

“Those who live apart” were Mercenaries

ABSTRACT: Since antiquity, scholars have thought that the phrase τοὺς χωρὶς οἰκοῦντας (Dem. 4.36) indicated a special class of slaves, or freedmen, or (Kazakévich) an unspecified form of free alien. The argument advanced in Dem. 4, this paper suggests, shows that the individuals who lived apart, were mercenaries.

In the first Philippic Demosthenes laments Athens’ inability to mobilize quickly and efficiently for naval expeditions. The city manages the complex and expensive task of administering the Panathenaia and Dionysia, he observes, because law clearly establishes who is to do what and when (4.35–36). But when it comes to preparing for war, Athens’ house is not in order (36–37):

τοιγαροῦν ἄμ’ ἀκηκόαμέν τι καὶ τριηράρχους καθίσταμεν καὶ τούτοις ἀντιδόσεις ποιούμεθα καὶ περὶ χρημάτων πόρου σκοποῦμεν, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτ’ ἐμβαίνειν τοὺς μετοίκους ἔδοξε καὶ τοὺς χωρὶς οἰκοῦντας, εἴτ’ αὐτοὺς πάλιν, εἴτ’ ἀντεμβιβάζειν, εἴτ’ ἐν ὄσφ ταῦτα μέλλεται, προαπόλωλεν τὸ ἐφ’ ὃ ἂν ἐκπλέωμεν·

So, as soon as we have heard something, we appoint trierarchs and we hold *antidoseis* for them and we investigate raising money, and after that it is resolved to embark the metics and those who live apart, and then in turn ourselves, and then to embark another crew instead, and then in the time in which these delays take place the purpose for which we were sailing out has been lost.

The identity of “those who live apart” has long provoked readers’ curiosity. Harpokration explained (s.v. Τοὺς χωρὶς οἰκοῦντας):¹

Δημοσθένης Φιλιππικοῖς “καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἐμβαίνειν τοὺς μετοίκους ἔδοξε καὶ τοὺς χωρὶς οἰκοῦντας τῶν δεσποτῶν.” οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ χωρὶς τοῦ προσκεῖσθαι φανερόν ἂν εἴη τὸ δηλούμενον, ὅτι οἱ ἀπελευθεροὶ καθ’ αὐτοὺς ὄκουν, χωρὶς τῶν ἀπελευθερωσάντων, ἐν δὲ τῷ τέως δουλεύοντες ἔτι συνήκουν.

Demosthenes (says) in the *Philippics*: “and after that it is resolved to embark the metics and those who live apart from their masters.” On the contrary, even without the addition the plain meaning would be obvious, because freedmen used to live on their own, apart from those who freed them, but used to live with them while they were still slaves.

To Harpokration it was “obvious” that these individuals were freedmen since freedmen lived apart from their masters, while slaves lived with theirs. But some freedmen lived with their former masters and some slaves lived apart.² This smells of conjecture and error—neither especially odd.

¹ Photius and Suda have the same, under the same lemma, but with προκεῖσθαι.

² For example, the speaker of Dem. 47 admitted to his *oikos* a former nurse whom his father had freed; she had lived on her own and now returned to the family of her manumitter: Dem. 47.55–56: πρὸς δὲ τούτοις, ὧ ἄνδρες δικασταί, ἔτυχεν ἡ γυνή μου μετὰ τῶν παιδίων ἀριστῶσα ἐν τῇ αὐλῇ, καὶ μετ’ αὐτῆς τιτθὴ τις ἐμῆ γενομένη πρεσβυτέρα, ἄνθρωπος εὐνοῦς καὶ πιστὴ καὶ ἀφειμένη ἐλευθέρᾳ ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ ἐμοῦ. συνήκησεν δὲ ἀνδρί,

What does stand out, though, is the rejection with which he begins the entry. This is the only time Harpokration uses the phrase οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ. To what does he object? To “the addition” (τοῦ προσκεῖσθαι). Of what? The answer can only be the words “τῶν δεσποτῶν,” which are absent from the manuscripts of Demosthenes,³ and which he must have encountered via some form of insertion or other readerly intervention. He uses the verb *proskeisthai* nowhere else and *prostithemi* but once, to indicate a lexical observation that Nikander seems to have ‘added’ to a point made by Didymos.⁴ He never uses the noun *prostheke*, but he will have known from Hyp. 3.10 that it could denote an insertion or appendage in a contract, an add-on—there, an allegedly deceitful one. Someone before him wondered about the identity of those who lived apart, concluded that they were slaves, and indicated this by ‘adding’ τῶν δεσποτῶν. Finding this, Harpokration rejects both the conclusion that those who lived apart were slaves and the addition of the words that would tell us so. “On the contrary,” he says, it is obvious that they were freedmen. A later lexicographer, finding τῶν δεσποτῶν in Harpokration or else in a common source, thought it not so obvious, defining those who lived apart as “freedmen, since they live apart from those who set them free, or slaves living apart from their masters.”⁵ The only thing that is “obvious” in the sentence of Demosthenes is that those who lived apart were neither metics nor citizens.

Who, then, were they? Thanks to Kamen, we now have a fully translated and helpfully updated version of Kazakévich’s 1960 article on the subject.⁶ Most scholars have followed the tradition that Harpokration thought so obviously wrong, concluding that those who lived apart

ἐπειδὴ ἀφείθη ἐλευθέρα· ὡς δὲ οὗτος ἀπέθανεν καὶ αὐτὴ γραῦς ἦν καὶ οὐκ ἦν αὐτὴν ὁ θρέψων, ἐπανῆκεν ὡς ἐμέ. ἀναγκαῖον οὖν ἦν μὴ περιδεῖν ἐνδεεῖς ὄντας μήτε τιτθὴν γενομένην μήτε παιδαγωγόν. The *naukleros* Lampis is said to be a slave, residing at Athens with his own family: Dem. 34.5: φασὶν δ’ ἀποδεδωκέναι τὸ χρυσίον Λάμπιδι τῷ Δίωνος οἰκέτῃ ἐν Βοσπόρῳ; 34.10: καὶ αὐτὸς μὲν ἀπεσώθη ἐν τῷ λέμβῳ μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων παίδων τῶν Δίωνος, ἀπώλεσεν δὲ πλεόν ἢ τριάκοντα σώματα ἐλεύθερα χωρὶς τῶν ἄλλων; 34.37: καὶ ταῦτ’ ἔπραξεν, ὃ ἄνδρες δικασταί, οἰκῶν μὲν Ἀθήνησιν, οὔσης δ’ αὐτῷ γυναικὸς ἐνθάδε καὶ παίδων, τῶν δὲ νόμων τὰ ἔσχατα ἐπιτίμια προτεθηκότων, εἴ τις οἰκῶν Ἀθήνησιν ἄλλοσέ ποι σιτηγήσειεν ἢ εἰς τὸ Ἀττικὸν ἐμπόριον.

³ J. J. Kearney, *Harpokration, Lexeis of the Ten Orators* (Amsterdam 1991) ad loc., p.251, notes, “τῶν δεσποτῶν om. codd. Dem.” Perhaps clearer to say that Harpokration includes those words than that the manuscripts of Demosthenes omit them.

⁴ Harp. s.v. Ξηραλοιφεῖν: Αἰσχίνης κατὰ Τιμάρχου. Ξηραλοιφεῖν ἔλεγον τὸ χωρὶς λουτρῶν ἀλείφεσθαι, ὡς Δίδυμος ἐν κη’ Τραγικῆς λέξεως καὶ Νικάνδρος ἐν ιη’ Ἀττικῆς διαλέκτου, προστιθεὶς ὅτι μήποτε καὶ τὸ ὑπὸ τῶν ἀλειπτῶν λεγόμενον Ξηροτριβεῖσθαι οὕτως ἐλέγετο.

⁵ Bekker, *Anec.* I 316.11: οἱ ἀπελεύθεροι ἐπεὶ χωρὶς οἰκοῦσι τῶν ἀπελευθερωσάντων ἢ δοῦλοι χωρὶς οἰκοῦντες τῶν δεσποτῶν.

⁶ E. G. Kazakévich, “Were the χωρὶς οἰκοῦντες Slaves?” ed. by D. Kamen, partly transl. by O. Levaniouk, *GRBS* 48 (2008) 343–380; originally, *VDI* 73.3 (1960) 23–42.

were slaves; some urge that the classification could apply to slaves or to freedmen; others are simply unsure; and Kamen has now argued that Harpokration was right all along.⁷ But Kazakévich alone, it seems, broke new ground, arguing that the lexicographers were mistaken, that those who lived apart were neither privileged slaves (too small a cohort to offer much manpower at the oar) nor freedmen (“who would probably be classed as metics anyway”); rather, “Demosthenes could have been referring to any or all of the various free populations groups in Attica and nearby areas, namely those groups who were neither Athenians nor *metoikoi*—either because they had not yet acquired the status of *metoikoi* or because their relationship with the Athenians was determined by some other, more or less permanent, ties.”⁸ “Then why did he not simply say τοὺς μετοίκους καὶ τοὺς (ἄλλους) ξένους? Possibly because he had in mind not every stranger (for example, he certainly did not mean travelers), and not only the mercenaries, but precisely all the “excluded” inhabitant foreigners, a group that could include more than just the professional sailors.”⁹ But who were these non-metic, non-transient, non-mercenary, non-Athenians, who were present in sufficient number to help man the fleet?

Despite its characterization in modern scholarship, there is no reason to think that οἰκῶντες χωρὶς οἰκοῦντες was a technical term. It appears nowhere else. For all of the Athenians’ talk about status and participation in the polity, no other reference to this group as such exists. In three places in the orators χωρὶς modifies οἰκεῖν, never indicating a class of person, as Kazakévich recognized.¹⁰ Bouselos had five sons, who, upon his death, divided his property and started five families. Each lived apart (χωρὶς ἕκαστος ὄκει) from the rest and from his paternal *oikos*, maintaining his own home.¹¹ Theophemos lived apart (χωρὶς οἰκοίη) from his father’s

⁷ D. Kamen, “Reconsidering the status of *khôris oikountes*,” *Dike* 14 (2011) 43–53; see esp. 44–45 for a review of scholarship. Freedmen and born-free metics enjoyed slightly different rights: Kamen *Dike* 14 (2011) 47–48; A. Dimopoulou-Piliouni, “*Apeleutheroi*: Metics or Foreigners?” *Dike* 11 (2008) 27–50. But that does not mean that Athens would draft “metics and freedmen.” If a freedmen registered as a metic he was required to name his former owner as *prostates* or else face *dike apostasiou* (see Harp. s.v. ἀποστασίου) by the same. But so far as we know he registered as a metic, not as a freedman. If Athens wanted to draft metics and freedmen all it had to do was summon metics.

⁸ *GRBS* 48 (2008) 374–375.

⁹ *GRBS* 48 (2008) 376–377.

¹⁰ Kazakévich, *GRBS* 48 (2008) 362–366.

¹¹ Dem. 43.19: καὶ παῖδες ἐγένοντο αὐτοῖς ἅπασιν καὶ παίδων παῖδες, καὶ ἐγένοντο πέντε οἴκοι ἐκ τοῦ Βουσέλου οἴκου ἐνὸς ὄντος, καὶ χωρὶς ἕκαστος ὄκει τὸν ἑαυτοῦ ἔχων καὶ ἐγγόνους ἑαυτοῦ ποιούμενος.

oikos while his brother was living there still.¹² One man's former nurse had been set free by his father and was no longer living in his *oikos*, but apart, with her husband.¹³ In all of these cases the collocation indicates not simply independence, but outsider status with regard to another's *oikos*.¹⁴ All of these individuals lived apart from some other place or thing. A metic's home was Athens. An alien, by contrast, was someone whose home was not, someone who lived apart from Athens. This, I urge, was the distinction that Demosthenes sought to make by collocating τοὺς μετοίκους and τοὺς χωρὶς οἰκοῦντας.

His specific proposals bear this out. Athens, he urged, should create two military forces, first, fifty triremes, which Athenians must resolve to man themselves (πλευστέον εἰς ταύτας αὐτοῖς ἐμβᾶσιν), along with horse transport and supply ships.¹⁵ The other contingent was to be a small raiding force, not ten or twenty thousand mercenaries (ξένους), but a force that would belong to the city (ἢ τῆς πόλεως ἔσται),¹⁶ and also include mercenaries (ξένους, 4.20). In all, he proposes a total infantry strength of two thousand, five hundred of them Athenians (Ἀθηναίους) and the rest mercenaries (ξένους), plus two hundred cavalry, at least fifty of them Athenians (Ἀθηναίους), the rest presumably mercenaries.¹⁷ It is essential, he stressed, that citizens (πολίτας) be included. In the past, when Athens maintained a mercenary force (ξενικὸν) with participation by Athenians themselves (αὐτοὺς ὑμᾶς), mercenaries with Athenians and Athenians with

¹² Dem. 47.35: ἀποκριναμένου δέ μοι Εὐέργου ὅτι νενεμημένος εἶη καὶ χωρὶς οἰκοῖη ὁ Θεόφημος, αὐτὸς δὲ παρὰ τῷ πατρὶ, πυθόμενος οὐ ᾄκει ὁ Θεόφημος, λαβὼν παρὰ τῆς ἀρχῆς ὑπηρέτην ἦλθον ἐπὶ τὴν οἰκίαν τοῦ Θεοφίμου.

¹³ Dem. 47.72: ἀφείτο γὰρ ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ ἐμοῦ ἐλευθέρα καὶ χωρὶς ᾄκει καὶ ἄνδρα ἔσχεν. She later returned; see Dem. 47.55–56 at n.2 above.

¹⁴ See also e.g. Pl. *Rep.* 460c, where the offspring of the good will be brought to nurses who lived apart, i.e. from the rest of the population: τὰ μὲν δὴ τῶν ἀγαθῶν, δοκῶ, λαβοῦσαι εἰς τὸν σηκὸν οἴσουσιν παρὰ τινος τροφῶς χωρὶς οἰκοῦσας ἐν τινὶ μέρει τῆς πόλεως; Pl. *Crit.* 110c refers to a military class that lived apart from the rest of the populace: Ὡκει δὲ δὴ τότε ἐν τῇδε τῇ χώρᾳ τὰ μὲν ἄλλα ἔθνη τῶν πολιτῶν περὶ τὰς δημιουργίας ὄντα καὶ τὴν ἐκ τῆς γῆς τροφήν, τὸ δὲ μάχιμον ὑπ' ἀνδρῶν θείων κατ' ἀρχὰς ἀφορισθὲν ᾄκει χωρὶς.

¹⁵ Dem. 4.16: πρῶτον μὲν τοίνυν, ὧ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, τριῆρεις πεντήκοντα παρασκευάσασθαι φημί δεῖν, εἴτ' αὐτοὺς οὕτω τὰς γνώμας ἔχειν ὡς, ἐάν τι δέη, πλευστέον εἰς ταύτας αὐτοῖς ἐμβᾶσιν.

¹⁶ Dem. 4.19: πρὸ δὲ τούτων δύναμιν τιν', ὧ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, φημί προχειρίσασθαι δεῖν ὑμᾶς, ἢ συνεχῶς πολεμήσει καὶ κακῶς ἐκείνον ποιήσει. μὴ μοι μυρίους μηδὲ δισμυρίους ξένους, μηδὲ τὰς ἐπιστολμαίους ταύτας δυνάμεις, ἀλλ' ἢ τῆς πόλεως ἔσται, κἂν ὑμεῖς ἓνα κἂν πλείους κἂν τὸν δεῖνα κἂν ὄντινον χειροτονήσητε στρατηγόν, τούτῳ πείσεται καὶ ἀκολουθήσει.

¹⁷ Dem. 4.21: λέγω δὴ τοὺς πάντας στρατιώτας δισχιλίου, τούτων δ' Ἀθηναίους φημί δεῖν εἶναι πεντακοσίους, ἐξ ἧς ἂν τινος ὑμῖν ἡλικίας καλῶς ἔχειν δοκῆ, χρόνον τακτὸν στρατευομένους, μὴ μακρὸν τοῦτον, ἀλλ' ὅσον ἂν δοκῆ καλῶς ἔχειν, ἐκ διαδοχῆς ἀλλήλοις· τοὺς δ' ἄλλους ξένους εἶναι κελεύω. καὶ μετὰ τούτων ἰπέας διακοσίους, καὶ τούτων πεντήκοντ' Ἀθηναίους τοῦλάχιστον, ὥσπερ τοὺς πεζοὺς, τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον στρατευομένους· καὶ ἰπαγωγὸς τούτοις.

mercenaries (παραταττόμενοι μεθ' ὑμῶν ἐνίκων οὔτοι οἱ ξένοι καὶ ὑμεῖς μετ' ἐκείνων) victory was hers; on the other hand, outcomes have not been nearly so favorable since Athens started having mercenary forces (τὰ ξενικὰ) fight for her on their own.¹⁸ And so, he asks, nearing the conclusion of the speech, shouldn't Athenians themselves (αὐτοὶ) go forth among their own troops (στρατιωτῶν οἰκείων), even if in the past they have not?¹⁹ It harms Athenian interests to dispatch generals at the head of a contingent of wretched mercenaries for hire (ἀθλίων ἀπομίσθων ξένων), i.e. without robust citizen participation.²⁰

Demosthenes stresses that the ideal force should be composed of both Athenians and mercenaries; that joint forces, such as the city once fielded, have succeeded, while the mercenary-only forces, which have become more common in recent years, fail. Athens, he urges, must have skin in the game, must field citizens (πολίτας), its very selves (αὐτοῖς, αὐτοὺς ὑμᾶς, ὑμεῖς), must produce a force that belonged to the city (τῆς πόλεως). Now, metics were not citizens, were not the “you” and “selves” to whom Demosthenes spoke. But they were in a crucial sense “the city’s,” subject to military conscription like their citizen betters.

The speech, though, has nothing to say about slaves or freedmen. Demosthenes’ specific proposal is to reject the prior practice of mounting mainly mercenary forces and to field joint forces instead. Thus, it would be a bizarre and inexplicable intrusion for Demosthenes to lament at 36–37 Athens’ reliance on slaves/freedmen in its naval campaigns, rather than its own citizens. He is chastising Athenians’ prior decisions “to embark those *who live with* (τοὺς μετοίκους) and *those who live apart* (τοὺς χωρὶς οἰκοῦντας), and only then their very selves (εἴτ' αὐτοὺς πάλιν).”²¹ Metics too play no part in the argument that he constructs in the rest of the speech, but

¹⁸ Dem. 4.24: πολίτας δὲ παρεῖναι καὶ συμπλεῖν διὰ ταῦτα κελεύω, ὅτι καὶ πρότερόν ποτ' ἀκούω ξενικὸν τρέφειν ἐν Κορίνθῳ τὴν πόλιν, οὗ Πολύστρατος ἠγεῖτο καὶ Ἰφικράτης καὶ Χαβρίας καὶ ἄλλοι τινές, καὶ αὐτοὺς ὑμᾶς συστρατεύεσθαι· καὶ οἷδ' ἀκούων ὅτι Λακεδαιμονίους παραταττόμενοι μεθ' ὑμῶν ἐνίκων οὔτοι οἱ ξένοι καὶ ὑμεῖς μετ' ἐκείνων. ἐξ οὗ δ' αὐτὰ καθ' αὐτὰ τὰ ξενικὰ ὑμῖν στρατεύεται, τοὺς φίλους νικᾷ καὶ τοὺς συμμάχους, οἱ δ' ἐχθροὶ μείζους τοῦ δέοντος γεγονάσιν. καὶ παρακύψαντ' ἐπὶ τὸν τῆς πόλεως πόλεμον, πρὸς Ἀρτάβαζον καὶ πανταχοῖ μᾶλλον οἴχεται πλέοντα, ὁ δὲ στρατηγὸς ἀκολουθεῖ, εἰκότως· οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν ἄρχειν μὴ διδόντα μισθόν.

¹⁹ Dem. 4.44: οὐκ ἐμβησόμεθα; οὐκ ἔξιμεν αὐτοῖς μέρει γέ τι στρατιωτῶν οἰκείων νῦν, εἰ καὶ μὴ πρότερον;

²⁰ Dem. 4.46: ὅταν γὰρ ἠγῆται μὲν ὁ στρατηγὸς ἀθλίων ἀπομίσθων ξένων, οἱ δ' ὑπὲρ ὧν ἂν ἐκεῖνος πράξῃ πρὸς ὑμᾶς ψευδόμενοι ῥαδίως ἐνθάδ' ὧσιν, ὑμεῖς δ' ἐξ ὧν ἂν ἀκούσῃθ' ὅ τι ἂν τύχητε ψηφίζησθε, τί καὶ χρὴ προσδοκᾶν;

²¹ Clear ancient statements on the etymology of μετοικεῖν are lacking. A metic both *lived with* and, as Whitehead suggested, *changed home*. He was “characterised by a past act no less than a present and continuing state.” Moreover, “the fact that not only genuine immigrants but manumitted slaves became *metoikoi*... constitutes clear evidence that the technical term, once adopted, took on a fossilised life of its own independent of historical circumstances.” Thus, Whitehead prefers “immigrant” to “resident alien.” See D. Whitehead, *The Ideology of the Athenian Metic* (Cambridge 1977) 6-7. Either way, the Athenian ear was primed to hear the root *-oik-*. Isocrates

the juxtaposition of τοὺς μετοίκους and τοὺς χωρὶς οἰκοῦντας is rhetorically opportune, a convenient vehicle for the speaker’s proposition: Athenians have relied almost entirely on those who don’t even live there at all (τοὺς χωρὶς οἰκοῦντας); the time has come to be part of their own force (στρατιωτῶν οἰκείων). It is hard to capture this wordplay in English, but the point is clear enough, and it is one that Demosthenes develops throughout the course of the speech, and not just in the one isolated sentence to which scholars have been drawn.²²

“Those who lived apart” were neither slaves nor freedmen; on this point Kazakévich—apparently alone—was right. But they were not, I urge, some sort of unidentified class of persons who had no share in the Athenian state but were present and eligible for service. The (unique) phrase was not even a technical term for any group at all. Rather, it was an artful reference to the largest known category of non-metic, non-Athenians, who lived apart from Athens and were nevertheless called by her to serve: mercenaries, the same ones whom Demosthenes mentions repeatedly elsewhere in the speech. The only evidentiary cause to think otherwise is an error of Harpokration and the later lexicographer who used him.

Joshua D. Sosin
Department of Classical Studies
Box 90103
Duke University
Durham, NC USA
joshua.sosin@duke.edu

notes that it is far more miserable to *oikein* among one’s own citizens than to *metoikein* among others (16.47): πολὺ γὰρ ἀθλιώτερον παρὰ τοῖς αὐτοῦ πολίταις ἠτιμωμένον οἰκεῖν ἢ παρ’ ἑτέροις μετοικεῖν. He is discussing exile and so contemplates both a change of residence and residence with others. Xen. *Por.* 2.6-7 neatly evokes both nuances: εἶτα ἐπειδὴ καὶ πολλὰ οἰκιῶν ἔρημά ἐστιν ἐντὸς τῶν τειχῶν καὶ οἰκόπεδα, εἰ ἢ πόλις διδοίη οἰκοδομησομένους ἐγκεκτῆσθαι οἱ ἂν αἰτούμενοι ἄξιοι δοκῶσιν εἶναι, πολὺ ἂν οἴομαι καὶ διὰ ταῦτα πλείους τε καὶ βελτίους ὀρέγεσθαι τῆς Ἀθήνησιν οἰκίσεως. καὶ εἰ μετοικοφύλακάς γε ὥσπερ ὀρφανοφύλακας ἀρχὴν καθισταῖμεν, καὶ τούτοις τιμὴ τις ἐπεὶ οἵτινες πλείστους μετοίκους ἀποδείξειαν, καὶ τοῦτο εὐνουστέροις ἂν τοὺς μετοίκους ποιοίη καί, ὡς τὸ εἰκός, πάντες ἂν οἱ ἀπόλιδες τῆς Ἀθήνησι μετοικίας ὀρέγοιντο καὶ τὰς προσόδους ἂν αὔξοιεν. Aspasia’s funeral oration distinguishes the autochthonous from those whose metic ancestors came from elsewhere: Pl. *Menex.* 237b-c: τῆς δ’ εὐγενείας πρῶτον ὑπῆρξε τοῖσδε ἢ τῶν προγόνων γένεσις οὐκ ἔπηλυς οὔσα, οὐδὲ τοὺς ἐγγόνους τούτους ἀποφνημαμένη μετοικοῦντας ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ ἄλλοθεν σφῶν ἠκόντων, ἀλλ’ αὐτόχθονας καὶ τῷ ὄντι ἐν πατρίδι οἰκοῦντας καὶ ζῶντας, καὶ τρεφομένους οὐχ ὑπὸ μητριᾶς ὡς οἱ ἄλλοι, ἀλλ’ ὑπὸ μητρὸς τῆς χώρας ἐν ἧ ὄκουν, καὶ νῦν κείσθαι τελευτήσαντας ἐν οἰκείοις τόποις τῆς τεκούσης καὶ θρεψάσης καὶ ὑποδεξαμένης; cf. *Thuc.* 1.2.5-6. Thus, even after the technical term had matured as such, Attic authors continued to play *oikein* and *metoikein* against each other for rhetorical effect.

²² Dem. 4 makes no reference to Athenians who had taken up residence elsewhere; such citizens might be said to live apart from Athens, rather like the sons who left their father’s *oikos* and established their own (Dem. 43.19, 47.35), or the freed slave who acted similarly (47.72). But again, they are not mentioned elsewhere in the speech, so that reference to them in what is very nearly a culminating sentiment would be out of place.