

UDC 94(38)  
DOI 10.24919/2519-058X.20.240018

**Oksana VARIAN**

postgraduate student of Department of world history and international relations, Zaporizhzhia National University, 66 Zhukovskogo Street, Zaporizhzhia, Ukraine, postal code 69600. Deputy Director of the Zaporizhzhia regional center for the protection of cultural heritage, 31 Troitska Street, Zaporizhzhia, Ukraine, postal code 69063 (melita16@ukr.net)

**ORCID:** 0000-0001-8380-2874

**ResearcherID:** AAT-4029-2021

**Andriy SHKOLYK**

PhD hab. (Law), Associate Professor, Associate Professor of the Department of Administrative and Financial Law, Faculty of Law, Ivan Franko National University of Lviv, 1 Universytets'ka Street, Lviv, Ukraine, postal code 79000 (andriy.shkolyk@lnu.edu.ua)

**ORCID:** 0000-0002-8215-2715

**Oksana VAR'YAN**

здобувачка кафедри всесвітньої історії та міжнародних відносин Запорізького національного університету, вул. Жуковського, 66, м. Запоріжжя, Україна, індекс 69600. Заступниця директора Запорізького обласного центру охорони культурної спадщини, вул. Троїцька, 31, м. Запоріжжя, Україна, індекс 69063 (melita16@ukr.net).

**Андрій ШКОЛИК**

доктор юридичних наук, доцент, доцент кафедри адміністративного та фінансового права юридичного факультету Львівського національного університету імені Івана Франка, вул. Університетська, 1, м. Львів, Україна, індекс 79000 (andriy.shkolyk@lnu.edu.ua)

**Bibliographical Description of the Article:** Varian, O. & Shkolyk, A. (2021). Citizenship as the Main Research Category in the Study of an Ideal Citizen Image in Ancient Athens. *Skhinoievropeiskyi istorychnyi visnyk [East European Historical Bulletin]*, 20, 8–19. doi: 10.24919/2519-058X.20.240018

## CITIZENSHIP AS THE MAIN RESEARCH CATEGORY IN THE STUDY OF AN IDEAL CITIZEN IMAGE IN ANCIENT ATHENS

**Abstract.** *The goal of the research* is to analyze the impact of the Athenian citizenship content on the image of an ideal citizen and finding the ways of achieving the image of a virtuous citizen by Athenians bastards, the image which was recognized by the society. **The research methodology** is based on principles of historicism, systematic, logicity, axiological and of the use of specific historical (historical and genetic, historical and typological, historical and comparative) methods. **The scientific novelty** consists in the fact that for the first time in Ukrainian historiography the attempt has been made to analyze the essence of Athenian citizenship and influence of its content elements on the image of an ideal citizen. Due to the uncertain socio-political status of the nothoi there has been considered the possibility of their public recognition as good citizens. **The Conclusions.** The concept of citizenship in Ancient Athens included socio-cultural and political components. The first assumed

the child's involvement in cultural and religious activities for the purpose of mastering and further reproduction of cultural norms, traditions of a civil society. The integration of a child into a body of citizens to participate in socio-cultural activities was preceded by his inclusion in the father's family and phratry. Phratry membership was the basis for getting political rights on register youth in the deme citizen. Active participation in socio-cultural activities and polis governance formed the framework of an ideal citizen image. The available sources did not allow to determine the status of nothoi in Athenian polis unambiguously. However, those facts that nothoi were a significant resource for replacement the body of citizens, adoption practices and granting civil rights by the decree of the ecclesia, loyalty to illegitimate children during certain periods, repeal or non-compliance the marriage and citizenship laws make it probable that nothoi could have political rights in some cases. Accessibility for nothoi to the gymnasium and temple in Cynosarges illustrates the possibility of their socio-cultural integration.

**Key words:** Ancient Athens, citizenship, image of ideal citizen, nothoi.

## ГРОМАДЯНСТВО ЯК БАЗОВА КАТЕГОРІЯ У ДОСЛІДЖЕННІ ОБРАЗУ ІДЕАЛЬНОГО ГРОМАДЯНИНА У СТАРОДАВНІХ АФІНАХ

**Анотація.** Метою дослідження є аналіз впливу змісту афінського громадянства на образ ідеального громадянина, а також визначення наявності способів досягнення суспільно визнаного образу добродесного громадянина у незаконнонароджених афінян. **Методологія дослідження** засновувалася на застосуванні історичного, логічного, системного, аксіологічного підходів та використанні спеціально-історичних (історико-генетичний, історико-типологічний, історико-порівняльний) методів. **Наукова новизна** полягає у тому, що вперше в українській історіографії здійснено спробу аналізу сутності афінського громадянства та впливу його змістових складових на образ ідеального громадянина. Узв'язку із невизначеним соціально-політичним статусом nothoi розглянуто питання можливості суспільного визнання їх хорошими громадянами. **Висновки.** Поняття громадянства у Стародавніх Афінах включало соціокультурну та політичну складові. Перша передбачала залучення дитини до культурної та релігійної діяльності з метою засвоєння і подальшого відтворення культурних норм, традицій громадянської общини. Інтеграції дитини до колективу громадян полісу для участі у соціокультурній діяльності передувало включення її у сім'ю та фратрію батька. Фратріальна належність була основою набуття політичних прав у спосіб реєстрації юнака в списках громадян дему. Активна участь у соціокультурній діяльності та управлінні полісом становили основу образу ідеального громадянина. Наявні джерела не дають підстав однозначно визначити статус nothoi в афінському полісі. Однак той факт, що nothoi становили суттєвий ресурс для поповнення колективу громадян, наявність практик усиновлення та надання громадянських прав декретом еклесії, а також існування періодів лояльного ставлення до незаконнонароджених, недотримання або відміни законів, що регулювали питання належності до громадянського колективу, створюють вірогідність наявності у nothoi політичних прав у певних випадках. Доступність для незаконнонароджених святилища та гімнасія у Кіносаргах демонструє наявність способу їх соціокультурної інтеграції.

**Ключові слова:** Стародавні Афіни, громадянство, образ ідеального громадянина, nothoi.

**The Problem Statement.** At the end of the archaic and during the classical periods citizenship was formed as a political institute in Ancient Athens. The myth of Athenian autochthony was an ideological rationale for equality of origin and political equality during the classical period (Tumans, 2002, pp. 409–410; Goušchin, 2019, pp. 18–194). Equal membership in Athenian civil community determined the position and status of a person in polis, scope of his rights and obligations. Accordingly, the development of a civil society as well as a socio-cultural and political community increased simultaneously with the evolution of citizenship from determinate ritualized activities to being approved by law. The rise of state regulation of marriage and inheritance, grounds for acquiring civil rights caused the emergence of a group of illegitimate Athenians. The strength and significance of this group are confirmed by the definition of their peculiar word – nothoi. There remain debatable the

issues on the status of nothoi and the scope of the rights they had. It is not clear whether nothos could reach *arête* and be considered a good citizen. Hence, the analysis of Athenian citizenship as the main research category in the study of image of an ideal citizen in Ancient Athens is topical.

**The Analysis of Sources and Recent Researches.** J. Blok explored various aspects of a political component of Athenian citizenship (Blok, 2005; Blok, 2009; Blok, 2013). Citizenship and civil society development in Ancient Athens are considered in the articles of M. Deene (Deene, 2011), R. T. Long (Long, n.d.). E. A. Meyer (Meyer, 1993) analyzed the evolution of Athenian citizenship on the basis of epitaphs. L. M. Gluskina (Gluskina, 1983), S. D. Lambert (Lambert, 1998), Ch. Hedrick (Hedrick, 1991) demonstrated the value of phratry in Athenian polis in connection with democratization and evolution of citizenship regulation during the archaic and classical periods.

S. Lape interpreted Solon's marriage law as an egalitarian measure that corresponds to the gist of political reforms (Lape, 2002 – 2003). D. M. MacDowell (MacDowell, 1976) proved the idea that Athenian bastards could have civil rights during the classical period. C. B. Patterson noted the clarification importance of the circle of persons who were defined as nothoi to understand Athenian family and polis (Patterson, 1990). The issue of the liberalization of Pericles' law was the subject of E. Carawan article (Carawan, 2008). D. Ogden analyzed the connection of illegitimate children with fatherly oikos (Ogden, 2009).

However, the issue of Athenian citizenship influence on the image of an ideal citizen was not covered in special works.

**The Purpose of Publication** is to analyze the notion of Athenian citizenship and its impact on the image of an ideal citizen. In this article there have been also considered the formation stages of Athenian citizenship in order to determine whether nothoi had the opportunities to achieve the image of a good citizen that was approved by the community.

**The Main Material Statement.** A civil society was the basis of polis in Ancient Athens. Aristotle pointed out Athenians apperceive state through a community or group of citizens (Arist., Pol. III.I.1274b40–1276b10). The polis was the form in which the community existed and, at the same time, the result of civil society activities (Andreev, 1987; Strauss, 2013, p. 23). The legal status of a citizen determined the human significance in Athenian polis.

Citizenship as a political concept in Ancient Athens emerged as a result of three stages of legislative initiatives, which determined the rise of polis in general. The first stage was Solon's law. Along with the *seisathēia* Solon restored civil rights to all Athenians previously deprived of them except for convicts of serious crimes, such as murder and tyranny (Plut., Sol. XIX).

In addition, Solon introduced regulation of family relations within oikos. Lawgiver limited the size of bride's dowry thereby reducing obstacles for marriages between families belonging to different property classes. Those Athenian citizens, who did not have legal children, received the right to bequeath money and oikos to anyone regardless of belonging to the genus (Plut., Sol. XX – XXI). In classical written works there is the appeal to the issue of recognizing a child as a full member of the civil society related to the right of inheritance mainly. According to Solon's law, Heracles had no right to inherit anything because his father did not introduce him in the phratry that notes Pisthetaerus in Aristophanes "The Birds" (Aristoph., Aves. 1650–1670). Illegal children were not recognized as heirs and did not have the right to property inheritance (Demosth., XXXVI.32).

Solon's marriage and inheritance laws contributed to strengthening family status and they were an instrument of polis democratization (Lape, 2002 – 2003, pp. 118–122). Since Solon's

time citizenship and inheritance laws were considered interconnected. At once Pericles' citizenship law did not contain any rules regulating inheritance (Gluskina, 1987, p. 86). Perhaps, coherence of civil and inheritance rights was the guarantee of the *eunomia* retention of a civil society after Solon's *seisachtheia*. *Oikos* was the main social, economic, and religious unit of the polis. Therefore, citizen freedom and economic independence, a realization of the economic component of Athenian citizenship were based on the preservation and inheritance of *oikos*. Inheritance was to provide a livelihood for citizen participation in government, military service, realization of the duty of a liturgist.

As a result of Solon's law there was formed a civic collective or civil community which was based on Athenian origin, personal freedom, legal equality of all citizens, land ownership, access to political and military activities (Kolobova, & Gluskina, 1958, p. 120; Evseenko, 2003, pp. 13–21).

The next stage of citizenship evolution was related to Cleisthenes' reforms. According to the reform, the Athenians were the subject to entry in the demes lists to their area of residence. Citizenship and self-identification began to be determined at the level of *demos* and polis (Strogetsky, 1991, pp. 33–34; Davies, 2004, pp. 107–109). P. Vidal-Naquet paid attention that the inclusion of all citizens regardless of property status in citizens' list immediately after Cleisthenes' reforms is debatable. The researcher considered the idea of initial including only hoplites in these lists to be also unreasonable (Vidal-Naquet, 2001, pp. 118–120). The significance of the reform was not only in the redistribution of political power aimed at weakening the influence of the traditional aristocratic families, a further rise of Athenian democracy, as well as the evolution of a civil status (Strogetsky, 1991, p. 33).

The final legal regulation of the citizens' status was related to the Pericles' citizenship law. The law determined the born of two *astoi* as the condition for granting civil rights (Arist., Ath. pol. 26.3). In his speeches the Demosthenes appeals to marriage "according to the rules" repeatedly and respectively with the laws (Demosth., XL.26; Demosth., XLIII.19; Demosth., XLVIII.53; Demosth., LIX.13; Demosth., LIX.58). But researchers note, that Pericles' law contained the norm of being born by the two Athenians *astoi* without specifying the conditions of a legal marriage (Patterson, 1990, p. 59).

Aristotle noted, that Pericles' citizenship law was the result of a large number of citizens (Arist., Ath. pol. 26.3). In contrast, Plutarch's information testifies that reducing the number of citizens did not happen immediately after the adoption of the law of Pericles. It would be logical if the legislator was guided by a reason called Aristotle. Plutarch noted that until 445 – 444 BC when the king of Egypt sent as a gift to Athenian citizens 40 *medimnos* wheat and there was a need to divide the gift among the citizens, Athenians looked through one's fingers at illegitimate children. And only this occasion became the cause of lawsuits over the legality of citizenship. As a result of lawsuits, almost 5000 Athenians were sold into slavery and the number of full citizens decreased to 14 240 (Plut., Pericl. XXXVII).

A citizen status became privileged owing to the restrictions imposed by Pericles (Meyer, 1993, p. 112). Full citizenship suggested the possibility of an equal participation in political activities. Athenians, whose origins did not meet the requirements of the new law, lost their citizenship. However, records of illegitimate Athenians were available in written sources before the middle of the Vth cent. BC. Therefore it is debatable that Pericles first introduced a law of the born by two Athenian *astoi*. Aristotle referred Athenians of impure descent to the supporters of Peisistratos. Their commitment was explained by fear for their civil rights since the revision of civil lists was held after the overthrow of the Peisistratid tyranny. The rise to power of Hippias and Hipparchus, the sons of Peisistratos, Aristotle

associated with their dignity due to the origin from a legal marriage (Arist., Ath. pol. 13.5; Arist., Ath. pol. 17.3-18). V. V. Latyshev shared the point of view that Pericles' law was introduced to reduce the number of Athenian citizens receiving the *theorika*. The researcher noted that Pericles' law was restored by Solon's law, which at the beginning of the Vth cent. BC ceased to be applied and the difference between citizens and non-citizens was not seen (Latyshev, 1997a, p. 190). According J. Blok Pericles changed the criteria for citizenship. As a result, there took shape the concept of citizenship as a political community endowed with rights and duties (Blok, 2005, pp. 8–21; Blok, 2009b, pp. 141–147).

Despite the above mentioned remarks of Aristotle, it is more probable that Pericles' law was not restored by Solon's law, but the first legal norm about the need of origin from two *astoi*. Possibly, issues of origin, mentioned by Aristotle, regarding recognition of phratry membership, which was taken by Pericles as the basis of a legal norm after the loss of a political significance by the phratries, was a result of Cleisthenes' reforms. Before Pericles' law there could be members of the political community those children, who were born from a wife not included in the phratry. But according to the polis religion they were considered illegitimate.

Plutarch cited Pericles' appeal to *ecclesia* on the repeal of its own law, which was justified by the need to pass the inheritance to a member of the genus by reason of deaths his legitimate sons Xanthippus and Paralus. Judging by the further words of Plutarch, the law was preserved, but the son of Pericles received civil rights. It was allowed to introduce him to the phratry and given patronymic (Plut., Sol. XXXVII). Apparently, Pericles was given the right to adopt his son or the *ecclesia* passed a decree on granting civil rights to the illegitimate Pericles' son. Demosthenes mentioned that children who were born from two Athenian citizens not married legally could get civil rights subject to their adoption by the mother's genus. Similarly, the father could accept his children who were born by a mother, an Athenian citizen, who was not married (Demosth., XL.10). In addition, the Athenian citizen could have legitimate children born to *pallakai* according to the law and if there was a desire (Demosth., XXIII. 53).

L. M. Gluskina determines the difference in the status of children who were born from the marriage between *astoi* and *xenoi* and children who were born from two unmarried *astoi* (citizens), (without a wedlock). In the first case fathers could introduce their sons to the phratry, but a decree of the *ecclesia* was required to obtain the civil rights. In the other case, children received civil rights after being introduced to the father's phratry, because the requirement of the legal birth of a child could be replaced by father's formal consent (Gluskina, 1987, pp. 94–96). Patterson similarly associates *nothoi*, after Pericles' law, with children who were born from *pallakai* or *xenoi* but weren't born by a mother of Athenian citizen (Patterson, 1990, pp. 61–63). S. Lape expresses a thought that after Solon's law all bastards had the status of *nothoi*. Childless citizens could adopt only a legal son of another Athenian citizen for inheritance and the preservation of the *oikos* (Lape, 2002 – 2003, pp. 122–124).

V. V. Latyshev linked the granting of civil rights to the son of Pericles with a repeal of citizenship law (Latyshev, 1997a, p. 190). Obtained by Pericles permission to legitimize his son by Aspasia in 430/429 BC E. Carawan relates to the first stage of weakening citizenship regulation. The second stage of this liberalization was the suspension of Pericles' law in 411 BC (Carawan, 2008, pp. 384–401).

During archonship of Eucleides, after overthrew the Thirty Tyrants, Pericles' citizenship law was finally reinstatement. Citizenship law, introduced in 403 – 402 BC, was not wound up. The law determined the born from two citizens on condition of citizenship. Demosthenes noted that from the first year of archonship of Eucleides *nothoi* lost the right of inheritance and

excluded from their family's religious cults (Demosth., XLIII.51). The order of inclusion into the official lists of citizens in the IV-th cent. BC was described by Aristotle (Arist., Ath. pol. 42).

After the reinstatement of Pericles' citizenship law lists of citizens were revised. As a result of such revision after the overthrow of the Thirty Tyrants, Euxitheus was removed from the lists of citizens and got the metic status. Appealing to the court he argued that both of his parents were Athenian citizens. Euxitheus pointed out that his father was born before archonship of Eucleides, i.e., in 403/402 BC when he could be considered a citizen even if one of his parents had civil rights (Demosth., LVII.1–LVII.30).

Though the procedure for obtaining full civil and political rights was regulated by law but the basis of citizen membership in polis as a political community was his membership in a civil community. Oikos, phratry, and genus, to limit the influence of which the above laws were directed, were the first and key regulators of Athenian membership in community. However, written sources provide information on the functioning of these social institutions only at the end of the archaic and during the classical periods, precisely when they changed under the influence of law and continued to perform a regulatory function with legal norms simultaneously.

The integration of children into Athenian civil community took place during several stages, which were accompanied by generally accepted rituals. Amphidromia ceremonial feast was celebrated for seven days after the birth of a child, it was a symbol of a newborn introduction into the family and oikos to attract to family cults (Beaumont, 2012, p. 67).

Written sources differed in determining the time of a child's given name. Aristotle pointed at naming the child on the seventh day after birth, arguing that it was high infant mortality during its first week (Arist., Hist. anim. VII.67). In Demosthenes' speeches "Against Boeotus" celebration of the tenth day after birth was associated with the recognition and naming of a child (Demosth., XXXIX.20 – XXXIX.22; Demosth., XL.28). Researchers took the celebration of Amphidromia on the fifth, seventh, or tenth day after birth. The child was named on the seventh, tenth day after birth or together with Amphidromia (Latyshev, 1997b, pp. 227–228; Cantarella, 2011, p. 336; Dasen, 2011, pp. 297–303).

Belonging to family and oikos was the basis for the child's further involvement in the social activities of a civil community. Children, who were introduced to the oikos, presented to the phratry members on the third day of the festival Apaturia. Father or guardian, the closest relative, had to swear that the child was legitimate and sacrificed on the altar. Then the sacrificial meat was distributed among phraters. A child was registered in phratry after phratry members voted successfully. Euxitheus justified his right to be considered an Athenian citizen, but not a bastard, by the fact that he was introduced into phratry and further registered in the deme's list (Aristoph., Tes. 550; Demosthenes, 1994a, pp. 597–598; see also: Beaumont, 2000, p. 46). If mother's Athenian citizenship was doubtful, a child registration had to be refused by the phrateres. In this case, the father could appeal to the arbiter (Demosth., LIX.59 – LIX.60). Orators appealed to the testimonies of the Athenians, who belonged to the common phratry, deme and had a common burial site, which indicated their reception as a separate social community and the existence of interrelation of social and political components of a civil status (Demosth., LVII.40; Demosth., XLIII.79).

Researchers shared the same point of view on the issue of determining the age of children introduction in the phratry. This event was attributed to the first or third year of their life (Latyshev, 1997a, pp. 192–193; Andrewes, 2007, p. 439; Dasen, 2011, p. 303). F. F. Zielinski and J. Larson attributed to Apaturia registration of boys as citizens meaning, probably, registration in phratry (Zielinski, 1995, p. 131; Larson, 2007, pp. 21, 50, 160).

Apparently the first introduction to phratry took place at the age of three years old since this age was the transition to the next age group and beginning engagement in worshiping of civic cults. On the second day of the festival Anthesteria, Choes, three-year-old children took part in public celebrations for the first time (Demosthenes, 1994a, p. 599; Larson, 2007, pp. 130–132).

In case of adoption registration in phratry could take place before introduction to the oikos. Mantitheus in a lawsuit against Boeotus indicated that his father Mantias was forced to introduce into a phratry Boeotus and Pamphilus, illegitimate sons of Mantias and Plangon, by the decision of the arbiter. But Mantitheus already introduced them in oikos after father's death and shared the inheritance with brothers according to the law (Demosth., XL.2; Demosth., XL.13). Exactly belonging to common oikos was an argument for the inheritance by the boy the property of a childless relative. The boy, who claimed the inheritance of his grandfather, was born in the legal marriage of two citizen parents, and his mother was epikleros. He was adopted by his maternal grandfather Ebulides, introduced to his oikos and phratry, to inherit his property in order to preserve his oikos (Demosth., XLIII.12–XLIII.78).

Reaching a physical maturity at the age of 16 was considered as a social adulthood. A boy of this age was a participant in the earnings distribution from mines of Laurion (Vidal-Naquet, 2001, pp. 132–133). At the age of 16, boys were reintroduced into their phratry. On the third day of Apaturia, Kureotis, a father repeatedly swore an oath that his son was legitimate, sacrificed to Zeus Phratrios and Athena Phratia, other gods of the phratry. In addition, a hair cutting ceremony was held, which symbolized the transition from childhood to adult. The aim of reintroducing into phratry was verification Eponymous archon and the first phratry introductions in early childhood, which were the basis for further registered in their deme and acquiring civic status and rights (Beaumont, 2000, p. 46; Beaumont, 2012, p. 22). K. L. Lawton attributed a ritual of hair cutting ceremony to the age of 16–18 years (Lawton, 2007, pp. 57–59).

In a significant sanctuary with the temple of Heracles in the deme Melite was held oinisteria, which was carried out earlier than kureotis (Larson, 2007, p. 185). Oinisteria and kureotis preceded towards becoming youth an ephebe. The boy made offerings of wine to Heracles, made a libation and handed out the remaining wine to his companions (Vidal-Naquet, 2001, p. 133; Parker, 2005, p. 437).

The introduction to phratry was accompanied by sacrifice. V. V. Latsyshev associated sacrifice meion and kureion with the first introduction to phratry (Latsyshev, 1997b, p. 228). F. F. Zielinski pointed out that kureion was a sacrifice for a son and smaller meion was a sacrifice for a daughter (Zielinski, 1918, p. 73). The decrees of the Demotionidai had information on the content of these sacrifices, which were intended for the priest. The meion sacrifice contained parts of sacrificial meat and three obols of silver. The kureion included parts of sacrificial meat, baking, wine, and a drachma of silver (Dillon, Garland, 2010, pp. 28–29). The presence of similar difference in the part of sacrifice, which was to be given to the priest, probably indicates that meion and kureion corresponded to different stages of introduction a boy into phratry. This idea is shared by a number of researchers, who associate meion with the first presentation to phratry in childhood and kureion with registration to phratry in adolescence (Cole, 1984, p. 233; Lambert, 1998, p. 70; Blok, 2009a, p. 104). B. Auld associated meion with the introduction of the newborn into oikos, public father's recognition of his child, and kureion with introducing in phratry the youth, who reached puberty that accompanied a dedication of a lock of a boy's hair to Delphi (Auld, pp. 1–7).

As a result of the Cleisthenes' reforms, phratry lost its political significance. But phratry remained the basis for identification of citizenship and ensuring the purity of origin (Zielinski,

1918, p. 73; Latyshev, 1997a, pp. 192–193; Starr, 1986, p. 28). Phratry provided not only presentation children to phrateres of their father, the registration in phratry in infancy, and in adolescence, but also witnessed the marriage of the Athenians. Owing to deme and phile, the Athenians became involved in political activities. Phratry regulated social life into the civil community and ensured the participation of phratry and polis cults activities (Gluskina, 1983, pp. 44–46; Cole, 1984, p. 234).

Phratry affiliation was the base of obtaining political citizenship. Registered in demes before inscribed on phratry lost considered wrong even in the IV-th cent. BC (Demosth., XLIV.41). Combination of political and social components in citizenship confirmed by such type of penalties for an offense as *atimia*, which was a form of deprivation of civil rights or “civil honor”. A citizen, who was made *atimos*, was not only denied of political participation rights but was also not allowed to be in public spaces such as squares, temples, and shrines (Demosth., XXII.34; Demosth., XXII.73; Demosth., XXIV.45).

The Athenians, who were born into the illegal marriage, by the Pericles’ law and later by the law of 403 BC were deprived of civil rights. They constituted a significant resource for increasing the number of citizens and their status in society was not fully equated with *metic*. Illegitimate children concentrated at the Cynosarges gymnasium, which was one of the largest in polis, functioned from the VIth cent. BC and was supported by the state (Demosth., XXIV.114). Demosthenes remembered that *nothoi* had made contributions to the Cynosarges for some time (Demosth., XXIII.213). Cynosarges were an alternative to phratry and deme for *nothoi* (Larson, 2007, pp. 147–148, 184).

According to S. Humphreys Cynosarges were already a place of training for the elite and at the same time were on the periphery of the religious and military citizens’ activities by the time of adoption Pericles’ citizenship law (Humphreys, 1974, pp. 92–94). The fact that the *nothoi* visited the temple of Heracles associated with a similar origin of this hero, who combined inborn *arete* and a problematic social position (Irwin, 2016, p. 99). We assumption is based on Aristotle’s recollections of illegitimate citizens before the Pericles’ law that since the time of Solon, the Cynosarges were concentrating youths, who were born by couples who were not married legally. Plutarch allegorically linked the Cynosarges with a *gynaceum*, referring to a mother’s status (Plut., *Amatorius* 4), and attributed to Themistocles, who was a *nothos*, levelling the difference between *nothoi* and full citizens. Themistocles attended the Cynosarges gymnasium and persuaded young aristocrats to train there with him (Plut., *Them.* 1). L. M. Gluskina considered implausible the plot about the training of Themistocles in the Cynosarges. But the researcher noted that illegitimate children, who were born as a result of marrying to *xenoi*, were registered in the Cynosarges (Gluskina, 1987, pp. 86–87). Gymnasium in Cynosarges ceased functioning as a result of the law of 403 BC (Busolt, 1890, p. 183).

V. V. Latyshev noted that the status of notes and legitimate children almost did not differ in practice, though the *nothoi* attended a particular gymnasium despite the attempts to restore restrictive laws (Latyshev, 1997a, pp. 190–191). E. V. Nikitjuk assumes that before the adoption of the Pericles’ law and until the restoration of democracy in 403 BC the attitude towards illegitimate children was loyal. *Nothoi* could have certain civil rights, but it’s not clear which ones (Nikitjuk, 2013, p. 77).

The sources that we have left ample opportunity to interpret the status of *nothoi* in Ancient Athens and the range of persons this group included. We tend to think that *nothoi* predominantly had access to participate in a social and political activity in the polis, which is substantiated by the following. Firstly, deprivation *nothoi* of full citizenship status was regulated by law only



in the middle of the Vth cent. BC. After that, the attitude towards the nothoi remained loyal for some time and the law was generally suspended after the Athenian coup of 411 BC, during the rule of Thirty Tyrants. Secondly, there was an adoption practice and granted civil rights by decree of the ecclesia during the period considered in this article, which was reflected in the oratorical speeches. Thirdly, among famous Athenian leaders of the late archaic and during classical periods were those, whose maternal origin did not meet the requirements of Solon's and Pericles' laws. In particular, Themistocles and famous orator Demosthenes were nothoi. In addition, in Ancient Athens there was a practice of naturalization. Solon passed the law granting foreigners civil rights (Plut., Sol. XXIV). According to the law, the foreigner could choose phyle, deme, and phratry to which he would belong (IG II<sup>3</sup> 1 490; see also: Andrewes, 2007, p. 439). Granting civil rights to foreigners and abolition of the atimia were the means to increase the number of citizens in crisis situations for the polis (Lyc., Against Leocrates 41). But sources do not contain information on the granting of civil rights to nothoi in such cases, which would be strange if their rights were limited significantly.

The functioning of the gymnasium in Cynosarges and training there the illegitimate Athenians are the basis for the point of view that the paideia was accessible to nothoi like legitimate boys during the period. The similar practice in the education of mothakes in Ancient Sparta is an argument that the nothoi could share in the paideia like children of citizens in the Athenian democratic polis.

**The Conclusions.** At the end of the archaic and during the classical periods citizenship was formed as a political institute in Ancient Athens. Athenian citizenship was a symbiosis of socio-cultural and political components. The integration of children in a civil community suggested their introduction into phratry, preceded the legal status of a citizen, and was marked by ritualized activities within the polis religion. Registered children in the phratry made possible their inculturation, inclusion in social activities of polis. Phratry affiliation was the basis for Athenian boys gaining political rights or citizenship, which gave the right to participate in government. In this context, the content of Athenian citizenship determined the image of an ideal citizen as an active participant in socio-cultural and political activities, who embodied in his civic virtues the values of polis, was able to ensure the functioning of the existing political regime and the transfer of accepted cultural norms, values the most effectively. Since nothoi were included in phratry and got political rights in certain cases, shared in the paideia, hence they could reach the arete, recognition as virtuous citizens.

**Acknowledgements.** The author expresses sincere gratitude to the Candidate of Science in History, associate professor Svitlana Ivanivna Andrukh for her valuable advice during carrying out the research.

**The Funding.** The author received no financial support for the publication of this article.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

**Andreev, Yu. V.** (1987). Istoricheskaya spetsifika grecheskoy urbanizatsii [The historical particularity of Greek urbanization] (E. D. Frolov, Ed.). *Gorod i gosudarstvo v antichnom mire. Problemy istoricheskogo razvitiya*, 4–34. [in Russian]

**Andrewes, A.** (2007). The Growth of the Athenian State. In J. Boardman, N. G. L. Hammond, *The Cambridge Ancient History: per. s angl.* (A. V. Zaykov, Ed., Trans.). (Vol. 3 Part 3, pp. 430–472). Moscow: Ladomir. [in Russian]

**Arist., Ath. pol. – Aristotle,** (1996). Afinskaya politiya [The Athenian Constitutions]. In L. P. Marinovich, & G. A. Koshelenko (Comps.), *Antichnaya demokratiya v svidetelstvakh sovremennikov* (pp. 29–86). Moscow: Ladomir. [in Russian]

- Arist., Hist. anim. – Aristotle**, (1996). *Istoriya zhivotnykh [History of Animals]*. Moscow: RGGU, 528 p. [in Russian]
- Arist., Pol. – Aristotle**, (1983). *Politika [Politics]*. In A. I. Dovatur (Ed.), *The works* (Vol. 4, pp. 375–644). Moscow: Mysl. [in Russian]
- Aristoph., Aves. – Aristophanes**, (2008). *Ptitsy [The Birds]*. *Komedii. Fragmenty* (pp. 376–472). Moscow: Lodomir, Nauka. [in Russian]
- Aristoph., Tes. – Aristophanes**, (2008). *Zhenshchiny na prazdnestve (Fesmoforiazusy) [Women at the Thesmophoria]*. *Komedii. Fragmenty* (pp. 545–614). Moscow: Lodomir, Nauka. [in Russian]
- Auld, B.** (n.d.). Boys to Men: the attainment and classification of male adulthood in ancient Greek society. URL: [https://www.academia.edu/16434313/Boys\\_to\\_men\\_the\\_attainment\\_and\\_classification\\_of\\_male\\_adulthood\\_in\\_ancient\\_Greek\\_society](https://www.academia.edu/16434313/Boys_to_men_the_attainment_and_classification_of_male_adulthood_in_ancient_Greek_society). [in English]
- Beaumont, L.** (2000). The Social Status and Artistic Presentation of “Adolescence” in fifth century Athens. In J. F. Derevenski (Ed.), *Children and material culture* (pp. 39–50). London; New York: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203991862> [in English]
- Beaumont, L. A.** (2012). *Childhood in ancient Athens: iconography and social history*. London; New York: Routledge, 303 p. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203136256> [in English]
- Blok, J.** (2013). Citizenship, the Citizen Body, and its Assemblies. In H. Beck (Ed.), *A companion to Ancient Greek government* (pp. 161–175). Malden; Oxford; Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell. doi: 10.1002/9781118303214. [in English]
- Blok, J. H.** (2005). Becoming Citizens. Some notes on the semantics of “citizen” in archaic Greece and classical Athens. *Klio. Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte*, 87 (1), 7–40. doi: 10.1524/kilo.2005.87.1.7 [in English]
- Blok, J. H.** (2009a). Citizenship in Action: “reading” sacrifice in Classical Athens. In C. Mann, M. Haake, & R von den Hoff (Eds.), *Rollenbilder in der athenischen Demokratie* (pp. 89–111). Wiesbaden: Reichert. [in English]
- Blok, J. H.** (2009b). Pericles’ Citizenship Law: a New Perspective. *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*, 58 (2), 141–170. [in English]
- Busolt, G.** (1890). *Ocherk gosudarstvennykh i pravovykh grecheskikh drevnostey [The Greek State, War and Private Antiquities]*. Kharkov: Tipografiya Adolfa Darre, 320 p. [in Russian]
- Cantarella, E.** (2011). Greek law and the family. In B. Rawson (Ed.), *A Companion to Families in the Greek and Roman World* (pp. 333–392). Wiley-Blackwell. doi: 10.1002/9781444390766 [in English]
- Carawan, E.** (2008). Pericles the Younger and Citizenship Law. *The classical journal*, 103 (4), 383–406. [in English]
- Cole, S. G.** (1984). The Social Function of Rituals of Maturation: the koureion and the arkteia. *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphic*, 55, 233–244. [in English]
- Dasen, V.** (2011). Childbirth and Infancy in Greek and Roman Antiquity. In B. Rawson (Ed.), *A companion to families in the Greek and Roman world* (pp. 291–314). Wiley-Blackwell. doi: 10.1002/9781444390766 [in English]
- Davies, J.** (2004). *Demokratiya i klassicheskaya Gretsiya [Democracy and Classical Greece]: per. s angl.* (I. A. Okazova, Ed., N. N. Trubnikova, Trans.). Moscow: ROSSPEN, 295 p. [in Russian]
- Deene, M.** (2011). Naturalized Citizens and Social Mobility in Classical Athens: the case of Apollodorus. *Greece & Rome*, 58 (2), 159–175. doi: 10.1017/S0017383511000039 [in English]
- Demosth., LVII. – Demosthenes**, (1994). LVII. Protiv Yevbulida: Apellyatsionnaya zhaloba. [Euxitheus against Eubulides, an Appeal]. In E. S. Golubtsova, L. P. Marinovich, & E. D. Frolov (Eds.), *Rechi – Oratory* (Vol. 2, pp. 232–252). Moscow: Pamyatniki istoricheskoy mysli. [in Russian]
- Demosth., LIX. – Demosthenes**, (1994). LIX. Protiv Neery. [Theomnestus and Apollodorus against Neaera]. In E. S. Golubtsova, L. P. Marinovich, & E. D. Frolov (Eds.), *Rechi – Oratory* (Vol. 2, pp. 273–312). Moscow: Pamyatniki istoricheskoy mysli. [in Russian]
- Demosth., XL. – Demosthenes**, (1994). XL. Protiv Beota po povodu pridanogo materi. [Mantitheus against Boeotus 2]. In E. S. Golubtsova, L. P. Marinovich, & E. D. Frolov (Eds.), *Rechi – Oratory* (Vol. 1, pp. 501–515). Moscow: Pamyatniki istoricheskoy mysli. [in Russian]

**Demosth., XLIII. – Demosthenes, (1994).** XLIII. Protiv Makartata o nasledstve Gagniya. [Sositheus against Macartatus in Regard to the Estate of Hagnias]. In E. S. Golubtsova, L. P. Marinovich, & E. D. Frolov (Eds.), *Rechi – Oratory* (Vol. 2, pp. 26–49). Moscow: Pamyatniki istoricheskoy mysli. [in Russian]

**Demosth., XLVIII. – Demosthenes, (1994).** XLVIII. Protiv Olimpiodora o nanesenii ushcherba. [Callistratus against Olympiodorus, an Action for Damages]. In E. S. Golubtsova, L. P. Marinovich, & E. D. Frolov (Eds.), *Rechi – Oratory* (Vol. 2, pp. 123–137). Moscow: Pamyatniki istoricheskoy mysli. [in Russian]

**Demosth., XXXVI. – Demosthenes, (1994).** XXXVI. V zashchitu Formiona. Vstrechnyy isk. [A Friend Pleading for Phormio]. In E. S. Golubtsova, L. P. Marinovich, & E. D. Frolov (Eds.), *Rechi – Oratory* (Vol. 1, pp. 443–460). Moscow: Pamyatniki istoricheskoy mysli. [in Russian]

**Demosth., XXXIX. – Demosthenes, (1994).** XXXIX. Protiv Beota po povodu imeni. [Mantitheus against Boeotus 1]. In E. S. Golubtsova, L. P. Marinovich, & E. D. Frolov (Eds.), *Rechi – Oratory* (Vol. 1, pp. 489–500). Moscow: Pamyatniki istoricheskoy mysli. [in Russian]

**Demosth., XXIII. – Demosthenes, (1994).** XXIII. Protiv Aristokrata [Against Aristocrates]. In E. S. Golubtsova, L. P. Marinovich, & E. D. Frolov (Eds.), *Rechi – Oratory* (Vol. 1, pp. 161–232). Moscow: Pamyatniki istoricheskoy mysli. [in Russian]

**Demosthenes, (1994a).** Primechaniya. XXXIX. Protiv Beota po povodu imeni. [Notes. Mantitheus against Boeotus 1]. In E. S. Golubtsova, L. P. Marinovich, & E. D. Frolov (Eds.), *Rechi – Oratory* (Vol. 1, pp. 596–601). Moscow: Pamyatniki istoricheskoy mysli. [in Russian]

**Dillon, M., & Garland, L. (Comps.). (2010).** *Ancient Greece. Social and historical documents from archaic times to the death of Alexander the Great* (3rd ed.). London; New York: Routledge. 600 p. doi: 10.4324/9780203854556 [in English].

**Evseenko, T. P. (2003).** K voprosu o “grazhdanskoy obshchine” v drevnem mire [To the question of the “civil community” in the Ancient world]. Abstracts of Papers’ 2003: *Antichnaya drevnost i srednie veka.* (pp. 9–22). Yekaterinburg. [in Russian]

**Gluskina, L. M. (1983).** Fratriya i rod v strukture afinskogo polisa v IV v. do n.e. [Phratry and genus in the structure of the Athenian polis in the 4th century BC]. *Vestnik drevney istorii – Journal of Ancient History*, 3, 39–52. [in Russian]

**Gluskina, L. M. (1987).** Nothoi v sotsialnoy strukture afinskogo polisa IV v. do n.e. [Nothoi in the social structure of the Athenian polis of the 4-th cent. BC]. *Vestnik drevney istorii – Journal of Ancient History*, 3, 84–96. [in Russian]

**Gushchin, V. R. (2019).** Obraz proshlogo kak politicheskiy mif: afinskaya avtokhtoniya (V – IV vv. do n.e.) [The image of the past as a political myth: Athenian autochthony (V – IV cent. BC)]. *Schola. Filosofskoe antikovedenie i klassicheskaya traditsiya – Schola. Ancient philosophy and classical traditions*, 13 (1), 180–197. doi: 10.25205/1995-4328-2019-13-1-180-197 [in Russian]

**Hawkins, C. (2011).** Spartans and perioikoi: the organization and ideology of the lacedaimonion army in the fourth century b.c.e. *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine studies*, 51 (3), 401–434. [in English]

**Hedrick, Ch. W. Jr. (1991).** Phratry shrines of Attica and Athens. *Hesperia: The journal of the American school of classical studies at Athens*, 60 (2), 241–268. [in English]

**Humphreys, S. C. (1974).** The nothoi of Kynosarges. *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 94, 88–95. doi: <https://doi.org/10.2307/25010920> [in English]

**IG II<sup>3</sup> I 490.** Decree bestowing citizenship, mid IV BC. *Attic Inscriptions Online*. URL: <https://www.atticinscriptions.com/inscription/IGII3I/490> [in English]

**Irwin, E. (2016).** The nothoi come of age? Illegitimate sons and political unrest in late fifth-century Athens. In P. Sanger (Ed.), *Minderheiten und Migration in der griechisch-romischen Welt. Politische, rechtliche, religiose und kulterelle Aspekte*, (31), 75–121. doi: <https://doi.org/10.30965/9783657766352> [in English]

**Kolobova, K. M., & Gluskina, L. M. (1958).** *Ocherki istorii Drevney Gretsii [Essays on the History of Ancient Greece]*. Leningrad, 348 p. [in Russian]

**Lambert, S. D. (1998).** *The Phratries of Attica*. Ann Arbor: The university of Michigan press, 424 p. doi: 10.3998/mpub.13495 [in English]

- Lape, S.** (2002 – 2003). Solon and the institution of the “democratic” family form. *The classical journal*, 98 (2), 117–139. doi: 10.2307/3298017. [in English].
- Larson, J.** (2007). *Ancient Greek cults: A guide*. New York; London: Routledge, 305 p. doi: 10.4324/9780203356982 [in English]
- Latyshev, V. V.** (1997a). *Ocherk grecheskikh drevnostey* [Essay on Greek antiquities]. (Vol. 1). (2nd ed.). Saint Petersburg: Aleteyya, 347 p. [in Russian].
- Latyshev, V. V.** (1997b). *Ocherk grecheskikh drevnostey* [Essay on Greek antiquities]. (Vol. 2). (2nd ed.). Saint Petersburg: Aleteyya, 319 p. [in Russian].
- Lawton, K. L.** (2007). Children in Classical Attic Votive Reliefs. In A. Cohen, & J. B. Rutter (Eds.), *Construction of childhood in Ancient Greece and Italy* (pp. 41–60). Princeton: ASCSA. [in English]
- Long, R. T.** (n.d.). Civil Society in Ancient Greece: The Case of Athens. URL: <http://www.praxeology.net/civsoc.htm> [in English]
- Lyc., Against Leocrates – Lycurgus**, (2013). Rech protiv Leokrata [Against Leocrates]. In E. D. Frolov (Ed.), *Isokrat. Rechi. Pisma. Malye atticheskie oratory* (pp. 521–557). Moscow: Ladimir. [in Russian]
- MacDowell, D. M.** (1976). Bastards as Athenian citizens. *The classical quarterly*, 26 (1), 88–91. [in English]
- Meyer, E. A.** (1993). Epitaphs and Citizenship in Classical Athens. *The journal of Hellenic studies*, 113, 99–121. doi: <https://doi.org/10.2307/632400> [in English]
- Nikityuk, Ye. V.** (2013). Sotsialnaya politika Afin posle vosstanovleniya demokratii v 403 g. do n.e. po dekretu Feozotida [The Social Politics of Athens after the Restoration of Democracy in 403 BC by Decree of Theozotide]. *MNEMON: Research and publications on the history of the Ancient World*, (13), 71–90. [in Russian]
- Ogden, D.** (2009). Bastardy and fatherlessness in ancient Greece. In S. R. Hübner, & D. M. Ratzan (Eds.), *Growing up Fatherless in Antiquity* (pp. 105–119). New York: Cambridge university press. doi: 10.1017/CBO9780511575594 [in English]
- Parker, R.** (2005). Polytheism and Society at Athens. Oxford: Oxford university press, 544 p. doi: 10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199216116.001.0001 [in English]
- Patterson, C. B.** (1990). Those Athenian bastards. *Classical Antiquity*, 9 (1), 40–73. doi: 10.2307/25010920 [in English]
- Plut., Amatorius. – Plutarch**, (1999). Ob erote [Dialogue on Love]. *Moralii: sochineniya* (pp. 719–759). Moscow: EKSMO Press; Kharkov: Folio. [in Russian].
- Plut., Pericl. – Plutarch**, (1961). Pericles. *Sravnitelnye zhizneopisaniya [Parallel Lives]*. (Vol. 1, pp. 196–224). Moscow: Izdatelstvo AN SSSR. [in Russian].
- Plut., Sol. – Plutarch**, (1961). Solon. *Sravnitelnye zhizneopisaniya [Parallel Lives]*. (Vol. 1, pp. 102–126). Moscow: Izdatelstvo AN SSSR. [in Russian]
- Starr, Ch. G.** (1986). *Individual and community. The rise of the polis 800 – 500 b.c.* New York; Oxford: Oxford university press, 133 p. [in English]
- Strauss, B.** (2013). The Classical Greek Polis and its Government. In H. Beck (Ed.), *A companion to Ancient Greek government* (pp. 22–37). Malden; Oxford; Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell. doi: 10.1002/9781118303214 [in English]
- Strogetsky, V. M.** (1991). *Polis i imperiya v klassicheskoy Gretsii [Polis and Empire in Classical Greece]*. Nizhnii Novgorod: NGPI im. M. Gorkogo, 244 p. [in Russian].
- Tumans, H.** (2002). *Rozhdenie Afiny. Afinskiy put k demokratii: ot Gomera do Perikla (VIII – V vv. do n.e.) [The Birth of Athena. The Athenian Way to Democracy: from Homer to Pericles (VIII – V cent. BC)]*. Saint Petersburg: Gumanitarnaya Akademiya, 544 p. [in Russian]
- Vidal-Naquet, P.** (2001). *Chernyy okhotnik. Formy myshleniya i formy obshchestva v grecheskom mire [The Black Hunter: Forms of Thought and Forms of Society in the Greek World]: per. s fr.* (S. G. Karpyuk, Ed., A. I. Ivanchik, Yu. N. Litvinenko, & Ye. V. Lyapustinova, Trans.). Moscow: Ladimir, 419 p. [in Russian]
- Zielinski, T. F.** (1918). *Drevnegrecheskaya religiya [The Religion of Ancient Greece: An outline]*. Petrograd: Ognii, 163 p. [in Russian]
- Zielinski, T. F.** (1995). *Istoriya antichnoy kultury [History of Ancient Culture]* (2nd ed.). Saint Petersburg: Mars, 380 p. [in Russian]

The article was received June 20, 2020.  
Article recommended for publishing 31/08/2021.