

In describing the Athenians' preparations for war, Demosthenes states: "We resolve that the fleet shall be manned by metics (*metoikoi*) and *khôris oikountes*, then again by citizens, then by substitutes" (Dem. 4.36-37). Debate on the meaning of the phrase *khôris oikountes* began at least as early as the second century CE, when the lexicographer Harpocration identified the group as freedmen, since "freedmen lived by themselves, apart from their manumitters." A Byzantine lexicographer concurred with Harpocration but added a secondary definition: "Or slaves living apart from their masters" (Bekker *Anec.* I 316.11). Since then, scholars have tended to adopt one or the other of these definitions, generally without any explanation for their choice (freedmen: Busolt 1926: 985, *RE* s.v. *misthophorountes*, Gernet 1955: 169 with n.4, Lipsius 1966: 622n.6 and 798n.29, Klees 1998: 307n.62; slaves: Perotti 1974, Cohen 2003: 130-154, and many others; either: Zelnick-Abramovitz 2005: 215-216, Fisher 2008; neither: Kazakévich 2008 [1960]). In this paper, I make the case that *khôris oikountes* must refer to freed slaves, thereby broadening our understanding of the range of status groups recognized in classical Athens.

First, I demonstrate that it is unlikely that the *khôris oikountes* were slaves. Although there were indeed slaves in Athens who lived and worked apart from their masters, ranging from workers in the mines to slave-bankers, they were far from forming a monolithic group of "living-apart slaves" (Kazakévich 2008 [1960]). In addition, Demosthenes' listing of *khôris oikountes* as a group separate from "substitutes"—that is, slave substitutes—implies that the former are unlikely to have been slaves as well. Finally, there is no good linguistic reason to take *khôris oikountes* as synonymous with *khôris oiketai* ("servants [working] apart"). Whereas the noun *oiketês* represents a known class of slave ("household servant"), *oikôn* is simply a participial modifier from the verb *oikeô*, "to live." Unlike *khôris oiketês*, then, there is nothing inherent in the phrase *khôris oikôn* that implies servile status.

I turn next to our evidence for taking the *khôris oikountes* as freed slaves. The phrase is not attested elsewhere, but the finite verb *oikeô* is paired with *khôris* in another Demosthenic speech to describe a freedwoman-nurse who lives apart from her former master's family ([Dem.] 47.72). Moreover, Demosthenes' juxtaposition of *khôris oikountes* and *metoikoi* in 4.36-37 indicates that he considered the two groups in some way similar, without being identical. This distinction between freedmen and metics is seen also in the Old Oligarch, who complains that it is illegal in Athens to strike "a slave, a metic (*metoikos*), or a freedman (*apeleutheros*)" (*Ath. Pol.* 1.10). Ultimately, I demonstrate that the term *khôris oikôn* well fits the freed slave in Athens, who shared many of the privileges and liabilities of the metic but occupied his own distinct legal and social status (Zelnick-Abramovitz 2005; cf. Whitehead 1977): he was forever conceptualized as a (former) slave, living apart from his (former) master.