF*, 371. See also J.W. Alexander, “The Marriage of Megacles”, 133 for the marriage of Megacles. See Humphreys, *Kinship*, 449, for the connection between Alcmeon and Cleisthenes of Sicyon.

<sup>64</sup> Hdt. 1.126.1. Simon Hornblower and Christopher Pelling suggest in their commentary that this “exalted it”, i.e., the Alcmaeonid *oikos*, in *Herodotus. Histories: Book VI. Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics*. (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2017), 277.

<sup>65</sup> Hdt. *Hist.* 6.130.2: τῷ δὲ Ἀλκμέωνος Μεγακλείῃ ἐγγυῶ παῖδα τὴν ἐμὴν Ἀγαρίστην νόμοισι τοῖσι Ἀθηναίων.

<sup>66</sup> VÉrilhac and Vial, *Le Mariage Grec*,52. For an analysis of the relevant legal terminology, 229–58. See also Wolff, H.J. “Marriage, Law and Family Organization in Ancient Athens: A Study on the Interrelation of Public and Private Law in the Greek City” in *Traditio* vol 2 (1944:43-95).

Other elites also sought matrimonial alliances even with non-Greeks. The Athenian Miltiades IV married Hegesipyle, the daughter of Olorus, king of Thrace.<sup>67</sup> Matthew Sears argues that although Miltiades ended up in the Thracian Chersonese as part of Pisistratus's comprehensive foreign policy,<sup>68</sup> Miltiades may have desired more personal power than what was available under the tyranny at the time.<sup>69</sup> He astutely notes that Herodotus lists the marriage as part of Miltiades' efforts to gain power,<sup>70</sup> but, again, this intermarriage is not interpreted or termed as an *epigamia*. Matrimonial alliances of this sort persisted into the fourth century, but Humphreys asserts that they were not as desirable since the Athenians thought of themselves as superior.<sup>71</sup> Already with Solon in the sixth century and followed by Cleisthenes and Perikles' reforms, the concern with legitimacy was starting to develop with these social programs interested in the integrity of the Athenian *oikos*. These examples demonstrate that intermarriage was practiced in the archaic Greek *polis*, perhaps associated with tyrannical ploys and behaviors; nevertheless, these aristocratic mixed unions were allowed to happen according to Athenian law.

These types of individual cases are not the focus of this paper, instead, the focus will be on the state granting the right of intermarriage. However, these contracted

---

<sup>67</sup> Hdt. 6.39.2.

<sup>68</sup> Cox, "The Social and Political Ramifications of Athenian Marriages", 121-3. Cox argues that the marriage could have sealed previous alliances established by Pisistratus.

<sup>69</sup> Matthew Sears. *Athens, Thrace, and the Shaping of Athenian Leadership*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 59-62.

<sup>70</sup> *Ibid.*, 66.

<sup>71</sup> Humphreys, *Kinship*, 450. Humphreys points out the number of Thracian princesses reappearing in the fourth century.



marriage alliances by elite individuals are crucial to understanding marriage patterns and political motivations that persist through the fourth century,<sup>72</sup> even alongside the state-granted civic exogamous practice of *epigamia*. *Epigamia* should be viewed as a subset of this larger practice of intermarriage and a form of civic exogamy, which, as we have seen from the absence of it within the Greek context of the sixth and fifth centuries, is distinct from archaic Greek matrimonial alliances.

### 2.3 Perikles' Citizenship Law

As *poleis* became more institutionalized in the fifth century, concepts of marriage, legitimacy, and citizenship, which were already linked, became further defined. It is within these notions that *epigamia* should be considered. The following is a brief overview of Perikles' citizenship law, which is critical for our understanding of Athenian citizenship during the second half of the fifth century until 403. Perikles's citizenship law of 451/0 first defined<sup>73</sup> citizenship in Athens by proposing qualifications that mainly remained in effect throughout the fifth century. The principal source for this law, the Aristotelian *Constitution of the Athenians* (Ath. Pol. 26.4), states: "In the third year after this, when Antiodotos was archon, owing to the larger number of citizens, they determined, on Perikles' proposal that no one who was not born from both *astoi* parents

---

<sup>72</sup> Most notably the general Cimon who married an Arcadian wife, see *BNJ* 372-37. Other mixed marriages include Themistocles's daughter, Italia's marriage to a Chian, *APF* 217, and Antisthenes the Socratic who Diogenes Laertius claims was of mixed parentage, Athenian father but a foreign mother (Diog. Laert. 6.1.4). See also "The Marriages of Tyrants" by Louis Gernet (ed.), *The Anthropology of Ancient Greece*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1981.

<sup>73</sup> Josine Blok, "Perikles' Citizenship Law: A New Perspective", *Historia: Zeitschrift Für Alte Geschichte* vol.58, no. 2 (2009: 141-70), 142. Cf. M.J. Osborne, *Naturalization in Athens*, vol.4, (Brussel: Paleis der Academiën, 1981), 140, who claims that the law (re-)defined citizenship.

would have a share in the polis.”<sup>74</sup> Therefore, if one is born from two *astos* parents, that is from Athenian citizen parents, one is an Athenian citizen and has a share or access to participate in the polis.<sup>75</sup> The law is not thought to be retroactive, but it is likely that children born to mixed marriages after the law was passed in 451/0 were not citizens.<sup>76</sup> It is also important to note that, while the law does not explicitly prohibit foreign marriages, it may be seen to discourage such unions and must have affected the practice of mixed marriages.

The law was relaxed on a few occasions due to extraordinary circumstances such as the plague and war. In 430, for example, Perikles, sought the assembly to allow his *nothos* son with Aspasia to be enrolled as a citizen since his other legitimate sons died in the plague.<sup>77</sup> It is also suggested that after the Sicilian disaster of 415-13, another exception was made when a law was passed that allowed an Athenian man who was married to have legitimate children from another woman due to the decline in population.<sup>78</sup> In 403, according to Eumelos, after the expulsion of the Thirty Tyrants and under the restoration of democracy, the law was reenacted, and a decree was issued

---

<sup>74</sup> *Ath.Pol.*26.3-4: καὶ τρίτῳ μετὰ τοῦτον ἐπὶ Ἀντιδότου διὰ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν πολιτῶν Περικλέους εἰπόντος ἔγνωσαν μὴ μετέχειν τῆς πόλεως ὅς ἂν μὴ ἐξ ἀμφοῖν ἀστοῖν ἢ γεγονώς. For other sources for the Periclean law see Ael. *VH.* 13.24, Plut.*Per.* 37.3, Arist. *Pol.*1278a34-35.

<sup>75</sup> Apart from political activities, Josine Blok argues in *Citizenship in Classical Athens*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017), 57ff., for a reinterpretation of citizenship that extends beyond political participation and includes one who also has a share in *hiera* and *hosia* and participates in its *timai*.

<sup>76</sup> Harrison, *The Law of Athens*, 25.

<sup>77</sup> Plut. *Per.* 37.5. Edwin Carawan in “Pericles the Younger and Citizenship Law,” in *The Classical Journal*, vol. 103, no.4 (2008:383-406) argues that this was not granted to Pericles alone but that the law was amended in 430/29 to allow adoptions of nothos.

<sup>78</sup> Diog. Laert. 2.26. See A.R.W Harrison, *The Law of Athens*, 16-17,25. See also Cyntia Patterson, in *Pericles' Citizenship Law of 451/0 B.C.*, (New York: Arno Press, 1981),142, and Edwin Carawan, “Pericles the Younger”, 395 and Sarah B. Pomeroy, *Goddesses, Whores, Wives, and Slaves: Women in Classical Antiquity* (New York: Schocken Books, 1975), 66-67.

prescribing that those born after the archonship of Eukleides (403/2) who could prove their parents were *astoi* would have a share in the city excluding those born before 403.<sup>79</sup> At some point in the early fourth century, there was a law in which mixed marriages with non-Athenians were liable to fines and penalties.<sup>80</sup> Apollodorus mentions this law “which does not permit a foreign woman to live with an Athenian man (*astos*) nor an Athenian woman (*astē*) with a foreign man, nor have children by no means whatsoever.”<sup>81</sup>

Prior to this citizenship law of 451/0, there must have been an understanding that in order to be a citizen, one must be born from at least one Athenian parent to have legitimate descent.<sup>82</sup> We have noted some of the circumstances in which the law was relaxed and reinstated, and further laws added concerned with citizenship and marriage. However, it is important to consider what initially led to the proposal of this qualification for citizenship in the mid-fifth century. Some of the factors that may have led to this change may be due to the number of non-Athenians in Attika after the Persian Wars.<sup>83</sup> According to the Aristotelean *Constitution of the Athenians*, this law was issued due to

---

<sup>79</sup> Eumelos, *FGrH* 77, fragment 2: μηδένα τῶν μετ’ Εὐκλείδην ἄρχοντα μετέχειν τῆς πόλεως, ἂν μὴ ἄμφω τοὺς γονεῶς ἀστοὺς ἐπιδείξῃται, τοὺς δὲ πρὸ Εὐκλείδου ἀνεξετάστως ἀφείσθαι. See also Dem. 57.30.

<sup>80</sup> [Dem] 59.16: Ἐὰν δὲ ξένος ἀστῆ συνοικῆ τέχνη ἢ μηχανῆ ἥτινιοῦν, γραφέσθω πρὸς τοὺς θεσμοθέτας Ἀθηναίων ὁ βουλόμενος οἷς ἔξεστιν. εἰ δὲ ἄλλῳ, πεπράσθω καὶ αὐτὸς καὶ ἡ οὐσία αὐτοῦ, καὶ τὸ τρίτον μέρος ἔστω τοῦ ἐλόντος. ἔστω δὲ καὶ εἰ ἢ ξένη τῷ ἀστῷ συνοικῆ κατὰ ταῦτα, καὶ ὁ συνοικῶν τῇ ξένη τῇ ἀλούσῃ ὀφειλέτω χιλίας δραχμάς. See A.R.W Harrison, *The Law of Athens*, 26-29.

<sup>81</sup> [Dem] 59.17: ὅς οὐκ ἔῃ τὴν ξένην τῷ ἀστῷ συνοικεῖν οὐδὲ τὴν ἀστὴν τῷ ξένῳ, οὐδὲ παιδοποιεῖσθαι, τέχνη οὐδὲ μηχανῆ οὐδεμιᾶ.

<sup>82</sup> Patterson, *Pericles’ Citizenship Law*, 8, argues that the male parent needed to be Athenian prior to the Pericles’ citizenship law. Similarly, A.R.W Harrison, *The Law of Athens*, 25.

<sup>83</sup> Blok, “Perikles’ Citizenship Law”, 147-149. See Robin Osborne, “Law, the Democratic Citizen and the Representation of Women in Classical Athens” in *Past & Present*, no.155 (1997:3-33),4-5, for demographic history.

the large number of citizens, but as Blok points out, there is no mention in the sources of issues due to shortages of land and in fact, in the decade prior to this law, intense warfare led to a decline of adult males in the population.<sup>84</sup> Blok proposes that this change from a one-parent requirement to descent from both parents “would raise the virtue of the Athenian citizens in their own eyes, making up in quality for quantitative loss.”<sup>85</sup> Patterson argues that as the Athenian empire grew, it was necessary to distinguish those in power from their related but ‘foreign’ allies.<sup>86</sup> Lambert further suggests that this imperial growth also caused Athenian citizenship to become more valuable.<sup>87</sup>

A further factor scholars have put forward as a motive for the law was the increase in mixed marriages. Yet, since the law was not retroactive, it would not have affected the number of citizens from such marriages that already introduced their offspring into their phratries.<sup>88</sup> Nevertheless, scholars like Humphreys and Hall argue that the law was anti-aristocratic and regulated the practice of elites who married non-Athenians out of fear that it would lead to conflicting loyalties and interfere with Athenian policy.<sup>89</sup> Correlating the Athenian myth of autochthony and Perikles citizenship law, Hall further states that these elites in democratic Athens would be

---

<sup>84</sup> Blok, “Perikles’ Citizenship Law”, 154-155.

<sup>85</sup> *Ibid.*, 159.

<sup>86</sup> Patterson, *Pericles’ Citizenship Law*, 103-105.

<sup>87</sup> S.D. Lambert, *The Phratries of Attica*, (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1993), 43, n.81.

<sup>88</sup> Patterson, *Pericles’ Citizenship Law*, 70. See also, K. Walter, “Perikles’ Citizenship Law”, in *CA* 2, (1983:314-336) and E. Carawan, “Pericles the Younger”, 389-90.

<sup>89</sup> See Jonathan Hall, “Autochthonous Autocrats: The Tyranny of the Athenian Democracy” in A. Turner (ed.), *Private and Public Lies: The Discourse of Despotism and Deceit in the Graeco-Roman World*, (Brill:2018), 26 and S.C. Humphreys, “The Nothoi of Kynosarges”, in *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*, vol. 94, (1974:88-95), 94. Cf. Patterson, *Pericles’ Citizenship Law*, 99-100.

regarded as “less authentically Athenian.”<sup>90</sup> These notions are similarly founded in VÉrilhac and Vial’s assertion that *polis* endogamy connects a city’s identity. <sup>91</sup>

Whatever the intention of the Periklean legislation, marriage and intermarriage are woven into the interpretation and practice of this law. Scholars have argued for various motivations, including the notion that the law was enacted to prevent children of mixed union from Athenian citizenship. <sup>92</sup> Not surprisingly, it is at this time in the fifth century, as Osborne and Rhodes note, when “we first encounter formal grants of citizenship to men from outside a community who are not the sons of citizens.”<sup>93</sup> Patterson also argues that in Athens after 451/0, the only legal way a foreigner could become an Athenian was through an honorary grant of citizenship, distinguishing these grants from naturalization.<sup>94</sup> But, what about the honorary grant of *epigamia*? This grant could potentially be a means by which a non-Athenian could produce offspring with an Athenian, bringing the issue of legitimacy and status into question. With the *polis* redefining their criteria for citizenship, the honorary right of *epigamia* first becomes attested as a practice between Greek communities in the literary evidence. As demonstrated in the previous section, *epigamia* is only referred to in the non-Greek context during the archaic period. Although Greek individuals continued to intermarry,

---

<sup>90</sup> Hall, “Autochthonous Autocrats”, 27.

<sup>91</sup> VÉrilhac and Vial, *Le Mariage Grec*, 79.

<sup>92</sup> Kamen, *Status in Classical Athens*, 55.

<sup>93</sup> Robin Osborne, Robin, and P. J. Rhodes, *Greek Historical Inscriptions, 478-404 BC*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), 155.

<sup>94</sup> Patterson, *Pericles’ Citizenship Law*, 80, n.98. See M.J. Osborne in *Naturalization in Athens*, 139, who posits that the term naturalization is a product of the fifth century and that laws concerning the status of citizens by decree were first evolved.

we see an establishment of an official state-granted practice of civic exogamy, *epigamia*, during the Classical period. In Athens, perhaps as an honorary grant, intermarriage would seem more compatible with its redefined ideas of citizenship, civic ideologies, and social structures.

### 3. Political and Philosophical Perspectives on *Epigamia* in the Classical period

Before directly looking at Athens' implementation of *epigamia*, the following section will briefly consider the political and philosophical narratives of the fourth century that encourage *epigamia* as a productive measure for the *polis*. In book five of the *Hellenica*, Xenophon tells us that shortly after the conclusion of the King's Peace,<sup>95</sup> the ambassador Kleigenes of Acanthus reported to the Lacedaemonians their growing concerns about the expansion of the Olynthians in the Chalcidice around 383. Kleigenes describes these concerns as follows:

For these cities that took part in the *politeia* unwillingly, if they see any opposition, they will revolt quickly. If, however, they are connected closely together by both the right of intermarriage [*epigamia*] and the right to acquire property [*enktēsis*] among one other, which have already been voted, and they know that it is advantageous to agree with the stronger ones, just as the Arcadians, when they go with you, they both keep safe their own things and plunder those belonging to another, perhaps it, namely the *koinon*, would no longer be easily dissolved.<sup>96</sup>

---

<sup>95</sup> The King's Peace of 386 was guaranteed by the Persian King and ended the Corinthian War (395-386) which was fought against Sparta by Athens, Thebes, Corinth and Persia.

<sup>96</sup> Xen. *Hell.* 5.2.19: αἱ γὰρ ἄκουσαι τῶν πόλεων τῆς πολιτείας κοινωνοῦσαι, αὐται, ἂν τι ἴδωσιν ἀντίπαλον, ταχὺ ἀποστήσονται· εἰ μὲντοι συγκλεισθήσονται ταῖς τε ἐπιγαμίαις καὶ ἐγκτήσεσι παρ' ἀλλήλοις, ἅς ἐνηφισμένοι εἰσὶ, καὶ γινώσκονται ὅτι μετὰ τῶν κρατούντων ἔπεσθαι κερδαλέον ἐστὶν ὥσπερ Ἀρκάδες, ὅταν μεθ' ἡμῶν ἴωσι, τὰ τε αὐτῶν σφύζουσι καὶ τὰ ἀλλότρια ἀρπάζουσιν, ἴσως οὐκέθ' ὁμοίως εὐλύτα ἔσται.

Previous efforts toward political unity might have occurred after the revolt against Athens in 432 with the creation of Olynthos as a stronghold for the Chalkidians but scholars disagree on their effectiveness.<sup>97</sup> Zarhnt asserts that the Chalkideans were split into independent cities with no intentions of a political union, however, in regard to their foreign affairs, they “acted as a united political entity” and maintained a sense of solidarity.<sup>98</sup> Yet on this occasion, Kleigenes states that the Olythians had undertaken certain measures that helped reassure the loyalty and stability of previously independent city-states. Two essential innovations of this unification process, according to Kleigenes, were the implementation of an *epigamia* and *enktēsis*.<sup>99</sup> Mackil, in examining the significance of these measures in the context of economic impact and property rights, points out that these would have been rights enjoyed by those throughout the *koinon*<sup>100</sup> and that these institutions were meant to “shape the interactions of its citizens with one another.”<sup>101</sup>

In this attempt at unification, the Olynthians expanded their Greek endogamous behavior and presumably engaged in a type of civic exogamy.<sup>102</sup> Zahnt adds that these

---

<sup>97</sup> Michael Zarhnt, “The Chalkidike and the Chalkidians” in *Federalism in Greek Antiquity*, ed. Beck, Hands, and Peter Funke, eds. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 345-378. See also M. H. Hansen and T. H. Nielsen, *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 811–814. C.f. J.A.O Larsen, *Greek Federal States: Their Institutions and Histories*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968).

<sup>98</sup> Zarhnt, “The Chalkidike and the Chalkidians”, 343-6.

<sup>99</sup> Larsen, *Greek Federal States*, 75. Larsen suggests that since these two rights were voted in, then this implies that these were recent innovations.

<sup>100</sup> Scholars often translate *koinon* with the modern term ‘federal state’ but Emily Mackil in *Creating a Common Polity: Religion, Economy, and Politics in the Making of the Greek Koinon*, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2013), 5-6, who suggests that we should be cautious unless it is clear that the “ancient institutions and practices...map closely onto the modern concept.”

<sup>101</sup> Mackil, *Creating a Common Polity*, 238.

<sup>102</sup> For civic-endogamy and civic-exogamy, see Vêrilhac and Vial, *Le Mariage Grec*, 71-78.

laws of *epigamia* and *enktēsis* also transgressed ethnical boundaries.<sup>103</sup> The Olynthians, it seems then, were intending to unify these areas to create a larger polity through a sense of shared kin blood ties, in which case intermarriage might not be seen as exogamous but more perhaps along a *koinon*-endogamous practice. Not all the cities in this region found this opportunity enticing, as the Akanthians and Apollonians expressed their desire to remain autonomous, living in accordance with their own laws.<sup>104</sup> Xenophon does not provide us with further details on the implementation of *epigamia*, but as was discussed above in Xenophon's mention of *epigamia* in "The Education of Cyrus," he is aware of the potential of *epigamia* as good diplomacy. He suggests that this privilege could be a powerful reinforcing tool utilized as part of the reciprocal rights given to all its members of expanding states.

This productive outlook on *epigamia* as being a part of a positive measure for a *polis* to undertake is also discussed by Plato in his philosophical discourse on the goal of the statesman and the means by which the best possible citizens are created.<sup>105</sup> In his *Statesman*, Plato is interested in the constitution and the ruler's knowledge of statesmanship. Plato has the stranger from Elea discuss the craft of ruling a city and reveals to Socrates that there are both divine bonds and human bonds needed for this act of political construction.<sup>106</sup> More specifically, the human bonds that are necessary are "those of rights of intermarriage (*epigamia*) and the sharing of children and of those

---

<sup>103</sup> Zarhnt, "The Chalkidike and the Chalkidians", 356.

<sup>104</sup> Xen. *Hell.* 5.2.14: Ἡμεῖς δέ, ὃ ἄνδρες Λακεδαιμόνιοι, βουλόμεθα μὲν τοῖς πατρίοις νόμοις χρῆσθαι καὶ αὐτοπολιταὶ εἶναι· εἰ μὲντοι μὴ βοηθήσει τις, ἀνάγκη καὶ ἡμῖν μετ' ἐκείνων γίνεσθαι

<sup>105</sup> Pl., *Plt.*, 297a5-b3.

<sup>106</sup> Pl., *Plt.*, 309c.



relating to portioning's and marriages within the state".<sup>107</sup> Perhaps in this dialogue, Plato is suggesting that *epigamia* would aid in the mixing of people with opposing qualities, which the Elean stranger proposes would be productive for a great statesman.<sup>108</sup> Furthermore, Aristotle also maintains *epigamia* as being a crucial element in state-building:

For if one were to bring together the sites into one, so that the city of Megara and Corinth were contiguous by means of the city-walls, even still they would not be one city; nor would they if they granted each other rights of intermarriage [*epigamia*], although this, [namely the right of intermarriage] is among the characteristic associations for city-states.<sup>109</sup>

Aristotle states that what constitutes a *polis* is “a partnership of both families and clans living well”<sup>110</sup> and that “this will not be the case unless they dwell in one and the same place and make use of the rights of intermarriage (*epigamia*).”<sup>111</sup> For Aristotle, *epigamia* is a positive and necessary condition for the *polis* to flourish fully, ensuring goodness for all.

The fourth-century figures Xenophon, Plato, and Aristotle all seem to share an awareness and even encouragement of *epigamia*. Was *epigamia* actually executed in this way to make a more concordant *polis* during the Classical period? We will look at how

---

<sup>107</sup> Pl., *Plt.*, 310b: Τοὺς τῶν ἐπιγαμιῶν καὶ παιδῶν κοινωνήσεων καὶ τῶν περὶ τὰς ἰδίας ἐκδόσεις καὶ γάμου. Translated by Harold N. Fowler, *Plato in Twelve Volumes, Vol. 12*, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1921).

<sup>108</sup> Pl., *Plt.*, 310d5-e5.

<sup>109</sup> Arist., *Pol.*, 1280b line 15: εἰ γὰρ τις καὶ συναγάγοι τοὺς τόπους εἰς ἓν, ὥστε ἄπτεσθαι τὴν Μεγαρέων πόλιν καὶ Κορινθίων τοῖς τεύχεσιν, ὁμοῦ οὐ μία πόλις· οὐδ' εἰ πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἐπιγαμίας ποιήσαιτο, καίτοι τοῦτο τῶν ἰδίων ταῖς πόλεσι κοινωνημάτων ἐστίν.

<sup>110</sup> Arist., *Pol.*, 1280b line 35: ἡ τοῦ εἶ ζῆν κοινωνία καὶ ταῖς οἰκίαις καὶ τοῖς γένεσι

<sup>111</sup> Arist., *Pol.*, 1280b line 36: οὐκ ἔσται μέντοι τοῦτο μὴ τὸν αὐτὸν καὶ ἓνα κατοικούντων τρόπον καὶ χρωμένον ἐπιγαμίας· See Ernest Barker, *The Politics of Aristotle*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1946) 119-120, who explains these conditions were necessary for a good quality of life through just law and good citizens which is the objective aim of the polis.

*epigamia* was implemented in Athens to explore the particular usage compared to the ideals of philosophical discourses.

#### 4. Athens and *epigamia*

This section considers the evidence for grants of *epigamia* given and received by the Athenians in the Classical period. There are two well-attested grants given to Plataea in 427 and to Euboea around 413-411. There is more problematic evidence of two grants received during the fourth century from Perinthos and Byzantion. Finally, there is still more problematic evidence of a final grant given to Thebes and all the Greeks.

##### 4.1 Athens, Plataea, and *epigamia*

During the sixth century through the fourth century, Plataea, a city in southern Boeotia about forty miles northeast of Athens, had varying relations with Athens, Sparta, and the Boeotians, especially the Thebans. Around 519, the Thebans pressured the Plataeans in an attempt to force those “who were not willing to belong to the *Boiōtoi*,”<sup>112</sup> so the Plataeans decided to break away from the Boeotian League, and in 519, they aligned themselves with Athens.<sup>113</sup> In 519, Athens advanced the borders by defeating the Boeotians, and the border between Plataea and Thebes became the Asopus River.<sup>114</sup> In

---

<sup>112</sup> Hdt. 6.108.5: μελλόντων δὲ συνάπτειν μάχην Κορίνθιοι οὐ περιεῖδον, παρατυχόντες δὲ καὶ καταλλάξαντες ἐπιτρεψάντων ἀμφοτέρων οὕρισαν τὴν χώραν ἐπὶ τοῖσιδε, εἴαν Θηβαίους Βοιωτῶν τοὺς μὴ βουλομένους ἐς Βοιωτοὺς τελέειν.

<sup>113</sup> Thuc. 3.61.2. See N.G.L. Hammond, “Plataea’s Relations with Thebes, Sparta and Athens” in *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*, vol. 112, (1992:143-150), 144, who suggest that Thebes was pressuring Plataea to join the Boiotian system and submit to their hegemony.

<sup>114</sup> Hdt. 6.108.6. Hammond in “Plataea’s Relations with Thebes”, 144, argues that Athens was able to advance the borders of Plataea with Thebes, the frontier of Hysiae with Thebes to the river Asopus by

490, the Plataeans fought alongside the Athenians against the Persians at the Battle of Marathon.<sup>115</sup> Later, in 479, the Plataeans, Athenians, and Spartans fought the Persians at Plataea (Hdt. 9.28.6), and after this battle, Pausanias, the Spartan in command, proposed to the allies that they restore the autonomy of the Plataea polis.<sup>116</sup> Badian remarks that this was a decisive battle for the Greeks, and it is not surprising that there would be special rewards for the Plataeans “in view of their special connection with the site.”<sup>117</sup>

Sometime in between these events and the Peloponnesian War, the Plataeans joined the Boeotian Federation<sup>118</sup> but had left by the time it was attacked by the Thebans in 431 (Thuc. 2.2-6). During the years 429-427, Plataea was besieged by the Spartans and its allies as it aligned itself with Athens during the Peloponnesian War.<sup>119</sup> Athens continued to support Plataea, and some of the Plataeans fled to Athens and were given citizenship rights.<sup>120</sup> In 427, the Plataeans surrendered, but later, around 386, rebuilt their city.<sup>121</sup>

In Isocrates', *Plataicus*, we learn of an *epigamia* in the Greek context between the Plataeans and the Athenians.<sup>122</sup> Plataea was yet again destroyed by the Thebans in

---

defeating the Boiotians, making “Athens an immediate neighbour of Plataea. C.f. E.Badian, *From Plataea to Potidaea*, (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1993), 117-199.

<sup>115</sup> Hdt. 6.108.1.

<sup>116</sup> Thuc.2.71.2

<sup>117</sup> Badian, *From Plataea to Potidaea*, 110.

<sup>118</sup> Hansen and Neilsen, *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis*, 450.

<sup>119</sup> Thuc. 2.71-78, 3.20-4, 3.64.3.

<sup>120</sup> Thuc.3.55.3, 3.63.2, This grant of citizenship will be further explored below.

<sup>121</sup> Thuc.5.32.1, the Athenians in 421 destroyed Skione and gave it to the Plataeans to occupy but were restored their native city after the King's Peace (Paus.9.1.4).

<sup>122</sup> See Terry Papillon's introduction to *Plataicus*, in *Isocrates II*, (University of Texas Press, 2004), 228-229, where he summarizes the scholarship surrounding the debate of this speech, namely that it is a transcript that may have been used as school exercise or it was used as a political pamphlet or serving

373. Isocrates preserves a plea for help that transpired in the aftermath of such destruction by a Plataean official to the Athenian assembly that conveys the following:

With these things in mind, we think that you should have some consideration for us. For indeed, we are not strangers to you, but all of us are related by our goodwill, and most of us by kinship. For because of the right of intermarriage (*epigamia*) which you gave us, we come into being (are born) from your female citizens.<sup>123</sup>

The Plataeans were invoking a claim to a prior *epigamia* granted by Athenians to the Plataeans. According to this passage, the Athenians endowed this right to them sometime in the recent past out of their goodwill towards Athens, allowing future Plataeans to marry and have legitimate children with Athenian female citizens. Scholars such as Oranges and Harrison believe that this *epigamia* cannot be considered an actual grant on the basis that they were granted citizenship in 427.<sup>124</sup> This would mean *epigamia* would have been implied in this citizenship grant and naturalization process; however, the Plataean specifically refers to a right, *epigamia*, which, from the Plataeans' perspective, should connect them closer to Athenians.

We learn from Herodotus that when the Plataeans were being attacked by the Thebans in 519, they sought aid from the Lacedaemonians, who rejected them and advised them to seek aid from the Athenians, who were neighbors (*πλησιοχώροισι*).<sup>125</sup>

The Plataeans went to the Athenians, “sitting down beside the altar they gave themselves

---

some other function. Despite the possible usages of this speech and the scholarly debate surrounding it, there is no indication to not consider the details of the *epigamia* as authentic.

<sup>123</sup> Isoc.,14.51: Ὦν αὐτοὺς ὑμᾶς ἀξιοῦμεν ἐνθυμουμένους ἐπιμέλειάν τινα ποιήσασθαι περὶ ἡμῶν. καὶ γὰρ οὐδ’ ἀλλότριον τυγχάνομεν ὑμῖν ὄντες, ἀλλὰ ταῖς μὲν εὐνοίαις ἅπαντες οἰκεῖοι, τῇ δὲ συγγενείᾳ τὸ πλῆθος ἡμῶν διὰ γὰρ τὰς ἐπιγαμίας τὰς δοθείσας ἐκ πολιτῶν ὑμετέρων γεγόναμεν·

<sup>124</sup> Oranges, “La concessione dell’epigamia agli Eubei”, 174, n.7, and Harrison, *The Laws of Athens*, 29, n.1.

<sup>125</sup> Hdt., 6.108.1. Note that, Thuc.3.68 tells us this occurred in 519.

to the Athenians,” that is to say, they put themselves under their protection.<sup>126</sup>

Thucydides further elucidates that this alliance took place at the Plataean's own request, and they were “admitted to their alliance and had shared the rights of citizenship with them [the Athenians].”<sup>127</sup> Neither Thucydides nor Herodotus stated that an *epigamia* was enacted; they stated that they were under their protection or had made an alliance, and citizenship was granted.

As noted above, Plataea was then destroyed in 428/7 during the Peloponnesian War, in which event some Plataeans escaped and sought refuge in Athens.<sup>128</sup> According to Isocrates, the Athenians “made the Plataeans who survived Athenian citizens, sharing everything they had with them.”<sup>129</sup> Did this shared right with Plataeans also imply the right to intermarriage in Athens, or was it an excluded right? Suppose these rights of citizenship and intermarriage were granted in 427. How did this conform to the Periklean citizenship law of 451, which required dual Athenian parentage for a share in the citizenship, or was this perhaps an exception? Such uncertainty leads to further questions about who exactly was granted these rights: the Plataeans living within Athens who sought refuge, or all Plataeans, *en masse*, thereafter?

Hansen suggests that the grant in 519 perhaps was meant for those Plataeans who moved to Athens and were “inscribed as a citizen without an individual decree passed by

---

<sup>126</sup> Hdt., 6.108.4: ἰκέται ἰζόμενοι ἐπὶ τὸν βωμὸν ἐδίδοσαν σφέας αὐτοῦς.

<sup>127</sup> Thuc., 3.55.3: ἄλλως τε καὶ οὗς εὖ παθὼν τις καὶ αὐτὸς δεόμενος προσηγάγετο ξυμμάχους καὶ πολιτείας μετέλαβεν.

<sup>128</sup> Thuc., 3.20-24. Plataea was attacked by Thebes in 431 (Thuc. 2.2.-6), then again besieged in 429 (Thuc. 2.71-78) and captured in 427 (Thuc. 3.20-24).

<sup>129</sup> Isoc., 12.94.: Πλαταιέων δὲ τοὺς περιγενομένους πολίτας ἐποίησαντο καὶ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων αὐτοῖς ἀπάντων μετέδοσαν.

the people.”<sup>130</sup> This initial grant is understood as being applied once a Plataean settled in Athens, and as Hornblower explains, ‘cashed-in’ by the citizen of the recipient state.<sup>131</sup> One can presume that a Plataean between 519 and 451 who shared in this citizenship grant would settle in Athens and be allowed to marry an Athenian without the issues of legitimacy being a concern like the archaic elites had practiced. A second wave was granted or activated again in 427 to Plataean refugees, making it an exception to the Perikean citizenship law.<sup>132</sup> The *epigamia* referred to by the Plataean in Isocrates was perhaps not established until after the restrictions of 451, conceivably made in 427, in which case, a specific *epigamia* would possibly have been needed to claim the marriage and the children of that marriage legitimate.<sup>133</sup>

Apollodorus, in [Demosthenes’] *Against Naeira*, alludes to a grant by decree established between the Athenians and the Plataeans under Hippocrates. The speech by Apollodorus was meant to demonstrate how difficult it was for foreigners to receive citizenship in Athens because of how important it was to the Athenians.<sup>134</sup> According to this decree, the Athenians allowed the Plataeans who were admitted into the demes and tribes to become Athenian citizens, with the addition that other Plataeans thereafter

---

<sup>130</sup> Hansen and Neilsen, *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis*, 450.

<sup>131</sup> Simon Hornblower, *A Commentary on Thucydides*, i: Books I-III, (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 449. Hornblower references Amit and Gomme’ who make a similar interpretation of how these grants might work.

<sup>132</sup> Osborne and Rhodes, *Greek Historical Inscriptions*, 554, indicates that the grant was either in 519 or 480 and that it was activated in 427 by surviving Plataeans.

<sup>133</sup> Blok, “Perikles’ Citizenship Law”, 258. Blok makes a similar claim that in order for the Plataeans to be enrolled as citizens, a decree was necessary in 427 in order for the ‘Plataeans to be Athenians’.

<sup>134</sup> Mirko Canevaro, “The Documents in the Public Speeches of Demosthenes: Authenticity and Tradition” PhD diss., (University of Durham, 2011), 273-274.

would obtain the rights from the Athenian demos.<sup>135</sup> While scholars doubt the authenticity of the decree as quoted in the speech, claiming that it provides no reliable evidence on the conditions of the decree, however, Apollodorus' summary of its contents should be considered reliable.<sup>136</sup> Apollodorus' account paraphrases further details about conditions of the grant of citizenship to the Plataeans and twice mentions that the descendants of the Plataeans who were granted these rights, “may, if born to a married Athenian woman (*astē*) according to the law,”<sup>137</sup> obtain an archonship or priesthood position. That is, only the offspring of an *epigamia* would be able to meet this requirement. This reference may allude to the addition of a grant of *epigamia*, possibly granted to certain Plataeans alongside the citizenship rights in 427.<sup>138</sup>

I am inclined to agree with Hornblower, who suggests that the *epigamia*, in Isocrates' speech, may indicate “something less than full citizenship” to those who were

---

<sup>135</sup>[Dem.] 59.104: Ἰπποκράτης εἶπεν, Πλαταιέας εἶναι Ἀθηναίους ἀπὸ τῆσδε τῆς ἡμέρας, ἐπιτίμους καθάπερ οἱ ἄλλοι Ἀθηναῖοι, καὶ μετεῖναι αὐτοῖς ὥνπερ Ἀθηναίους μέτεστι πάντων, καὶ ἱερῶν καὶ ὀσίων, πλὴν εἴ τις ἱερωσύνη ἢ τελετὴ ἐστὶν ἐκ γένους, μηδὲ τῶν ἐννέα ἀρχόντων, τοῖς δ' ἐκ τούτων. κατανεῖμαι δὲ τοὺς Πλαταιέας εἰς τοὺς δήμους καὶ τὰς φυλάς. ἐπειδὴν δὲ νεμηθῶσι, μὴ ἐξέστω ἔτι Ἀθηναῖω μηδενὶ γίγνεσθαι Πλαταιέων, μὴ εὐρομένω παρὰ τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Ἀθηναίων.” Blok in *Citizenship in Classical Athens*, 258, claims that this decree is disputed, “but not the fact of this grant, which was the first of its kind as far as we know.”

<sup>136</sup> Mirko Canevaro, “The Decree Awarding Citizenship to the Plataeans [Dem.]59.104” in *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies*, vol. 50, no.3 (2010: 337-69), 339, 342. See also Canevaro, *The Documents in the Attic Orators: Laws and Decrees in the Public Speeches of the Demosthenic Corpus* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 198. Cf. Osborne, *Naturalization*, iv, 173-176, who argues that although this provision is only found in Apollodorus, it seems to have summarized the law at the time of the speech and dates these disabilities back to the Periklean law and such eligibility laws for the archonship are later found in the *Ath.Pol.*, where one had to prove three generations of Athenian citizenship from both sides. Although he finds unusual features in the language of the document, they are not enough to speak against its authenticity.

<sup>137</sup> [Dem.]59.106: ἄν ὧσιν ἐξ ἀστῆς γυναικὸς καὶ ἐγγυητῆς κατὰ τὸν νόμον. Repeated also in 59.102.

<sup>138</sup>K. Kapparis, “The Athenian Decree for the Naturalisation of the Plataeans”, *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies*, vol. 36, no. 4, (1995:359-78), 370, dates this part of the law to 427 as well.

granted this right.<sup>139</sup> Blok similarly argues that citizens-by-decree “were almost the same as those born Athenians” with some restrictions.<sup>140</sup> Here, the marriage of a Plataean male, who is an Athenian citizen-by-decree, and an Athenian citizen female may be considered “less than” one between two natural-born Athenian citizens. Or did the Athenians understand the offspring of an *epigamia* as being of two Athenian citizens? The discourse surrounding previous examples of *epigamia* seems to propose a sort of mutual unification of two communities. In this case, the Plataeans remained their own group with a Plataean status that is clearly less than full Athenian citizenship. Osborne argues that the Plataeans were their own ethnic unit with their own *polis* and identity and did not desire to remain Athenians.<sup>141</sup> In 420, many resettled at Scione when the Athenians gave them the land to occupy,<sup>142</sup> but a number of Plataeans stayed in Athens. Kapparis concludes that they may have had a choice in their degree of integration.<sup>143</sup> This example of *epigamia* begins to reflect particular concerns resulting in the granting of this right to non-Athenians, putting into question the status of those granted rights and of their offspring. Moreover, in this case, there is an indifference to the unifying potential that *epigamia* can have on communities, which seems distinct from previous examples of *epigamia* and not the goal of this *epigamia* granted by Athens.

---

<sup>139</sup> Hornblower, *A Commentary on Thucydides*, i, 450. Meanwhile, Kapparis, in “The Athenian Decree,” 361, argues that the Plataeans were dependent on their degree of integration.

<sup>140</sup> Blok, *Citizenship in Classical Athens*, 259-262. Blok argues that in some cases, the status of an Athenian-by-decree is a legal fiction and one can be made an Athenian but never as *astos*.

<sup>141</sup> See Osborne, *Naturalization*, iv, 182-183. Also note, Lys. 23, [Dem.]59.92,104,106, for restrictions placed upon naturalized citizens.

<sup>142</sup> Thuc. 5.32.1: Περὶ δὲ τοὺς αὐτοὺς χρόνους τοῦ θέρους τούτου Σκιωναίου μὲν Ἀθηναῖοι ἐκπολιορκήσαντες ἀπέκτειναν τοὺς ἠβῶντας, παῖδας δὲ καὶ γυναῖκας ἠνδραπόδισαν καὶ τὴν γῆν Πλαταιεῦσιν ἔδοσαν νέμεσθαι. See Osborne, *Naturalization*, iv, 183.

<sup>143</sup> Hornblower, *A Commentary on Thucydides*, i, 450. See also Kapparis, “The Athenian Decree”, 368.



This *epigamia* is not only limited to textual evidence – some material sources may suggest that it was a right that was actually exercised. The practice of intermarriage between Athenians and Plataeans may be corroborated by epigraphical evidence, such as *IG I<sup>3</sup> 1363*, which dates around 430 and consists of a group of grave stelai found in Athens. The epitaphs found on these stelai include Plataeans found alongside the names of Athenians or non-Plataeans, which may indicate the mixed marital unions made by the Plataeans; more work on these fragments is needed, however.<sup>144</sup> The epigraphic evidence also records Plataean women marrying Athenian men during the fourth century.<sup>145</sup> An inscription from the fourth century, *IG II<sup>2</sup> 10091*, gives the name of Plataean Eupraxis, who is likely the wife of Athenian Miltiades.<sup>146</sup> Presumably, an *epigamia* would have been required to ensure the legitimacy of the marriage and offspring.

This relationship with the Plataeans was initially an alliance in the sixth century. By 427, a mass right of citizenship was granted because of their acts of loyalty to the Athenians, alongside an *epigamia*, which was needed to legitimize the offspring of these unions, maneuvering around the Periklean law. Given the mass grant of citizenship granted to the Plataeans, several Plataeans would reside in Athens and could potentially

---

<sup>144</sup> *IG I<sup>3</sup> 1363*, the stelai were found in a single plot along the Sacred way, the group is made up of the following names: a. Ξένων (*FRA 6618*), θόγα (*FRA 6106*); b. Δορκίων (*FRA 6084*) and Καλλίς (*FRA 6110*); c. Κοντώ (*FRA 6111*); d. Θεομνάστ[ς] (*FRA 6104*) and Νικοστράτα (*FRA 6116*); e. Απολλόδωρος (*FRA 6071*); f. Φερενίκα (*FRA 6136*) g. Τιμώ (*FRA 6132*) h. ...στράτη. Some of the names inscribed date between 404-403. More work is needed to make conclusions about these fragments is needed since the claim that they were Plataeans is based on a fourth-century inscription found together with these stelai - *IG II<sup>2</sup> 10092* “Ἡρῦλος Πλαταιεύς”.

<sup>145</sup> *FRA 6097*, *FRA 6124*, *FRA 6144*.

<sup>146</sup> *FRA 6097/ IG II<sup>2</sup> 10091*: Μιλτιάδης. Εὔπραξις Πλαταιική.

marry an Athenian female, resulting in challenges to the legitimacy and status of the offspring of such a union. Although the Plataeans invoked these blood kinships, they were not fully integrated into Athenian society, which the Athenians may not have intended to be the case. From these sources, the *epigamia* was not meant to ease tensions and unify the Athenians with Plataeans, but was a grant given to the Plataeans as an extension of already established ties with the Plataeans that, I suggest, needed to be revisited because of Athenian strict laws of legitimate citizenship. This *epigamia* is received by Plataeans out of their *eunoia*, which constitutes an honorary aspect as well as the idea of a gift or reward,<sup>147</sup> and seems distinct from previous examples that seem to have a bilateral aspect. The Plataeans were interested in remaining Plataeans, so why grant them an *epigamia* that could further integrate them into the polis? *Epigamia* adds further to the discussion of these varying degrees of Athenian citizenship and integration.

#### 4.2 Athens, Euboea, and *epigamia*

The Athenians also established an *epigamia* with the Euboeans around 413.<sup>148</sup> A speech written by Lysias against Phormisus is the principal source. Phormisus, who

---

<sup>147</sup> Similarly, Osborne in *Naturalization*, iv, 150, explains that Athenian's attitude towards grants in this period down to the second century was to regard grants as "honours or rewards."

<sup>148</sup> See Oranges in "La Concessione Dell' Epigamia" where she explains that there is not a consensus on when this *epigamia* was granted; some scholars date it back to 446, arguing that it was in favor of the cleruch's who were in Euboea, or the suppression of the Euboean revolt (Thuc.1.114), others to 413 after the Sicilian expedition. Alfonso Moreno in *Feeding the Democracy: The Athenian Grain Supply in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries B.C.* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 340, who also dates this *epigamia* to before 413.

returned from exile after fleeing the Spartan-backed oligarchy of the Thirty, proposed to restrict citizenship by introducing a land qualification after the democratic restoration of 403/2.<sup>149</sup> Lysias wrote in opposition, as many Athenians would lose their citizenship as a result, and questioned why the Athenians returned from exile if they were willing to enslave themselves by means of an Assembly vote.<sup>150</sup> He continues: "...and I consider that the only deliverance for the city is for all Athenians to have a share in the citizenship. When we possessed our walls and ships and money and allies, we did not intend to drive out any Athenian, but we actually gave the right to intermarriage (*epigamia*) to the Euboeans."<sup>151</sup>

Lysias here reminds the Athenians of their past conduct of not denying any Athenians their citizenship, but that they even extended this by means of an *epigamia* to the Euboeans. This speech, unfortunately, does not tell us any details of this grant, such as when it was granted, nor does it indicate which particular settlements on Euboea were impacted, but refers to Euboeans as a whole.<sup>152</sup> We can presuppose that this was granted after the Periklean Citizenship law was in place, and as Oranges points out, this *epigamia* served as a way to legitimize the children of these unions.<sup>153</sup> Ogden further

---

<sup>149</sup> This speech is not part of Lysias manuscript but is a speech as quoted by Dionysius of Halicarnassus. Although it is unclear if the speech was delivered, the speech was composed as if for a real debate, see introduction to this speech in S.C. Todd, *Lysias*, (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2000).

<sup>150</sup> Lys.34.2.

<sup>151</sup> Lys. 34.3: ἡγοῦμαι ταύτην μόνην σωτηρίαν εἶναι τῇ πόλει, ἅπασιν Ἀθηναίοις τῆς πολιτείας μετεῖναι, ἐπεὶ ὅτε καὶ τὰ τεῖχη καὶ τὰς ναῦς καὶ [τὰ] χρήματα καὶ συμμάχους ἐκτησάμεθα, οὐχ ὅπως τινὰ Ἀθηναίων ἀπόσομεν διενεοῦμεθα, ἀλλὰ καὶ Εὐβοεῦσιν ἐπιγαμῖν ἐποιούμεθα.

<sup>152</sup> See Osborne and Rhodes, *Greek Historical Inscriptions*, 154-155, for another loose usage of Euboea, where we are not sure which Euboean community is referred to.

<sup>153</sup> Oranges, "La Concessione Dell' Epigamia", 174.

argues that this *epigamia* allowed Athenian men to have legitimate children from Euboean women.<sup>154</sup> This is probable if we consider that this *epigamia* was granted to the Athenians who settled alone in the cleruchies on Euboea. These cleruchs remained Athenian citizens even if they lived in the cleruchies and not in Athens.<sup>155</sup> Osborne states that these Athenian men could marry local wives if they were granted the right to intermarriage.<sup>156</sup> This *epigamia* would be advantageous to the Athenians as they would be able to own and transfer Euboean property.<sup>157</sup> However, the passage in Lysias specifically refers to Euboeans, and perhaps there was another concession made upon the cleruchs around 446 since, as Athenian citizens, they would not have needed this right to intermarry another Athenian.

Unlike the more cordial alliance with Plataea, the Euboeans had a tumultuous relationship with Athens throughout the fifth century. The Euboean settlements revolted on various occasions against Athens, who progressively subjected the island for its land and agricultural resources.<sup>158</sup> There was an apparent awareness of the significant role of Euboea to Athenians founded already in Thucydides during the Peloponnesian Wars.<sup>159</sup> Thucydides describes the Athenians as confused and afraid after the disaster in Sicily in 413 and eager to secure their allies, especially the Euboeans. The Athenians elected a

---

<sup>154</sup> Daniel Ogden, *Greek bastardy in the classical and Hellenistic periods*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 70.

<sup>155</sup> Hornblower, Simon. "Cleruchy." *Oxford Classical Dictionary*. 7 Mar. 2016

<sup>156</sup> Robin Osborne, "Law, the Democratic Citizen and the Representation of Women in Classical Athens" in *Past and Present*, no.155, (1997: 3-33),10, n 20.

<sup>157</sup> Moreno, *Feeding the Democracy*, 100.

<sup>158</sup> For Athens's control over Euboea's agricultural resources, see Moreno in *Feeding the Athenian Democracy*, 110—146.

<sup>159</sup> See, for instance, Thuc.2.14, 7.28, 8.95.2 for the significance of Euboea to Athens.

council of elders, the *probouloi*, to propose measures concerning the present affairs in response to the perceived failure of Sicily that made the present situation of losing Euboea alarming.<sup>160</sup> I agree with Oranges who argues that this event led to measures such as *epigamia* to strengthen this relationship.<sup>161</sup> Euboea broke away from Athens in 411, in which recovery measures, such as the grant of *epigamia*, could have been needed to strengthen this deteriorating relationship. The intention of this *epigamia*, although used to calm tensions, was granted as part of the actions needed to regain control of Euboea and its resources for Athens by offering them perhaps something that the Athenians believed would appeal enough and benefit the Euboeans. This goes beyond the right to intermarriage, as Lambert suggests, “it would presumably have permitted children of mixed marriages to be Athenian citizens and inherit Athenian and Euboean property.”<sup>162</sup>

In addition to these literary sources, epigraphical evidence is concerned with major settlements and alliance arrangements on Euboea.<sup>163</sup> One of these inscribed decrees, *IG I<sup>3</sup> 40*, dating to 446/5 or 424/3, refers to an alliance between Athens and Chalkis on Euboea. The first set of provisions included an oath against future revolts from Athens (22-5), tribute payment to Athens (26-27), and the agreement to defend

---

<sup>160</sup> Thuc. 8.1.3-4. καὶ μάλιστα τὴν Εὐβοίαν...ἀρχὴν τινα πρεσβυτέρων ἀνδρῶν ἐλέσθαι, οἵτινες περὶ τῶν παρόντων ὡς ἂν καιρὸς ἢ προβουλεύσουσιν.”

<sup>161</sup> Oranges, “La Concesssione Dell’ Epigamia”, 183-184. See Moreno, *Feeding the Democracy*, 97-98, who notes that 446 Perikles depopulated Histiaea, resettled it with Athenian cleruchies, and argues that the grant of *epigamia* makes sense in this context.

<sup>162</sup> Stephen Lambert, *Two Inscribed Documents of the Athenian Empire: The Chalkis Decree and the Tribute Reassessment Decree* (Evesham, Worcestershire: Attic Inscription Online, 2017), 12-13.

<sup>163</sup> *IG I<sup>3</sup> 39-41*.

Athenian people (28-29), while a later provision adds that in terms of the protection of Euboea, “the generals would be in charge as best as they can in the best interest of the Athenians.”<sup>164</sup> Unfortunately, there is no mention of *epigamia*, but, as Osborne states, this document demonstrates how the Athenians managed their allies.<sup>165</sup> Athens's previous management of the Chalkis consisted of imposing unilateral terms in some ways while also not imposing on their internal affairs.<sup>166</sup> Perhaps future negotiations with the Euboeans, in which the Athenians were in desperate need of stronger alliances, had to consist of something that would not be perceived as unilateral but would offer something to the Euboeans, thus imposing on the internal structures to the extent of granting intermarriage rights.

This relationship with Euboea is not straightforward and could be further explored by considering Euripides' *Ion* as a way to understand the social dynamics implicated with *epigamia*. Albeit set in a mythological tradition, it may embody Athenian's anxieties about legitimacy, and as Gibert suggests, it reflects on the “experience of Creusa and Ion, and ideology of autochthony and empire.”<sup>167</sup> Similarly, Patterson suggests that this tragedy might have been produced after the events of 411 and may indeed be reflecting on the question, “Who is an Athenian citizen?”<sup>168</sup> Oranges

---

<sup>164</sup> IG I<sup>3</sup> 40.76-78: περι δὲ φυλακῆς Εὐβοίας τὸς στρατηγὸς ἐπιμέλεσθαι ἡὸς ἂν δύνονται ἄριστα, ἡόπος ἂν ἔχει ἡὸς βέλτιστα Ἀθηναίους.

<sup>165</sup> Osborne and Rhodes, *Greek Historical Inscriptions*, 174.

<sup>166</sup> Lambert, *Two Inscribed Documents*, 23.

<sup>167</sup> J.C. Gibert, Euripides, *Ion*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), ix.

<sup>168</sup> Cynthia Patterson, “Those Athenian Bastards”, in *Classical Antiquity*, vol. 9, no.1 (1990: 40-73), 66 n.99.

and Patterson also speculate that some of these references in *Ion* allude to the grant of *epigamia* to the Euboeans mentioned in Lysias, perhaps placed in 413.<sup>169</sup>

*Ion* begins with a recounting of prior events. Creusa, after being assaulted by Apollo, gives birth to Ion, leaving him exposed at Athens, but Hermes rescues the child, leaving him at Delphi to be reared by the priestess of Apollo's temple. Meanwhile, Creusa is married to Xuthos, but their marriage is childless, which motivates the couple to seek oracular consultation. As we will see, tragedy reflects on social attitudes such as Athenian ideologies of autochthony, identity, and perhaps the social dynamics implicated in such measures as *epigamia* that impose on this *oikos*.

In Euripides' version, Xuthos, a Euboean, non-Athenian, we are told that in return for his assistance against the Chalcodontidae inhabitants of Euboea, "he received an honor of marrying Creusa,"<sup>170</sup> who is the embodiment of Athenian autochthony.<sup>171</sup> The term *epigamia* is not used, but we can suppose that since he is not an Athenian and he has demonstrated goodwill for the Athenians, like the Plataeans, this honor is meant to indicate an *epigamia*. Creusa herself, in regards to Xuthos status, states that "he is not an *astos*, a citizen, but a foreigner from another land."<sup>172</sup> The tragedy does not mention an honorary grant of citizenship or *epigamia*, but the inferences made by Ion further allude to unconventional circumstances that need an explanation. For instance, when interrogating Creusa, his mother, Ion asks: "And being a foreigner, how could he have

---

<sup>169</sup> Patterson, "Those Athenian Bastards," 66n100, and Oranges, "La Concesssione Dell' Epigamia", 185.

<sup>170</sup> Eur. *Ion*, 57-61: γάμων Κρεούσης ἀξίωμ' ἐδέξατο. Similarly, in lines 294-298.

<sup>171</sup> Ogden, *Greek Bastardy*, 170.

<sup>172</sup> Eur.*Ion*, 290: οὐκ ἀστὸς ἀλλ' ἐπακτὸς ἐξ ἄλλης χθονός.

you who are a native?”<sup>173</sup> Such references may evoke an Athenian audience to question these allowed state-granted intermarriages and as well as Athenian anxieties towards those granted citizen-like privileges.

Through these honorary rights granted to him, Xuthus, as the beneficiary, is under the assumption that Ion would have no issues being accepted in Athens.<sup>174</sup> Ion, however, believing that he is the offspring of a mixed union,<sup>175</sup> shares his own concerns of not being a full Athenian citizen as he recognizes that “things are different up close” and that:

they say that the renowned Athenians are autochthonous/  
not an immigrant race,/   
I would suffer two disadvantages/  
My father being a foreigner, I being a bastard.<sup>176</sup>

Here, Ion, apparently aware of Athenian ideology, expresses his concern about his status in Athenian society and is aware of the prejudices that await him. Xuthus may have been rewarded an *epigamia* and exercised his right to marry Creusa, but this does little for Ion, since, as a *nothos*, he would be denied his access to participate as a citizen. As Oranges notes, these confrontations are meant to “evoke some issues of contemporary Athenian political debates,” using Ion, unaware of his divine lineage, as an example of the marginalization of children of mixed unions. Ogden points out the ambiguity of how citizenship for the offspring would work in such *epigamia* cases. If the father were a

---

<sup>173</sup> Ibid., 293: καὶ πῶς ξένος σ' ὦν ἔσχεν οὐσαν ἐγγενῆ;

<sup>174</sup> Ibid., 578-581 οὐ σ' ὄλβιον μὲν σκῆπτρον ἀναμένει πατρός, πολὺς δὲ πλοῦτος· οὐδὲ θάτερον νοσῶν δυοῖν κεκλήσῃ δυσγενῆς πένης θ' ἅμα, ἀλλ' εὐγενῆς τε καὶ πολυκτῆμων βίου.

<sup>175</sup> Later in the play, Ion finds out that he is the son of Creusa, an Athenian and of the god Apollo.

<sup>176</sup> Eur. *Ion*, 589-592: εἶναί φασι τὰς αὐτόχθονας/κλεινὰς Ἀθήνας οὐκ ἐπέισακτον γένος,/ ἴν' ἐσπεσοῦμαι δύο νόσω κεκτημένος, πατρός τ' ἐπακτοῦ καὶ τὸς ὦν νοθαγενῆς.



foreigner in Athens, he would not belong to a phratry or deme to introduce his offspring as legitimate, but Ogden suggests that they may have been assigned one.<sup>177</sup> In the case of a naturalized citizen, it is likely that these individuals could be awarded and admitted to a deme.<sup>178</sup> Xuthus proceeds to grant his land to Ion, but Creusa, representing the native Athenian, accuses Ion of taking what is hers.<sup>179</sup> In this case, Ogden explains that Creusa's claim to autochthony is threatened by Ion, who, as the bastard son of Xuthus, "will drive the legitimate from her house."<sup>180</sup>

Ion makes it clear that this may be what it seems like from a distance, or it may be the case outside of Athens but not within.<sup>181</sup> If we reflect on the *epigamia* granted to the Euboeans, would these states-granted intermarriages be considered legitimate in Athens? Athenians, such as cleruchs, on Euboea who were granted *epigamia* may have benefited from such unions as they would increase their landholdings, but this may be different for a Euboean male exercising this same granted right in Athens. Xuthus is legally able to marry Creusa and, in theory, would produce legitimate offspring. However, he is not considered an Athenian but rather an Euboean living in Athens as Creusa makes it clear, he is "an ally is not an inhabitant of this land."<sup>182</sup> Despite his legal ability in theory to marry Creusa, in practice, Loraux describes Xuthus as encroaching in the practice on the the *oikos*, as an "intruder into the house of Erectheus,

---

<sup>177</sup> Ogden, *Greek Bastardy*, 71.

<sup>178</sup> On naturalization process and deme admittance, see Kamen, *Status in Classical Athens*, 83.

<sup>179</sup> Eur. *Ion*, 1295: ἔμελλες οἰκεῖν τᾶμ', ἐμοῦ βία λαβῶν.

<sup>180</sup> Ogden, *Greek Bastardy*, 171.

<sup>181</sup> Eur. *Ion*, 585-586. οὐ ταῦτόν εἶδος φαίνεται τῶν πραγμάτων πρόσωθεν ὄντων ἐγγύθεν θ' ὀρωμένων.

<sup>182</sup> Ibid., 1299: ἐπικούρος οἰκίτῳ γ' ἄν οὐκ εἴη χθονός

whose *epiklēros* (heiress) daughter he has married in violation of all the rules of the classical city.”<sup>183</sup> Here, the *epigamia* is also perceived as impinging on another institution and rules, that of the *epikleros*. Loraux further points out that, in the end, Creusa’s divine bastard will become king of Athens and that the sons of her “legitimate” marriage to Xuthus will not be Athenian but a step away from an intruder.<sup>184</sup> *Epigamia* can thus blur the boundaries of legitimate marriage, legitimate offspring, and the quality of citizenship the offspring inherits. It may be legally legitimized, but as the anxieties of this production demonstrate, it is socially perceived as unaccepted.

Euripides’ *Ion* suggests that there are social aspects and distinctive lived realities created by *epigamia* that need to be further explored. It may be granted, but how is it received and implemented in a society where descent and legitimacy are fundamentally built into the institutions of a *polis*, especially in Athens? It could be granted by the Athenians to another *polis*, but was it recognized in Athens, in Athenian society, as a legitimate union and as a possible way of naturalizing offspring without any prejudices? With Euboea, Athens may have granted an *epigamia* out of fear of losing Euboea as an ally and imperial territory, but there was no intention of unifying these communities.

#### 4.3 *Epigamia* received by Athens

A further possible case involving Athens is found in the decrees of Byzantine and Perinthos which were attached to the medieval manuscripts and bracketed by editors in

---

<sup>183</sup> Nicole Loraux, *The Children of Athena: Athenian Ideas About Citizenship and the Division Between the Sexes*, (Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press, 1993), 203.

<sup>184</sup> Loraux, *The Children of Athena*, 205-206.

Demosthenes' speech *On the Crown*. In defending his political career, Demosthenes justifies his anti-Philip policies and his role in pushing Philip II out of Euboea, and the actions taken when Philip attempted to take Thrace.<sup>185</sup> Being unsuccessful this time, Philip sought the support of his allies,<sup>186</sup> the Byzantines, in his attack against Athens, but they refused, and he laid siege to Byzantium in 340/39. Demosthenes, the leading politician during these events, discusses his role in defending the Bosphorus along with Athens' role in saving the Byzantines from Philip in this defense.<sup>187</sup> He asks the clerk to “read to them the crown decrees of both the Byzantines and those of the Perinthians, in which they rewarded the city as a result of these deeds.”<sup>188</sup> The decree in the medieval manuscript reads as follows:

[Decree of the Byzantines, Decree of the Perinthians]

In the priesthood of Bosporichus, Damagetus proposed in the Assembly, receiving the permission of/from the Council: since/whereas on previous occasions the People of Athens continue being well-inclined to the Byzantines and their allies and to their kinsmen the Perinthians and provided many and great services, and on the present occasion when Philip of Macedon marched against the land and the city to destroy the Byzantines and the Perinthians and burning the countryside and cutting down the trees, they came to aid with one hundred and twenty ships, grain, and with arms and soldiers removed us from great dangers and reestablished our ancestral constitution and laws and funeral-rites, [91]it is decreed by the Byzantines and the Perinthians that we give the rights of intermarriage(*epigamia*), citizenship, ownership of land and houses, also the seat of honors in the contests, and first access to the Council and the people after the sacrifices and for those who want to settle in our city, exemption from all our public services; also to erect three statues sixteen cubits high in the Bosphoreion,

---

<sup>185</sup> Dem.18.87.

<sup>186</sup> Harvey Yunis, *On the Crown*, (New York: Cambridge University Press,2001),158, suggests that this alliance occurred around 351 broken by 340 and that in this context it could be considered diplomatic posturing.

<sup>187</sup> Dem.18.88. Demosthenes renounced the Peace of Philocrates in 340 after Philip seized the grain ship in the Bosphorus.

<sup>188</sup> Dem.18.89: λέγει δ' αὐτοῖς καὶ τοὺς τῶν Βυζαντίων στεφάνους καὶ τοὺς τῶν Περινθίων, οἷς ἐστεφάνουν ἐκ τούτων τὴν πόλιν”

with the People of Athens being crowned by the People of Byzantion and Perinthos; and to send ambassadors panhellenic festivals, the Isthmia, the Nemean, the Olympian, and the Pythian, and to proclaim the crowns the People of Athens have been bestowed by us, so that the Greeks know the virtue of the Athenians and the gratitude of the Byzantines and the Perinthians.<sup>189</sup>

According to this document, in gratitude for the Athenian efforts in saving Byzantion from Philip, honorary privileges were granted, which included *epigamia*. Yunis alleges that the decrees found in *On the Crown* have no relation to the original decrees Demosthenes refers to and should be considered spurious.<sup>190</sup> As scholars doubt the authenticity of these documents and caution against the reliability of the information within these documents,<sup>191</sup> some scholars still find significance in assessing these sources as historical evidence.<sup>192</sup>

Canevaro argues that there is no evidence of a *sympoliteia* at the time of Demosthenes' speech and notes that Demosthenes refers to two different decrees of each

---

<sup>189</sup> [Dem.] 18.90-91: Ἐπὶ ἱερομνάμονος Βοσπορίχῳ Δαμάγητος ἐν τῇ ἀλία ἔλεξεν, ἐκ τῆς βολῆς λαβὼν ῥήτρην, ἐπειδὴ ὁ δᾶμος ὁ Ἀθηναίων ἐν τε τοῖς προγεναμένοις καιροῖς εὐνοέων διατελεῖ Βυζαντίοις καὶ τοῖς συμμάχοις καὶ συγγενέσι Περινθίοις καὶ πολλὰς καὶ μεγάλας χρείας παρέσχηται, ἐν τε τῷ παρεστακότῳ καιρῷ Φιλίπῳ τῷ Μακεδόνος ἐπιστρατεύσαντος ἐπὶ τὰν χώραν καὶ τὰν πόλιν ἐπ' ἀναστάσει Βυζαντίων καὶ Περινθίων καὶ τὰν χώραν δαίοντος καὶ δενδροκοπέοντος, βοαθήσας πλοίοις ἑκατὸν καὶ εἴκοσι καὶ σίτῳ καὶ βέλεσι καὶ ὀπίλοις ἐξεῖλετο ἀμὲ ἐκ τῶν μεγάλων κινδύνων καὶ ἀποκατέστασε τὰν πάτριον πολιτείαν καὶ τὴν νόμον καὶ τὴν τάφω, (91) δεδόχθαι τῷ δάμῳ τῷ Βυζαντίων καὶ Περινθίων Ἀθηναίοις δόμεν ἐπιγαμίαν, πολιτείαν, ἔγκτασιν γᾶς καὶ οἰκιᾶν, προεδρίαν ἐν τοῖς ἀγῶσι, πόθοδον ποτὶ τὰν βολῆν καὶ τὸν δᾶμον πρᾶτοις πεδὰ τὰ ἱερά, καὶ τοῖς κατοικεῖν ἐθέλουσι τὰν πόλιν ἀλειτουρηγῆτοις ἡμεῖν πασᾶν τὰν λειτουργιᾶν· στᾶσαι δὲ καὶ εἰκόνας τρεῖς ἑκκαίδεκαπάχεις ἐν τῷ Βοσπορείῳ, στεφανούμενον τὸν δᾶμον τὸν Ἀθηναίων ὑπὸ τῷ δάμῳ τῷ Βυζαντίων καὶ Περινθίων· ἀποστεῖλαι δὲ καὶ θεαρίας ἐς τὰς ἐν τῇ Ἑλλάδι παναγύριος, Ἴσθμια καὶ Νέμεα καὶ Ὀλύμπια καὶ Πύθια, καὶ ἀνακαρῶσαι τὴν στεφάνωσιν οἷς ἐστεφάνωνται ὁ δᾶμος ὁ Ἀθηναίων ὑπ' ἀμέων, ὅπως ἐπιστέωνται οἱ Ἕλληνας τὰν τε Ἀθηναίων ἀρετὰν καὶ τὰν Βυζαντίων καὶ Περινθίων εὐχαριστίαν.

<sup>190</sup> Yunis, *On the Crown*, 30. Yunis believes that these documents are either school exercises or just forgeries.

<sup>191</sup> *ibid.*, 30.

<sup>192</sup> Canevaro, *The Documents in the Attic Orators*, 238, n. 9. For a few exceptions, see Jack Cargill, *Athenian Settlements of the fourth century B.C.*, (New York: E.J. Brill, 1995), 73-4, and Victor D. Hanson, *Warfare and Agriculture in Classical Greece*, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998), 100, 113.

city, entering negotiations with Athens and Philip independently.<sup>193</sup> This inserted forged decree presupposes a later *sympoliteia*, which, according to Canevaro, “dates to the third century, was interrupted in 202/1 and reinstated in 196.”<sup>194</sup> I agree with Canevaro’s argument regarding the authenticity of these documents, nevertheless, the consideration of the historical relationship between Athens, Perinthos, Byzantion —and the Chersonese, decrees of which Demosthenes mentions in the body of the speech, while only the joint decree of Perinthos and Byzantion is quoted — helps us to consider *epigamia* as a historically possible if not plausible grant in the later fourth century. The following will explore circumstances under which *epigamia* could have been utilized as part of diplomacy and will also discuss Byzantion’s laws concerning citizenship to understand the fluidity of rights, allowing for the probability of an *epigamia*.

A previous discussion of these documents by Treves speculates that the forger perhaps was aware of such institutions and that errors might be explained by a “conscious or involuntarily ‘transposition’ to the time of Philip II of events in the time of Philip V.”<sup>195</sup> According to Polybius, Philip V in 198/7 was demanded to withdraw his garrisons in the area and to “permit the *sympoliteia* of the Perinthians and Byzantines be reestablished.”<sup>196</sup> The forger may, according to Treves, have been crediting the current situation known to him of a *sympoliteia* made prior to the interruption of Philip V back

---

<sup>193</sup> Canevaro, *The Documents in the Attic Orators*, 265.

<sup>194</sup> Canevaro, *The Documents in the public speeches of Demosthenes*, 53. Perinthos was later annexed by Philip V of Macedon in 202.

<sup>195</sup> Piero Treves, “Les documents apocryphes du “Pro Corona”, in *LEC* 9 (1940:38-174), 157.

<sup>196</sup> Polyb.18.2.4: ἀποκαταστήσαι δὲ καὶ Περινηθίου εἰς τὴν Βυζαντίων συμπολιτείαν.” See also Polyb.18.44.4

to these events in Demosthenes' speech.<sup>197</sup> Could this also be the case for an *epigamia*? Perhaps the forger transposed these rights as part of the privileges granted to the Athenians for their actions against Philip II, which Demosthenes claims brought the city honors and "won goodwill from everywhere."<sup>198</sup> This remains speculative, however, and cannot determine convincingly whether there was an *epigamia*. It is therefore necessary to consider what institutions and relationships existed between these *poleis* that could have made it plausible for the forger to include *epigamia* among the honors granted to the Athenians.

Unlike the previous cases where Athens bestows the privilege of *epigamia* to another *polis*, here it is an honor granted to them. The Athenians had been involved in the Thracian Bosphorus region since the sixth century due to their interest in controlling the strait. They were not alone as the Persians and Thracians also pressured Byzantium for its economically advantageous position.<sup>199</sup> However, in 477, the Athenians managed to "oust the other two from the region," leaving Athens as the only tributary empire pressuring Byzantium,<sup>200</sup> and also took over the Greek alliance against Persia.<sup>201</sup> During the fifth century, the Athenians established institutions in Byzantium to control exports

---

<sup>197</sup> Treves, "Les documents apocryphes", 158.

<sup>198</sup> Dem.18.93-94: εὔνοιαν παρὰ πάντων ἐκτᾶσθε.

<sup>199</sup> See Moreno in *Feeding the Democracy*, 161, who suggests that the archaeological evidence from Thrace to the Bosphorians cities shows a degree of political and military unrest as it was a major source of grain in the early fifth century.

<sup>200</sup> Vincent Gabrielsen, "Trade and Tribute: Byzantium and the Black Sea straits" in Gabrielsen and J. Lund (eds), *The Black Sea in Antiquity: Regional and Interregional Economic Exchanges*, (Denmark: Aarhus University Press: 2007)290, 297. According to Thomas Russell in *Byzantium and the Bosphorus: A Historical Study from the Seventh Century BC until the Foundation of Constantinople* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016),62, the expulsion of the Spartan Pausanias, who had 'tyrant' intentions for Byzantium, led to Athens's prominence over Byzantium and the Bosphorus.

<sup>201</sup> Thuc.1.96.

and taxes through the strait, which, from an economic standpoint, positively affected both Byzantion and Athens.<sup>202</sup> The Byzantines and the Perinthians joined the Delian League in 478/7,<sup>203</sup> revolting from Athens in 441 against such arrangements, and in 439, “the Byzantines agreed to be subjects like before.”<sup>204</sup> By 424/3, the Athenians had other measures of control in the straits areas, including cleruchies, garrisons, and at Byzantion, set up Athenian officials or “watchers” (φρουροί).<sup>205</sup> The Byzantines defected again in 411 after the Sicilian disaster,<sup>206</sup> going over to Sparta, but were regained by Athens in 408.<sup>207</sup> Similar to the economic importance of Euboea, the historical and political narratives point to a tumultuous and imperialistic relationship between Athens, Byzantion, and Perinthos during the fifth century.

This constant shifting of alliances and renegotiations continued in the fourth century. The Byzantines and the Perinthians joined the Second Athenian League in 378<sup>208</sup> and 377<sup>209</sup> respectively. Perhaps, as Russell proposes, this renewed friendship was due to the essential grain supply from the Bosporan kingdom in the Black Sea to Athens.<sup>210</sup> Nevertheless, Byzantion and other members withdrew from the alliance in 357, starting the Social Wars, concluding in peace with Athens in 355, with the

---

<sup>202</sup> Ibid., 291-294. See also Russell, *Byzantium and the Bosphorus*, 55.

<sup>203</sup> *ATL* iii.206. IG I<sup>3</sup> 259.III.7 records Byzantion in the tribute list as of 454/3. Also, Hansen and Nielsen, *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis*, 916.

<sup>204</sup> Thuc. 1.117.3: ξυνέβησαν δὲ καὶ Βυζάντιοι ὡσπερ καὶ πρότερον ὑπήκοοι εἶναι. See also Thuc. 1.115.5.

<sup>205</sup> Moreno, *Feeding the Democracy*, 165-166.

<sup>206</sup> Thuc.8.80.3; cf. Diod.13.34.2.

<sup>207</sup> Xen. *Hell.* 1.3.20-22

<sup>208</sup> IG II<sup>2</sup> 41 A separate fragmented treaty between Athens and Byzantion made in 378.

<sup>209</sup> IG II<sup>2</sup> 43:84.

<sup>210</sup> Russell, *Byzantium and the Bosphorus*, 75.

Byzantines leaving the League.<sup>211</sup> The Byzantines and the Perinthians were left open to Thracian oppression, leading them to ally with Philip II in 352/1.<sup>212</sup> In 341, in his Macedonia expansion, Philip II attempted to conquer Perinthus and laid siege to Byzantium, seizing the ships bound to Athens, breaking the Peace of Philocrates, leading to events described by Demosthenes in the speech. It is difficult to conceive of an *epigamia* within these oppressive narratives, yet this is reminiscent of a similar relationship between Athens and Euboea in which an *epigamia* was possible despite the tenuous alliances. We must turn to other concepts, such as citizenship, to further consider the possibility of this *epigamia* and why these *poleis* might have granted this right.

In trying to understand the integration of Thracian neighbors into Byzantium, Russell examines the status of offspring of mixed marriages questioning whether citizenship was attainable or if there was a sharp distinction as scholars suggest.<sup>213</sup> Loukopoulou argues that the Byzantines had a rather strict citizenship requirement of double Byzantine citizen parents that excluded indigenous people and Thracians from political life, similar to the sharp distinctions of the Periklean citizenship law.<sup>214</sup> According to the pseudo-Aristotelian *Oeconomica*, under extreme circumstances and economic crisis, the Byzantines took certain measures: “And whereas there was a law

---

<sup>211</sup> Isoc.8.16,15.63-64.

<sup>212</sup> Dem.9.34,11.3,18.87 and 93; *Staatsvertäge* 318. Cf. Hansen and Nielsen, *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis*, 916 and 920.

<sup>213</sup> Russell, *Byzantium and the Bosphorus*, 167

<sup>214</sup> Louiza D. Loukopolou, *Contribution à l'histoire de la Thrace propontique durant la période archaïque* (Athènes: Centre de recherches de l'antiquité grecque et romaine, Fondation nationale de la recherche scientifique, 1989), 79-81. Loukopoulou uses this as evidence to suggest that the Byzantines normally excluded Greeks and Thracians from political life.



for them that there would not be citizenship rights for those unless born from both citizen parents, being in need of money, they passed a decree that a man from only one citizen parent would become a citizen if they pay thirty *minae*.”<sup>215</sup> Vérihilac and Vial suggest this law was in force during the Classical period, while Russell places these measures in the early Hellenistic period and argues that such measures were not a one-time occurrence.<sup>216</sup> Laws such as the Periklean citizenship law in Athens influenced the understanding of citizenship and gave a more restrictive concept of marriage as well,<sup>217</sup> and we can presume these laws in Byzantium would have a similar effect on Byzantium society.

Despite this dating issue, this passage illustrates significant features regarding citizenship law. These strict laws were relaxed from a double endogamy requirement and extended to a population in Byzantium that did not have full rights. Vérihilac and Vial suggest that this was only a temporary measure for a limited “category of beneficiaries.”<sup>218</sup> However limited this category might have been, we can understand that there was a portion of them who were children of mixed (Byzantine and non-Byzantine) marriages and enjoyed fewer citizen rights as a result. Russell associates the Thracians as a group that would have benefited from this payment for citizenship as their offspring were considered *nothoi*.<sup>219</sup> We can infer other potential benefactors if we

---

<sup>215</sup> [Arist]. *Oec.* 1346b 26: Ὅντος δὲ νόμου αὐτοῖς μὴ εἶναι πολίτην ὃς ἂν μὴ ἐξ ἀστῶν ἀμφοτέρων ἦ, χρημάτων δεηθέντες ἐπηφίσαντο τὸν ἐξ ἑνὸς ὄντα ἀστοῦ καταβαλόντα μνᾶς τριάκοντα εἶναι πολίτην.

<sup>216</sup> Russell, *Byzantium and the Bosphorus*, 168-170 and Vérihilac and Vial, *Le Mariage Grec*, 60.

<sup>217</sup> Humphreys, *Kinship*, 777.

<sup>218</sup> Vérihilac and Vial, *Le Mariage Grec*, 60.

<sup>219</sup> Russell, *Byzantium and the Bosphorus*, 170.

consider the *sympoliteia* made between the Perinthians and Byzantium and speculate about mutual rights granted within a *sympoliteia*. Xenophon also reports that there was a large Athenian population in Byzantium in 390/89,<sup>220</sup> and perhaps an Athenian population also benefited from such an extension. If selling citizenship was not beyond Byzantium's practice, as conveyed by ps.- Aristotle, then an *epigamia* with the Perinthians and the Athenians may not be either when we understand the possible measures taken under dire circumstances. This passage reveals modifiable citizenship rights in Byzantine law that could deviate from the strict endogamous union to those of mixed unions. It is here, within this flexibility of rights, that I suggest an *epigamia* is possible and may explain forger's addition of these rights in the inserted decree.

#### 4.4 *Epigamia* between Athens and Thebes?

Demosthenes continues his narrative with Philip's need for an alliance with the Thebans and Thessalians to cross into Attica<sup>221</sup> and the necessary policies that he, Demosthenes, had to make due to Philip's intentions. Demosthenes argues that he was aware of the mutual hostility between the Athenians and Thebans; however, an alliance was needed, given the growth of Philip's power.<sup>222</sup> With Philip capturing Elatea in late 339, the *pyrtaneis* summoned an Assembly (§169), and he alone stood up to advise the Council – allegedly, no one else came forward to the *bema* except himself on the

---

<sup>220</sup> Xen. *Hell.* 4.8.27: ὥστε οὐκ ἀχθεινῶς ἑώρα ὁ τῶν Βυζαντίων δῆμος Ἀθηναίους ὅτι πλείστους παρόντας ἐν τῇ πόλει.

<sup>221</sup> Dem.18.145. Demosthenes is attempting to demonstrate that Aeschines had a great deal in aiding Philip with this interest.

<sup>222</sup> Dem.18.161-162.

necessary measures to be taken.<sup>223</sup> He claims that it was not the case that he: “spoke things, not without moving a decree, nor moved a decree without being an envoy, nor serve as an envoy without convincing the Thebans.”<sup>224</sup> The decrees are then read:

[Dem. 18.181-7: The Decree of Demosthenes]

...[183] And so long as the people of Athens saw him [Philip] seizing barbarian cities and his own, they considered that their own wrongs to be of less account, but now seeing the Greek cities being ruined and destroyed, they deem it to be terrible and unworthy of the reputation of their ancestors to disregard that the Greeks are being enslaved, [184] therefore it is resolved by the Council and the People of Athens...and after considering well the virtues of their ancestors, since they maintained the freedom of the Greeks more than they did their own country, to put 200 ships to sea...also that envoys be sent to other Greeks, but first of all to the Thebans since Philip is nearest to their territory, [185] to exhort them not to be panic-stricken by Philip but to hold onto their liberty and that of other Greek and since the Athenian people, bearing no grudge for any previous differences between the cities, will help them with troops, money, weapons, and arms, knowing that it is good for those who are Greeks to dispute with each other over for hegemony, but to be ruled by a foreign man and deprived of hegemony is unworthy of the Greeks reputation and of the virtue of their ancestors. [186] Furthermore, the people of Athens do not consider the Theban people to be foreign either in respect to kinship nor in race... [187] Therefore now the people of Athens will not desert the interest of Thebans and other Greeks. An alliance with them is concluded and the rights of intermarriage (*epigamia*) established and oaths given and received.<sup>225</sup>

---

<sup>223</sup> Dem.18.170-3.

<sup>224</sup> Dem.179: οὐκ εἶπον μὲν ταῦτ', οὐκ ἔγραψα δέ, οὐδ' ἔγραψα μὲν, οὐκ ἐπρέσβευσα δέ, οὐδ' ἐπρέσβευσα μὲν, οὐκ ἔπεισα δὲ Θεβαίους

<sup>225</sup> [Dem.]18.183-7: καὶ ἕως μὲν πόλεις ἑώρα παραιρούμενον αὐτὸν βαρβάρους καὶ ἰδίας, ὑπελάμβανεν ἕλαττον εἶναι ὁ δῆμος ὁ Ἀθηναίων τὸ εἰς αὐτὸν πλημμελεῖσθαι· νῦν δὲ ὁρῶν Ἑλληνίδας πόλεις τὰς μὲν ὑβρίζομένας, τὰς δὲ ἀναστάτους γιγνομένας, δεινὸν ἡγεῖται εἶναι καὶ ἀνάξιον τῆς τῶν προγόνων δόξης τὸ περιορᾶν τοὺς Ἑλληνας καταδουλομένους· [184] διὸ δεδόχθαι τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ τῷ Ἀθηναίῳ...καὶ ἐνθυμηθέντας τῆς τῶν προγόνων ἀρετῆς, διότι περὶ πλείονος ἐποιούντο τὴν τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἐλευθερίαν διατηρεῖν ἢ τὴν ἰδίαν πατρίδα, διακοσίας ναῦς καθέλκειν εἰς τὴν θάλατταν...πέμψαι δὲ καὶ πρέσβεις πρὸς τοὺς ἄλλους Ἑλληνας, πρῶτον δὲ πάντων πρὸς Θεβαίους διὰ τὸ ἐγγυτάτω εἶναι τὸν Φίλιππον τῆς ἐκείνων χώρας παρακαλεῖν δὲ αὐτοὺς μηδὲν καταπλαγέντας τὸν Φίλιππον ἀντέχεσθαι τῆς ἑαυτῶν καὶ τῆς τῶν ἄλλων Ἑλλήνων ἐλευθερίας [185] καὶ ὅτι ὁ Ἀθηναίων δῆμος, οὐδὲν μνησικακῶν εἴ τι πρότερον γέγονεν ἀλλότριον ταῖς πόλεσι πρὸς ἀλλήλας, βοηθήσει καὶ δυνάμεσι καὶ χρήμασι καὶ βέλεσι καὶ ὅπλοις, εἰδὼς ὅτι αὐτοῖς μὲν πρὸς ἀλλήλους διαμφοισθητεῖν περὶ τῆς ἡγεμονίας οὕσιν Ἑλλῆσι καλόν, ὑπὸ δὲ ἀλλοφύλου ἀνθρώπου ἄρχεσθαι καὶ τῆς ἡγεμονίας ἀποστρεφῆσθαι ἀνάξιον εἶναι καὶ τῆς τῶν Ἑλλήνων δόξης καὶ τῆς τῶν προγόνων ἀρετῆς.[186] ἔτι δὲ οὐδὲ ἀλλότριον ἡγεῖται εἶναι ὁ Ἀθηναίων δῆμος τὸν Θεβαίων δῆμον οὔτε τῇ συγγενείᾳ οὔτε τῷ ὁμοφύλῳ ... [187]διόπερ οὐδὲ νῦν ἀποστήσεται ὁ Ἀθηναίων δῆμος τῶν

This decree, like that of the Byzantines and Perinthians discussed above, is also considered spurious by scholars. Canevaro does not believe that this document is the final decree of the alliance between Thebes and Athens since Demosthenes began negotiations with them but did not refer to a final approved alliance.<sup>226</sup> Canevaro also argues that the terms of this decree are “inconsistent with this account, contain[ing] idiosyncratic features” and that the events and terms within this decree must have been decided at different Assembly meetings as separate decrees, not in one decree as is inserted.<sup>227</sup> The final section of this decree states that an alliance with Thebes is concluded along with granting *epigamia*; as Canevaro explains, however, that these grants of intermarriage are not mentioned in other sources about these terms and that the decree fails to mention any “actual terms of the terms as they are described by Aeschin.3.142-7.”<sup>228</sup> These agreements included supporting the Boetians in Thebes, the two-third war expense for Athens, having joint naval command, and giving land command to the Thebans.<sup>229</sup> Aeschines describes these terms of this alliance as “unjust and not at all equal.”<sup>230</sup> Scholar Mosley considers Aeschines’ perspective as possibly distorted and suggests that it is likely that the terms were fair, not one-sided, and

---

Θηβαίοις τε καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις Ἑλλησι συμφερόντων. συνθέσθαι δὲ πρὸς αὐτοὺς καὶ συμμαχίαν καὶ ἐπιγαμίαν ποιήσασθαι καὶ ὄρκους δοῦναι καὶ λαβεῖν.

<sup>226</sup> Canevaro, *The Documents in the Attic Orators*, 314.

<sup>227</sup> *ibid.*, 315.

<sup>228</sup> *ibid.*, 318.

<sup>229</sup> Aeschin. 3.142-143.

<sup>230</sup> Aeschin. 3.106: ἄδικον δὲ καὶ οὐδαμῶς ἴσην τὴν πρὸς Θηβαίους συμμαχίαν γράψας.

followed the pattern of establishing alliances during the fourth century.<sup>231</sup> A part of the pattern although rare, was Athens engaging and extending *epigamia*, as they had in previous alliances, but more evidence is needed to understand the forged document containing this grant. Acknowledging the doubtful authenticity of this later document, it is still striking that the forger chose to specifically include *epigamia* while not laying out the other more familiar terms of this alliance.

Aside from these alliances, Demosthenes is also criticized for proposing that a grant of citizenship be made in return for payment to Kallias of Chalkis and his brother Taurosthenes around 330, whose father, Aeschines claims, had done many wrongs to the Athenians.<sup>232</sup> Before 324, he also granted citizenship to Chairephilos and his sons, for Epigenes and Konon.<sup>233</sup> In defending the practice of honorific grants, Demosthenes argues that the people, not laws or opinions, decide who is worthy based on their actions, not by their birth or reputation.<sup>234</sup> Demosthenes has no qualms with granting the highest honor of citizenship to foreigners, and along these lines, it would not be a far stretch to imagine *epigamia* as part of these honorific or alliance decrees.

---

<sup>231</sup> D.J. Mosley, "Athens' Alliance with Thebes 339 B.C." in *Histoire: Zeitschrift Für Alte Geschichte*, vol. 20, no. 4, (1971:508-510), 509-510.

<sup>232</sup> Aesh. 3.85: Ὑμεῖς γάρ, ὧ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, πολλὰ καὶ μεγάλα ἠδικημένοι ὑπὸ Μνησάρχου τοῦ Χαλκιδέως, τοῦ Καλλίου καὶ Ταυροσθένους πατρός, οὗς οὗτος νυνὶ μισθὸν λαβὼν Ἀθηναίους εἶναι τολμᾷ γράφειν. Cf. Hyp. *Against Demosthenes* 20.

<sup>233</sup> Din., *Against Demosthenes*, 1.43.

<sup>234</sup> Dem.20.17: ἰδίᾳ μὲν γὰρ ἕκαστος ἡμῶν σκοπεῖ τίς ἄξιός ἐστιν ἐκάστου κηδεστής ἢ τῶν τοιούτων τι γίνεσθαι, ταῦτα δὲ καὶ νόμοις τισὶ καὶ δόξαις διώριστα· κοινῇ δ' ἡ πόλις καὶ ὁ δῆμος, ὅστις ἂν αὐτὸν εὖ ποιῇ καὶ σώξῃ, τοῦτο δ' οὐ γένει καὶ δόξῃ ἴδιοι τις ἂν, ἀλλ' ἔργῳ.

Epigraphic evidence from the mid-fourth century attests to Thebans, who were rewarded with other honors by the Attic deme Eleusis.<sup>235</sup> The decree, *IEleusis 70*, proposed that two Thebans be crowned and one rewarded the following:

[25-27] and he will have a privilege the front seats, exemption from taxes which the Eleusinians have authority, both for himself and his descendants and let him seek any other benefit if he wishes from the demesmen of Eleusis...<sup>236</sup>

Lambert notes that if this is placed around 340 within the context of the Athenian and Theban alliance, that one could interpret these honors as part of these diplomatic gestures.<sup>237</sup> *Epigamia* is not mentioned, but one could imagine it being another benefit the Theban could request from the deme. The local deme, it seems here, is offering privileges they have control over. Perhaps, if there is a localized understanding of marriage, a deme which has arbitration over citizenship, might have a say in whether to extend a right of intermarriage, a *polis*-level grant. This is a highly tenuous argument, though, and involves further investigation beyond the scope of this paper.

Another type of inscription might be useful as evidence for cases of *epigamia*. Two fragmentary fourth-century epitaphs refer to Theban residents of Athens who had possibly married Athenians.<sup>238</sup> A further epitaph dated to the late fourth century is certainly the case of a Theban-Athenian intermarriage and reads:

Κ<λ>ειτῶ | Πραξίωνος | θηβαία | Τιμοδήμου | Ἀτηνέως | γυνή

---

<sup>235</sup> *IEleusis70* (IG II<sup>2</sup> 1186) and *IEleusis 71* (IG II<sup>2</sup> 1185).

<sup>236</sup> *IEleusis71*: ἔστω δὲ αὐτῶι προεδρία καὶ ἀτέλεια ὧν εἰσιν κύριοι Ἐλευσίνιοι καὶ αὐτῶι <καὶ> ἐγγόνιοι καὶ ἐάν τι [ ] ἄλλο [β]ούληται ἀγαθὸν εὐρέσθαι παρὰ τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Ἐλευσινίων...

<sup>237</sup> See Lambert's commentary followed by his translation on *IEleusis 70*.

<sup>238</sup> See IG II<sup>2</sup> 8868: Ζωπύρα Κίττου θηβαίου γυνή, "Zopyra, wife of Kittos, the Theban"; and IG II<sup>2</sup> 8883: for the Theban Potamon, a famed aulete, and Patrokleia, his wife (1.5: Πατρόκλεα Ποτάμωνος γυνή).

Kleito, daughter of Praxion, (she a) Theban wife of Timodemos of Atene.<sup>239</sup>

The forger of the document claims that Demosthenes decreed *epigamia* for all Greeks allied at that time. These fragments are not enough to substantiate that claim; nevertheless, the epigraphical evidence combined with the literary sources allow for the possibility of *epigamia*, at least on an individual basis. The sources provide evidence for other honorary grants but do not specifically mention *epigamia*, but the possibility of it should not be dismissed entirely. Within the same speech, two instances of *epigamia* are embedded as decrees, creating a quasi-historical narrative to Demosthenes' corpus in which this type of response of *epigamia* is imagined as necessary against the threat posed by Philip.

## 5. Conclusion

The examples above highlight only the start of a much-needed analysis of *epigamia*. *Epigamia* has been understood as a right of intermarriage that poleis could grant to one another. In the Hellenistic period, *epigamia* was perceived as an effective measure to calm disputes and create unification through these created kinship ties used as a diplomatic tool, especially by leagues or communities tied to “the idea of federal tendency for its cities.”<sup>240</sup> Some of these characteristics associated with Hellenistic *epigamia* are seen in the earliest mentions of the practice in the archaic period. This implementation of *epigamia* as a diplomatic tool is already seen in the earliest non-

---

<sup>239</sup> IG II<sup>2</sup> 8875 dates either to the late fourth century or third century.

<sup>240</sup> Saba, “Epigamia in Hellenistic Interstate Treaties”, 106.

Greek implementation of *epigamia* in Herodotus' account of the Egyptians, as it is used as part of stabilizing communities and political reorganization.<sup>241</sup> We see this in the Classical period, idealistically at least, as Aristotle and Xenophon view *epigamia* as part of good diplomacy awarded to one another to join more closely together. We can interpret these examples of *epigamia* almost as precursors to what we later see implemented by the Hellenistic city-states. However, in practice, this does not seem to be the case for Classical Athens.

Whereas the literary sources mention Greek elites intermarrying during the Archaic and Classical periods, this should be considered distinct from the state-granted right to intermarry, *epigamia*, which only appears as an aspect of Greek interstate affairs after the mid-fifth century and for Athens, moreover, as I have argued, specifically after the implementation of Perikles' Citizenship law of 451/0. Beyond restricting citizenship eligibility, as a result, legitimacy both in terms of marriage and offspring became further scrutinized. *Epigamia* would legally allow a non-Athenian to marry an Athenian female and potentially have legitimate citizen children, making an exception to the strict citizenship law. At the same time, the city began to grant privileges to non-Athenians, such as citizenship rights, and by the fourth century, Osborne claims, this honor was "superior to such honors of *proxenia*, *isoteleia*, *atelia* and the like."<sup>242</sup> *Epigamia* also began to be granted to non-Athenians during this time, and I would add should be considered as one of these highest honors since it had the potential to affect the status of

---

<sup>241</sup> See above 8-12.

<sup>242</sup> Osborne, *Naturalization*, iv, 148.



a non-citizen and impinges on Greek endogamous marriage traditions and Athenian ideologies.

Imperial Athens may have been innovative in their utilization of *epigamia* as they do not seem to be implementing *epigamia* in a similar diplomatic way as the Archaic kings nor the later Hellenistic communities. *Epigamia*, for Athens, was regarded as an honor or reward given to those who benefit the *polis*. It does not seem to be implemented between both communities involved, but rather that those given this honor out of their goodwill towards Athens were granted this right. When Athens granted an *epigamia* to another community, this right does not appear in our sources to be a mutual right like in *isopoliteia* or *sympoliteia* cases with *epigamia*.

In the case of the Plataeans, the Athenians granted *epigamia* to those who demonstrated goodwill towards Athens, while with Euboea, it was granted out of fear of completely losing Euboea and used as a recovering measure. In a sense, these rights were granted under extreme circumstances to strengthen the relationship between Athens and the beneficiaries of these rights. Whether this had a unifying effect with the intention of bringing them together through blood kinship is not apparent. The Plataeans were given citizenship and the right to intermarry; in an institutional sense, at least, they would pass as Athenian citizens, yet they may not have been seen as full Athenian citizens. Socially, these marriages may not have been regarded as acceptable, as Euripides' *Ion* may hint at some of the complexities of those granted citizen-like privileges, which illustrates social aspects and distinctive lived realities that need to be further explored. The epigraphic evidence further reveals epitaphs of mixed unions that

may attest to the usage of these rights, indicating that they were not purely symbolic honors.

During the Classical period, imperial Athens granted these benefits, and as the tenuous documents in Demosthenes may suggest, Athens also possibly received these grants. More work needs to be done on these claims of *epigamia*, but there are alliances, economic connections, and institutions that establish relationships where an *epigamia* is probable. This is the start of other potential case studies that look beyond the Athenian context and geographic region. Unlike the fifth and fourth-century Athens, the Hellenistic period has more epigraphical evidence to reconsider the far-reaching implications and utilizations of *epigamia* in other Greek city-states.

## Bibliography

- Alexander, James W. "The Marriage of Megacles." In *The Classical Journal*, vol.55, no. 3 (1959): 129–34.
- Asheri, David, Alan B. Lloyd, Aldo Corcella, Oswyn Murray, and Alfonso Moreno. *A Commentary on Herodotus Books I-IV*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Badian, Ernst. *From Plataea to Potidaea: Studies in the History and Historiography of the Pentecontaetia*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993.
- Barker, Ernest. *The Politics of Aristotle*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1946.
- Blok, Josine. *Citizenship in Classical Athens*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017.
- . "Perikles' Citizenship Law: A New Perspective." In *Historia: Zeitschrift Für Alte Geschichte*, vol. 58, no. 2, (2009):141–70.
- Canevaro, Mirko. *The Documents in the Attic Orators: Laws and Decrees in the Public Speeches of the Demosthenic Corpus*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013
- . "The Documents in the Public Speeches of Demosthenes: Authenticity and Tradition." PhD diss. University of Durhan, 2011.
- . "The Decree Awarding Citizenship to the Plataeans." In *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies*, vol.50, no. 3, (2010):337–69.
- Cargill, Jack. *Athenian Settlements of the Fourth Century B.C.* Leiden: E.J. Brill Publication, 1995.
- Carawan, Edwin. "Pericles the Younger and the Citizenship Law." In *The Classical Journal (Classical Association of the Middle West and South)* vol.103, no. 4 (2008): 383–406.
- de Coulanges, Fustel. *The Ancient City: A Study on the Religion, Laws, and Institutions of Greece and Rome*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1980.
- Cox, Cheryl Anne. *Household Interests: Property, Marriage Strategies, and Family Dynamics in Ancient Athens*. Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press, 1998.
- . "The Social and Political Ramifications of Athenian Marriages ca. 600-400 B.C. (Greece)." PhD diss. Duke University, 1983.

- Davies, John K. *Athenian Propertied Families, 600-300 B.C.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971.
- Demetriou, Denise. *Negotiating Identity in the Ancient Mediterranean: The Archaic and Classical Greek Multiethnic Emporia.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- Finley, Moises, “Was Greek Civilisation Based on Slave Labour?” In *Historia: Zeitschrift Für Alte Geschichte* vol.8, no. 2 (1959): 145–64.
- Gabrielsen, Vincent. “Trade and Tribute: Byzantion and the Black Sea straits” in *The Black Sea in Antiquity: Regional and Interregional Economic Exchanges.* Edited by Vincent Gabrielsen and John Lund, 287-324. Denmark: Aarhus University Press, 2007.
- Gallo, Paolo and Masson, Oliver. “Une stèle “hellénomemphite” de l’ex-collection Nahman.” In *BIFAO* 93 (1994): 265-276.
- Gernet, Louis, and Hamilton, John. *The Anthropology of Ancient Greece.* Translated by Blaise Nagy. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1981.
- Gibert, John. Euripides, *Ion.* Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 2019.
- Hall, Jonathan. “Autochthonous Autocrats: The Tyranny of The Athenian Democracy” in *Private and Public Lies*, ed. by Andrew Turner, et al., 9-28. Boston: Leiden, 2010.
- Hammond, N. G. L. “Plataea’s Relations with Thebes, Sparta and Athens.” In *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 112 (1992): 143–50.
- Hansen, Mogens Herman, and Thomas Heine Nielsen. *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis.* Oxford; Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Hanson, Victor Davis. *Warfare and Agriculture in Classical Greece,* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998.
- Harrison, A.R.W., *The Laws of Athens, I,* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968.
- Hornblower, Simon. *A Commentary on Thucydides, Vol. iii: Books 5.25-8.109.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991.
- . *A Commentary on Thucydides, Vol. i: Books I-III.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991.

- How, W. W, and Joseph Wells. *A Commentary on Herodotus*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1928.
- Humphreys, Sarah C. *Kinship in Ancient Athens: An Anthropological Analysis*. First edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018.
- . “The Nothoi of Kynosarges.” In *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 94 (1974): 88–95.
- Kamen, Deborah. *Status in Classical Athens*. Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press, 2013.
- Kammerzell, Frank. “Die Geschichte der karischen Minderheit in Ägypten.” In *Naukratis: Die Beziehungen zu Ostgriechenland, Ägypten und Zypern in archaischer Zeit*, edited by Ursula Höckmann and Detlev Kreikenbom. Möhnesee Bibliopolis; Publication, 2001.
- Kapparis, K. "The Athenian Decree for the Naturalisation of the Plataeans." In *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies*, vol. 36, no. 4 (1995): 359-378.
- Lambert, Stephen. *Two Inscribed Documents of the Athenian Empire: The Chalkis Decree and the Tribute Reassessment Decree*. Attic Inscriptions Online, 2017.
- . *The Phratries of Attica*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1993.
- Larsen, J. A. O. *Greek Federal States: Their Institutions and History*. Oxford: Clarendon P., 1968.
- Lendon, J. E. “Xenophon and the Alternative to Realist Foreign Policy: ‘Cyropaedia’ 3.1.14-31.” In *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 126 (2006): 82–98.
- Lloyd, A.B, “Egypt” in *Brill’s Companion to Herodotus*. Ed. Egbert Bakker, Hans van Wee, J.F. de Jong, 415-435. Boston: Brill Publication: 2002.
- . “Herodotus on Egyptians and Libyans.” In *Entretiens sur l’Antiquité classique* 35, (1990):215-53.
- Loukopoulou, Louiza D. *Contribution à l’histoire de la Thrace propontique durant la période archaïque*. Athènes: Centre de recherches de l’antiquité grecque et romaine, Fondation nationale de la recherche scientifique, 1989.
- Loraux, Nicole. *The Children of Athena: Athenian Ideas about Citizenship and the Division between the Sexes*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993.

- Mackil, Emily Maureen. *Creating a Common Polity: Religion, Economy, and Politics in the Making of the Greek Koinon*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2013.
- Masson, Oliver. "Les Cariens en Égypte." In *Bulletin de la Société Française d'Égyptologie*, no. 56 (1969): 25-36.
- McAnally, Jay. "Herodotus 2.61.2 and the Mwdon- of Caromemphitae." In *Ancient Near Eastern Studies* 53 (2016):195–218.
- Moreno, Alfonso. *Feeding the Democracy: The Athenian Grain Supply in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries B.C.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Mosley, D. J. "Athens' Alliance with Thebes 339 B.C." In *Historia: Zeitschrift Für Alte Geschichte* 20, no. 4 (1971): 508–10.
- Nicolai, Roberto. "At the Boundary of Historiography: Xenophon and his Corpus" in *Between Thucydides and Polybius: The Golden Age of Greek Historiography*. Edited by Giovanni Parmeggiani. Washington, D.C: Center for Hellenic Studies, 2014.
- Ogden, Daniel. *Greek Bastardy in the Classical and Hellenistic Periods*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.
- Oranges, Annabella. "La Concessione Dell'Epigamia Agli Eubei." in *Tra Mare e Continente: l'isola d'Eubea*. Edited by Cinzia Bearzot and Franca Landucci, 173-189. Milano: Vita e Pensiero, 2013.
- Osborne, M. J. *Naturalization in Athens, Vol.4*. Brussel: Paleis der Academiën, 1981
- Osborne, Robin. "Law, the Democratic Citizen and the Representation of Women in Classical Athens." In *Past & Present*, no. 155 (1997): 3–33.
- Osborne, Robin, and P. J. Rhodes. *Greek Historical Inscriptions, 478-404 BC*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017.
- Patterson, Cynthia. "Those Athenian Bastards." In *Classical Antiquity* vol. 9, no. 1 (1990): 40–73.
- . *Pericles' Citizenship Law of 451-50 B.C.* New York: Arno Press, 1981
- Pomeroy, Sarah B. *Families in Classical and Hellenistic Greece: Representations and Realities*. New York: Clarendon Press, 1996.

———. *Goddesses, Whores, Wives, and Slaves: Women in Classical Antiquity*. New York: Schocken Books, 1975.

Pownall, Frances, “Xenophon’s *Cyropaedia* and Greek Historiography” in *Ancient Information on Persia Re-Assessed: Xenophon’s Cyropaedia*” edited by Bruno Jacobs, 3-18. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2020.

Russell, Thomas. *Byzantium and the Bosphorus. A Historical Study, from the Seventh Century BC Until the Foundation of Constantinople*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016.

Sears, Matthew A. *Athens, Thrace, and the Shaping of Athenian Leadership*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Saba, Sara “Epigamia in Hellenistic Interstate Treaties: Foreign and Family Policy.” In *Ancient Society*, vol. 41. (2011): 93–108.

Stadter, Philip. “Fictional Narrative in the *Cyropaideia*.” In *American Journal of Philology* 112 (1991): 461-91.

Thompson, Dorothy J. *Memphis under the Ptolemies*. Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press, 1988.

Treves, Piero. ‘Les Documents apocryphes du *Pro Corona*’, in *LEC* (1940): 38-174.

Todd, S.C, *Lysias*, University of Texas Press, 2000.

Vérilhac, A.M. and Vial, C., *Le Mariage Grec: Du VI<sup>e</sup> Siècle av. J.C. à l’époque d’Auguste*. Athens: École française d’Athènes, 1998.

West, Stephanie. “Agariste’s Bethrotal: The Adaptability of a Cautionary Tale.” In *Lucida Intervalla* 44, (2015): 7-35.

Walters, K. R. “Perikles’ Citizenship Law.” In *Classical Antiquity* 2, no. 2 (1983): 314–36.

Wolff, Hans Julius. “Marriage Law and Family Organization in Ancient Athens: A Study on the Interrelation of Public and Private Law in the Greek City.” In *Traditio* 2 (1944): 43–95.

Whidden, Christopher. “The Account of Persia and Cyrus’s Persian Education in Xenophon’s ‘*Cyropaedia*.’” In *The Review of Politics* vol. 69, no. 4 (2007): 539–67.

Yunis, Harvey, *On the Crown*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001

Zahrnt, Michael. "The Chalkidike and the Chalkidians." In *Federalism in Greek Antiquity*, 341–57. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 2015.