

The Free Slave and the Slavish Free:  
Athenian Society in the Fifth Century B.C.

By

El-Sayed M. Gad.

10/10/10

10/10/10

10/10/10

10/10/10

The Free Slave and the Slavish Free:  
Athenian Society in the Fifth Century B.C.

=====

In an essay attributed to Xenophon, the Athenian historian, and entitled *The Constitution of the Athenians*, the author refers to the population living in Athens towards the end of the fifth century B.C., saying:

Slaves and metics enjoy the most licence at Athens; neither is it possible to strike a slave there, nor will a slave take side for you. I shall state why this is the case there: if there were a law that a slave might be struck by a free man, and a metic or a freedman by a citizen, oftentimes you would take an Athenian for a slave and strike him. For, with regard to their clothes, the common people, *ho demos*, are in no way better than slaves and metics, nor are they any better in their appearance, there. And if someone wonders at this, namely that they allow slaves to live in luxury there, and let some of them lead a magnificent life, it will become clear that they do this for a reason. For where, because of the nature of the affairs, the power is a naval one, it becomes necessary that slaves work for hire so that we may take a share from what they earn, and that they need to be let free. And wherever slaves are rich, it is no longer profitable for my slave to be afraid of you. However, in Sparta, my slave would fear you; but if your slave fears me here, he will be in danger and will give money so as not to suffer any risks personally. Because of this, we established free speech *isegoria* for slaves before free men and for metics before citizens, since the city needs both slaves and metics because of the

---

multiplicity of its professions and the fleet. Therefore, it was fitting, on this account, that we give also slaves and metics the right to free speech.(1)

I have chosen to quote this rather lengthy passage in the beginning because of its importance in clarifying the structure of Athenian society in general, and the nature of social interaction amongst its members in an important period of Athenian history in particular. The fifth century Athens, probably more than any other preceding period in its history, witnessed so many changes affecting all aspects of life in the city. The Athenians themselves were aware of these changes. In the funeral oration given by Perikles in 431, he comforted the parents of the dead, saying: "They know that they have grown up in ever changing conditions".(2) On the following pages, I shall study the impact of the changing world of Athens on its social life and how it manifested itself in terms of a sharp contrast of its social groups. More importantly, however, I shall argue that the boundaries between "political" and "social" atmospheres were not always clearly defined, and that they are best understood in terms of each other, while paying attention to the influence of the "economic" aspect on them both.

As can be understood from the passage of *The Constitution of the Athenians*, cited above, Athenian society in the fifth century was composed of three main groups of population: citizens, metics and slaves. Each of these groups occupied a certain position which, in addition to being legally defined, stood in a

hierarchical relationship to the other two. Moreover, as far as criteria of differentiation are concerned, two obvious points may be emphasized. First, the principle criteria that differentiated these three social groups are citizenship and freedom. Second, these groups were hierarchically stratified according to these criteria.

Citizens, with both citizenship and freedom, occupied the highest place in society, followed by metics; then came slaves who were distinguished by their lack of both criteria. This hierarchical arrangement is also emphasized by the few examples of social mobility recorded in our sources. Slaves who managed to obtain their freedom became metics although, as freedmen (*apeleutheroi*, *exeleutheroi*), their former owners continued to be their guardians or sponsors (*prostatai*).<sup>(3)</sup> It was also a sign of great honor, at least as viewed by citizens, for foreigners to be granted citizenship, or to be given some right pertaining to citizens. Since this honor of becoming a citizen was rarely given to metics who were residing in Athens, it was undoubtedly a sign of a higher social rank for each one of them to be granted citizenship, to have a decree drafted, passed and voted on by a *quorum* of the citizens and inscribed on stone. The fact that this procedure was both rare and complicated shows that "the conferment of citizenship on an alien never became a routine matter".<sup>(4)</sup>

The hierarchical arrangement of these groups is further

confirmed, conversely, by some examples of movement down the social ladder. Although he did not technically become a metic, a disfranchised citizen was deprived of all privileges pertaining to citizens. He could not go to the *agora*, attend the meetings of the assembly or the council, or serve as a juror or in any office. That each of these activities was considered a privilege can be seen from the title given to disfranchised citizens who were called *atimoi*.<sup>(5)</sup> As a form of punishment, metics, on the other hand, could be sold into slavery if they illegally assumed a privilege limited to citizens, or if they failed to pay their tax, *metoikon*, which served at the same time as a "stamp of a metic-status, and a constant reminder of the citizen/metic divide".<sup>(6)</sup>

In addition to this hierarchical ordering of the three groups, however, there can be other ways of classification. By emphasizing one criterion at a time, one may group them in binary divisions. Thus, according to the "political" criterion of citizenship, the population are divided into citizens and noncitizens (encompassing metics and slaves). On the other hand, by employing the "social" criterion of freedom, we can divide them into free men (including citizens and metics) and slaves. Although these two ways of differentiating the population are not to be neglected, particularly because they were used in antiquity, as can be seen from our passage, it must be noted that they share with the tripartite division

certain characteristics. First, they show that citizens were on top of the social ladder by virtue of their citizenship, then come metics by virtue of their freedom, followed by slaves who score negatively on both criteria. Second, they show the overlap between the political and social spheres since, as will be demonstrated, social differences were simultaneously based on and expressed in terms of both political and social statuses.

The importance of these socio-political criteria in defining people's roles and positions in Athenian society cannot therefore be overlooked. They have been emphasized by some scholars in their studies concentrating on Athenian social life and applying the *status* model in studying it. Proponents of this model argue that the status of the individual, as being a citizen, metic, or slave, was the factor most determining of his position in the society as a whole. This view has been challenged by some other scholars who, in turn, emphasize the role of *class* distinctions, or the economic positions of individuals in defining the social hierarchy.

The model of status, as opposed to class, has most notably been applied by Finley in *The Ancient Economy*.<sup>(7)</sup> In this study, he argued that, for wealthy men, status considerations were of greater importance: "categories of social division other than occupation have priority in any analysis".<sup>(8)</sup> Few pages later, he went so far as not to acknowledge the validity of economic class as a social system since "there is little agreement among

---

historians and sociologists about the definition of 'class' or the canons by which to assign anyone to any class," and he rightly observed that, if the Marxist concept of economic class is applied to the ancient world, "the slave and the free wage labourer would be then members of the same class".(9) In his *Politics in the Ancient World*, Finley takes up the issue once again, defending his own use of the term class and arguing against Ste Croix's use of a class model to interpret Aristotle:

I have used the term 'class' loosely, as we customarily do in ordinary discourse. Aristotle's 'rich' and 'poor' are such classes, undefined but nevertheless identifiable by contemporaries.... Obviously a simple binary classification cannot be pushed to mean more than it does, particularly not to be converted into a sociologically acceptable class structure.(10)

Although Finley's thesis on the significance of status in determining economic behavior finds support in other aspects of social life, its disregard for the significance of class is to be regretted since an individual's social standing in Athenian society was certainly determined, in part, by wealth. Moreover, Finley's objection to the use of Aristotle's binary division of people into rich and poor as a tool to analyze the society along class lines is not *a priori* compelling since, after all, this binary division was the way in which economic differences were perceived by an intelligent contemporary.(11) Since the economic behavior of the wealthy is also determined by their class position, in other words by the extent of their



wealth, which provided the conditions for this behavior, class becomes an important tool in studying that behavior as well as the society at large.

The concept of class was applied by Ste Croix in his study *The Class struggle in the Ancient Greek World*. Having observed the controversy surrounding the definition of class among scholars, he offered his own detailed definition of the concept.(12) He has also argued against scholars who limited the value of class for the study of the ancient world,(13) and has discussed in detail the Weberian concept of status and Finley's use of the term.(14) While not disregarding entirely the fact that status can be of use in studying Greek society, Ste Croix only insists on limiting its significance. Status, he contends, can be a helpful category in studying social stratification, but only as a descriptive category, as opposed to an analytical or explanatory tool which he reserves for class.(15) Class becomes, therefore, in his words, *the fundamental* tool to use:

Of course I have no wish to pretend that class is the only category we need for the analysis of Greek and Roman society. All I am saying is that it is the fundamental one, which *over all* (at any given moment) and *in the long run* is the most important, and is by far the most useful to us, in helping us to understand Greek history and explain the process of change within it.... I would say that social status, and even in the long run political power, tended to *derive from* class position in the first place... and that in the long run distinctions having any other basis than the economic

---

tended to *decay in favor of*, and *ultimately to resolve themselves into*, distinctions based upon economic class.(16)

Ste Croix's emphasis on the significance of class and the limited role he assigns to status, in the preceding manner, has its own difficulties and has not gone unchallenged. In his essay on Aristotelian political sociology, Ober has emphasized the importance of class and status while referring to Ste Croix's thesis:

Ste Croix's argument that Aristotle's political sociology supports a Marxist analysis to the exclusion of other models appears incorrect. Aristotle employed status and order categories as well as the category of class... [He] does explain some social conflicts (and therefore, at least by implication, some social changes) in nonclass terms, and he does not invariably proceed on the basis of a class analysis.(17)

Although class is obviously an important and useful model in understanding Greek society, the status model ought to be appropriately considered to achieve the same goal. According to their ideological orientation, scholars tend to give prominence to one model and to reserve limited significance to the other. The matter is further complicated by the fact that spheres of social interaction were not clearly defined in ancient societies into 'social,' religious, economic, and political (as they are in modern societies).(18) In fact, we may be on a firmer ground, thinking that the intertwined relationship between these aspects of life in Athenian society has

ultimately led, and corresponded, to a similar degree of overlap between class and status in determining its structure and the nature of social interaction within it.

Both models, therefore, prove important as well as complementary. Wealth was always essential, but it was manifestations of wealth which, in part, distinguished people of high social status in the society. It had to be spent in particular ways, ideologically determined, to wield political power, social prestige, or, for that matter, economic influence. According to Gorgias, as mentioned by Plutarch, the Athenian politician Kimon "acquired wealth to use it, and used it to be honored (*timonito*)".(19) Almost half a century later, Alkibiades, another Athenian politician and general, said that his excessive spending on horses and chariot-races was something that brought honor to himself as well as to his ancestors.(20)

Status-categories, on the other hand, had their socio-political significance. The right to participate in the political and the judicial administration of the city, for example, was reserved only for citizens who had also the right to own land. Metics, as was pointed out, could contribute to the welfare of the city and hence could be given an exemption from the *metoikon*, or even granted citizenship. Slaves who were at the bottom of the social hierarchy could be granted their freedom or could purchase it if they afforded to do so. Although the documented instances for these cases are rare,

---

particularly in the fifth century, they are sufficient to prove the point. Social mobility in Athenian society was therefore possible not only within each status-category, but it helped also to transcend them, and was made possible, for the most part, by economic influences.

The Athenians themselves, as the author of *The Constitution of the Athenians* indicates, were aware of the existence of status-categories as well as of class distinctions. It may even be added that they were also aware of an intertwined relationship between status and class, which they envisaged in their own terms. The society included, amongst its population, rich slaves, metics and citizens. Few slaves and some metics could afford to live in luxury which some citizens could not dream of. Nonetheless, status-categories were carefully recognized and observed, the more so on the ideological plane and from the legal point of view. Therefore, a rich slave who, through the contrast between his status and class, may constitute an anomaly to the Athenian way of thinking, was taken as a fact of life in the realities of Athenian day-to-day social interaction. The records of the building of the Erechtheon in Athens include, in addition to the names of some metics, the names of Athenian citizens (who were also free) working side by side with their slaves.(21)

The important point to consider when it comes to the nature of social interaction, however, is that differences in

economic positions among members of Athenian society were highlighted by differences in the political sphere. In the course of the fifth century, the Athenian citizens were divided into oligarchs and democrats. The oligarchs, mostly representing the ancient aristocracy, (22) were becoming gradually embittered by the rise of democracy and against the increasing role of the common people in administering the affairs of the city. The gap between these two groups grew even wider in the course of the second half of the century and particularly during the peloponnesian wars. The oligarchic revolutions of 411/410 and 404/403 were merely indications of the intense political dispute over Athenian politics, characteristic of the period.(23)

As the two oligarchic movements towards the end of the century show, the oligarchs did not easily abandon their previous positions of superiority and leadership. On the contrary, they fought for keeping them in the political arena, and developed their own propaganda to maintain them in the social sphere. The literature of the second half of the century, in particular, is full of their recurrent objections and resentment that people of inferior social status had more political power than, in their view, they thought ordinary people deserved. The author of *The Constitution of the Athenians*, who may be dated in the thirties of the fifth century, and who is sometimes called the "old oligarch,"(24) is a good illustration

---

of this resentment. Further signs may be found in the oligarchic tendency to assimilate leaders of the common people to slaves, who constituted the lowest status-category in the society, and in the redefinition of the concept of freedom.(25)

After the Greeks' victory over the Persians in the beginning of the century, freedom was promoted as a political ideal.(26) In the course of the century, equality became one of the fundamental aspects of Athenian democracy.(27) However, the radical claim of Athenian democracy to equality of all citizens did not materialize even in the sphere of politics and before the law, where it may have been most noticeable. The reality, as Finley recognized, "has always fallen short of the ideal."(28) Social and economic inequalities persistently undermined the principle of equality among citizens, though the point applies to the fourth century more than to the fifth.

The political signification of the antithesis between free men and slaves, probably more than any other antithesis, reflects how the concept of the equality of citizens was far from unanimously accepted. In their attempt to distinguish themselves in an environment promoting democratic ideals, such as equality, Athenian oligarchs sought to undermine the democratic ideal itself by redefining in social terms what a citizen should be. According to this definition, only those with leisure to cultivate virtue, and free time to participate in politics, were worthy of taking part in the government. Since

only a few sections of society could meet these requirements, the majority, the ordinary citizens, those who had to work and who were not educated, did not deserve to be called citizens. Consequently, they were assimilated to slaves who, similarly, lacked control over their lives.

The assimilation was made complete by claims such as the one mentioned by our author. He claims that Athenian common people, *ho demos*, do not wear proper clothes or have a respectable appearance which often, *pollakis*, cause them to be mistaken for slaves. The bias of the author is stated openly in the beginning of the treatise when he says clearly that his view of the Athenian democratic constitution is not a favorable one (1.1): *ton tropon tes politeias ouk epainw*. But it is nowhere more obvious than in his play on the words in this particular sentence which states that an Athenian citizen from the common people may often be thought to be a slave (1.10): *pollakis... oietheis einai ton Athenaion doulon*.

The factor most determining of the status of the Athenian common people, as is expressed by our author, is their poverty which he equates with ignorance and baseness. Thus, they are described throughout the essay as being wicked, poor and democrats: *poneroi kai penetes kai demotikoi* (1.4), and as enjoying the most ignorance, disorder and wickedness (1.5). On the other hand, the oligarchs are termed as being rich, noble and worthy: *gennaioi kai chrestoi kai plousioi* (1.2). The emotional

connotations behind the social vocabulary, noted by Donlan, are only one indication of the socio-political controversy among Athenian citizens, highlighted by differences in economic positions and enhanced by the presence of other status-categories:

The majority of the socio-political expressions are 'emotionally loaded', and appear to be more the reflection of already hardened social attitudes than the product of rational enquiry. The intensified articulation of class conflict, evidenced by the expansion of social terminology, was not a cause but a result of public controversy about status.... [T]he latter half of the Athenian fifth century witnessed, for the first time, wide-spread debate concerning status incongruence, involving not just the intelligentsia but a broad spectrum of the citizen body.(29)

Ordinary citizens who were aware of these oligarchic views were, therefore, in difficult positions. They were looked down upon by rich citizens, who were their political equals, and they were closer to poor metics and slaves, whom they may consider their inferiors. The picture was not flattering and the "incongruence" in the poor citizens' status, referred to by Donlan, joined by the tendency to equate poverty with slavery,(30) put the common people in even more difficult situations. The negative connotations which they attributed to the very signs with which the aristocrats sought to establish their superiority may be viewed, in this context, as an attempt to retaliate. The practice of pederasty and wearing



long hair which were aristocratic signs of luxury came to be equated with effeminacy, and leisure came to be equated with softness.(31)

The interplay between the basically democratic notion of equality and the fundamentally aristocratic new definition of freedom has been studied recently by Raaflaub, who concentrates on their political and social ramifications in the conflicts between democratic and oligarchic attitudes in the late fifth century.(32) He explains that the notion of the "free citizen" happened to be interpreted in two different ways: one oligarchic, the other democratic. Moreover, the concept of equality came to be understood in the same manner. While:

the oligarchic interpretation was based on the assessment of the individual's personal qualities and as such rooted in social status and values rather than in political life and experience.... In marked contrast, the democratic interpretation was a function of the collective concept of freedom... and as such was rooted in the political sphere.(33)

The implications of Raaflaub's discussions are important as well as manifold. They show how differences in economic status were at the same time expressed in social terms and given political dimensions; thus, leading us to question whether the economic, the social, and the political were ever clearly demarcated in classical Athens.(34) They also show the dangers involved in overemphasizing either the democratic or the

oligarchic interpretations of these ideals and taking either one to be representative of the cultural ideal of society as a whole, particularly because we happen to know more about the oligarchic view. More importantly, however, they show that the more Athenian oligarchs emphasized their high social status in terms of *freedom*, the more the low social status of the poor was expressed in terms of *slavery*, and the more the former emphasized their status in terms of *political equality* (and citizenship *vis à vis* noncitizens). It is no surprise, in this context, that a poor citizen considered it slavery to work for a wealthy Athenian, something to be avoided at all costs.(35)

As can be understood from the previous discussion of the oligarchic/democratic dispute in the fifth century and of its impact on the social sphere, the importance of politics cannot be underestimated in Athenian society. Some recent studies have gone so far as to make politics or the political, as opposed to the private world of an Athenian citizen, "not only an important sphere of activity in many respects, but the central element in life... of Athenian society."(36) This theory has some merit since, above all, citizens constituted the highest status-category in Athens by virtue of their citizenship and their participation in the government, which was more or less direct. It may be questioned, however, whether the political identity of a citizen, *qua* citizen, outweighed all other criteria in determining his position in society at large, and particularly

with regard to his fellow citizens, some of whom may be his political opponents.

We have already seen that the collective superiority of Athenian citizens, which was emphasized by the citizenship law of Perikles,(37) did not make up for whatever differences existing among them, individually, as well as between them and other members of the society (for example, in terms of wealth and education). Despite the democratic propaganda about equality, and despite Perikles' allegation that "no one, so long as he has it in him to be of service to the state, is kept in political obscurity because of poverty,"(38) the disparity between the rich and the poor has always undermined this claim. The primary role assigned to politics in Athens in the fifth, and for that matter in the fourth, century may appear, therefore, to be limited to the level of ideology. However, it emerges also from the previous discussion that the farther the realities of daily life got away from political ideologies, the more these realities, paradoxically, were influenced by those ideologies. Although aspects of social life cannot be easily demarcated, as has been mentioned before, politics had its influence on other aspects of life in Athenian society inasmuch as it was influenced by them.

To sum up the argument so far, in studying Athenian society in the fifth century, we need to consider its status-categories of citizens, metics and slaves. We need also

---

to study political, social, and economic aspects of life in-so-far as they determined the structure of society and the nature of social interaction among its members. While doing this, however, a close attention must be given to the role of politics in determining the ideological attitudes and in influencing other aspects of life, and to how it was influenced, in particular, by the disparity between the rich and the poor.

E. M. Gad

Notes:

- 1 - Ps. Xenophon, *The Constitution of the Athenians*, 1.10-12. The text, as edited by Ruehl, reads as follows (my translation):

10 Τῶν δούλων δ' αὖ καὶ τῶν μετοίκων πλείστη ἐστὶν Ἀθήνησιν ἀκολασία, καὶ οὔτε πατάξαι ἔξεστιν αὐτόθι οὔτε ὑπεκστήσεται σοι ὁ <ἐμὸς> δοῦλος. οὐ δ' ἔνεκέν ἐστι τοῦτο ἐπιχώριον ἐγὼ φράσω. εἰ νόμος ἦν τὸν δοῦλον ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐλευθέρου τύπτεσθαι ἢ τὸν μέτοικον ἢ τὸν ἀπελεύθερον <ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀστοῦ>, πολλάκις ἄν <τις> οἰηθεὶς εἶναι τὸν Ἀθηναῖον δοῦλον ἐπάταξεν ἄν· ἐσθῆτά τε γὰρ οὐδὲν βελτίων ὁ δῆμος αὐτόθι ἢ οἱ δοῦλοι καὶ οἱ μέτοικοι καὶ τὰ εἶδη οὐδὲν βελτίους

11 εἰσίν. εἰ δέ τις καὶ τοῦτο θαυμάζει, ὅτι ἔωσι τοὺς δούλους τρουφᾶν αὐτόθι καὶ μεγαλοπρεπῶς διαιτᾶσθαι ἐνίοις, καὶ τοῦτο γνώμη φανεῖεν ἄν ποιοῦντες. ὅπου γὰρ ναυτικὴ δύναμις ἐστὶν ἀπὸ χρημάτων, ἀνάγκη τοῖς ἀνδραπόδοις δουλεύειν, ἵνα λαμβάνωμεν, <ᾧ> πράττει, τὰς ἀποφοράς, καὶ ἐλευθέρους <δέους> ἀφιέναι. ὅπου γὰρ εἰσι πλούσιοι <οἱ> δοῦλοι, οὐκέτι ἐνταῦθα λυσιτελεῖ τὸν ἐμὸν δοῦλον σὲ δεδιέναι· ἐν δὲ τῇ Λακεδαιμόνι ὁ ἐμὸς δοῦλος σὲ δέδοικεν· εἰ δὲ δεδίῃ ὁ σὸς δοῦλος ἐμέ, κινδυνεύσεις καὶ τὰ χρήματα διδόναι

12 τὰ σεαυτοῦ, ὥστε μὴ κινδυνεύειν περὶ ἑαυτοῦ. διὰ τοῦτ' οὖν ἰσηγορίαν καὶ τοῖς δούλοις πρὸς τοὺς ἐλευθέρους ἐποιήσαμεν καὶ τοῖς μετοίκους πρὸς τοὺς ἀστούς, διότι δεῖται ἡ πόλις <καὶ δούλων καὶ> μετοίκων διὰ τε τὸ πλῆθος τῶν τεχνῶν καὶ διὰ τὸ ναυτικόν. διὰ τοῦτο οὖν <καὶ τοῖς δούλοις> καὶ τοῖς μετοίκους εἰκότως τὴν ἰσηγορίαν ἐποιήσαμεν.

As for the date of the work, see below.

- 2 - Thucydides. 2.44.1: "ἐν πολυτροποῖς καὶ συμφορῶν ἐπιστάντων τραπεήταις." See also the Corinthians' description of the lute

of the Athenians who "never lead a quiet life," (*mete echein hesuchian*) in the debate preceding the declaration of the peloponnesian war in 432/1 (Thucydides, 1.70-71).

- 3 - D. M. MacDowell, *The Law in Classical Athens*, Ithaca, 1978, 82-83 and D. Whitehead, *The Ideology of the Athenian metics*, Cambridge, 1977, 114-117, who persuasively argues that freedmen were not considered regular metics: "they seem in fact to have been perceived as a distinct subgroup by the ordinary observer" (quote at 117).
- 4 - MacDowell (note 3 above) 70-73, quote at 73.
- 5 - The word literally means dishonored, but in a political context it refers to the citizens who were deprived of their privileges "either totally or in part." See Liddel and Scott, *Greek - English Lexicon*, s.v.
- 6 - Whitehead (note 3 above) 76. See also MacDowell (note 3 above) 76-78.
- 7 - M. I. Finley, *The Ancient Economy*, 2nd edition, London, 1985, in his chapter on "Orders and Status," 35-61, but more specifically in 45-51.
- 8 - Finley (note 7 above) 45.
- 9 - Finley (note 7 above) 49.
- 10 - M. I. Finley, *Politics in the Ancient World*, Cambridge, 1983, 10, with the reference to Ste Croix in note 26, who, he argues, "has now turned Aristotle into a Marxist." Finley repeats the same idea in his second edition of *The Ancient Economy*, 183: "There are many contexts in which we all speak of 'class' vaguely and non-technically, without causing any difficulty in comprehension."

- 11 – Whether or not binary divisions show an awareness of the existence of intermediate classes is not the crucial question. It is more important to note that, despite their obvious simplicity, binary divisions are "the most popular, or at all events the most socially significant view of social stratification." See S. Ossowski, *Class Structure in the Social Consciousness*, trans. S. Patterson, London, 1963, 20.
- 12 – G. E. M. Ste Croix, *The Class Struggle in the Ancient Greek World: from the Archaic Age to the Arab Conquest*, London, 1981, 21. His definition covers such aspects as class exploitation and class consciousness.
- 13 – Ste Croix (note 12 above) 23, 64–65, against such scholars as M. M. Austin and P. Vidal-Naquet, *Economic and Social History of Ancient Greece: an Introduction*, Berkeley, 1977, 20–26.
- 14 – Ste Croix (note 12 above) 85–93.
- 15 – Ste Croix (note 12 above) 91–94, where he refers to Finley.
- 16 – Ste Croix (note 12 above) 45. (emphasis original); see also p. 26.
- 17 – J. Ober, "Aristotle's Political Sociology: Class, Status, and Order in the Politics," in C. Lord and D. K. O'Connor, eds., *Essays on the Foundation of Aristotelian Political Science*, Berkeley, 1991, 113–135, quote at 132. See also by the same scholar, *Mass and Elite in Democratic Athens. Rhetoric, Ideology and the Power of the People*, Princeton, 1989, 12–13, 248.
- 18 – G. Moyser and M. Wagstaffe, eds., *Research Methods for Film Studies*, London, 1987, 16, stress the impact of "industrialization and secularization" on determining the social hierarchy in the modern world.

- 
- 19- Plutarch. *Kimón*, 10.5. Plutarch clarifies what he means when he says that Kimon used to leave the gates of his fields open for his demesmen so that they might take freely what they needed. See also Plutarch's observations on the excessive spending of Nikias who was likewise aiming at increasing his prestige, *Nikias*, 10.
- 20- Thucydides, 6.12. Alkibiades goes to say that his victories was a sign of distinction not only to him, but also to the city whose name was also mentioned in the games.
- 21- They were notably performing quite similar jobs. It may be tempting here to speculate about the nature of their relationship as well as about their feelings, but, needless to say, status-categories were nonetheless carefully recognized and observed.
- 22- K. Raaflaub, "Perceptions of Democracy in Fifth Century Athens." in J.R. Fears, ed., *Aspects of Athenian Democracy. Classica et Mediaevalia Dissertationes*, XI (1990) 38 n. 11, uses aristocracy and oligarchy "indiscriminately" noting that, while aristocracy "certainly was a positive term, it does not seem certain that the former [oligarchy] carried only negative overtones."
- 23- See, for example, the description of the revolution of 411/10 mentioned by Thucydides, 8.53-54.
- 24- A good translation of this work may be found in J.M. Moore, *Aristotle and Xenophon on Democracy and Oligarchy*, 2nd ed., Berkeley, California, 1986, 37-47.