

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

WHEN DID PLATAEA JOIN ATHENS?

Our knowledge of the history of late sixth-century Greece is quite imperfect. Athens is best represented in the sources, but even in her case the picture is incomplete and must be filled out by conjectures supported where possible by the skillful interpretation of circumstantial evidence. The question of establishing a date for the first joining of Plataea to Athens would be a prime example of this sort of problem circumstantially argued were it not for the complication that the event seems to be precisely dated by Thucydides. Complication is indeed the word, because it has long been recognized that Thucydides' date is difficult to harmonize with the circumstantial evidence.

In 3. 68. 5 Thucydides informs us that Plataea was destroyed by the Spartans ἔτει τρίτῳ καὶ ἑνενηκοστῷ ἐπειδὴ Ἀθηναίων ξύμμαχοι [i.e., οἱ Πλαταιῆς] ἐγένοντο. Since Plataea was destroyed in 427, the beginning of the alliance appears fixed at 519. A record of the Plataean move to join Athens is found in Herodotus 6. 108. Here the Plataeans approach king Cleomenes, who is presumably nearby on unspecified business, and "offer themselves" to him. He rejects them, however, advising them to turn to Athens, which they do. In Athens the Plataean ambassadors place themselves on the altar of the twelve gods. The Athenians accept the embassy and, as Herodotus puts it, the Plataeans "gave themselves to the Athenians" (ἐδεδώκεσαν σφέας αὐτοὺς τοῖσι Ἀθηναίοισι). Since we may be reasonably confident that Cleomenes was indeed a reigning king of Sparta by ca. 516,¹ a casual glance reveals no reason to divorce the events described in Herodotus from the date implicit in Thucydides' text.

R. J. Buck's attempt to fit the approach of the Plataeans to Athens into the context of the building of the Boeotian League is not unreasonable. He suggests that an alliance between Orchomenus and Thessaly associated with Theban military aggression against Orchomenus is best dated (without using Thucydides 3. 68. 5) to ca. 520. If that is so, the Plataeans might well have become concerned for their own future in the 520s.² Nevertheless, doubts about the reliability of the Thucydidean date have long been in circulation. Cleomenes' presence in central Greece at that time is not confirmed elsewhere and, modern speculations notwithstanding, lacks motivation. If the Plataeans did approach Athens in 519, it was an Athens still controlled by Hippias and the Peisistratids. Hippias' support through the 520s had been seriously eroded in all parts of Greece, as R. Sealey has shown.³

1. W. G. Forrest, *A History of Sparta 950–192 B.C.* (London, 1968), p. 85; G. L. Huxley, *Early Sparta* (London, 1962), p. 77; P. Cartledge, *Sparta and Lakonia, A Regional History 1300–362 B.C.* (London, Boston, and Henley, 1979), pp. 144–45, accepts the date implicit in Thucydides' text and gives a succinct statement of the generally accepted reconstruction of Spartan history that certainly seems to follow, if that date is correct. The chronology of this period is so imprecise that accuracy to within three years is often a major accomplishment.

2. *A History of Boeotia* (Edmonton, 1979), pp. 107–17.

3. *A History of the Greek City States ca. 700–338 B.C.* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1976), pp. 144–45.

Permission to reprint a note in this section may be obtained only from the author.

Why then did he choose to alienate his Theban allies by accepting Plataea? The pursuit of harmonious relations with neighbors in central Greece, the Aegean islands, and the Thracian Chersonese had been Peisistratid policy of long duration: 519 was not the time to risk a departure from it. The Peisistratids were generally unwilling to see the citizens regularly under arms. Consequently, they avoided border disputes and petty militarism, tending to rely in military crises on foreign mercenaries who might take time arriving with aid.⁴ Again, from the Spartan point of view an anti-Peisistratid move in 519 is uncomfortably early. Relations then between the Peisistratids and Sparta are characterized by Herodotus as excellent. A change in attitude took place in about 514–513 when the Alcmeonids corrupted the Delphic oracle.⁵ In this connection, the comment about the Athenians attributed to Cleomenes when he rebuffed the Plataeans might be noted: they are "... neighbors [to you] and can be relied on for support" (πλησιοχώροισι τε ἀνδράσι καὶ τιμωρῆειν ἐοῦσι οὐ κακοῖσι). Set back in 519, or even in the turmoil of 509 (the popular alternative), this comment is an anachronism. It becomes true of Athens only in 506 and after.⁶

Part of the problem is the way in which Herodotus records the approach made by the Plataeans to Athens. It is included as a digression to explain the arrival of the Plataeans in full force to oppose the Persians at Marathon. There, in Book 6, the story is removed from its true chronological context. If Cleomenes is in the vicinity of Plataea, we must guess the reason; some Corinthians "happen by" to act as arbiters, but we are not told what they are doing there. Much earlier, in Book 5, three intrusions by Cleomenes into Attica datable to between ca. 510 and ca. 506 are recorded, one to depose Hippias, and two in support of Isagoras.⁷ Were it not for Thucydides 3. 68. 5, the temptation to associate the Plataean approach related in Book 6 with one or another of the visits of Cleomenes narrated in Book 5 would be well-nigh irresistible.

The most popular date after 519 is 509, produced by the simple emendation of Thucydides' text from ἐνενηκοστῷ to ὀγδοηκοστῷ. It closely (but not precisely) coincides with one or another intrusion of Cleomenes into Attica, when he came to install Isagoras for the first time (ca. 508), or expel Hippias (511/10). Major difficulties with this solution include the fact that ἐνενηκοστῷ does not look to be an easy corruption of ὀγδοηκοστῷ; the Athens of 509/8 cannot have seemed a stable ally to anyone; nor was she in a position to confront Thebes in a border dispute.⁸

4. Forcefully shown by A. French, "A Note on Thucydides iii 68.5," *JHS* 80 (1960): 191. See also G. Grote, *A History of Greece*², vol. 3 (London, 1907), pp. 383–86.

5. Herodotus says that Sparta and the Peisistratids enjoyed excellent relations that were interrupted only by the corruption of the oracle (5. 63). However, when Cleomenes advised the Plataeans to go over to Athens, he did it seeking to embroil Athens with Thebes (6. 108. 3), hardly a pursuit of good relations.

6. E. Kirsten, s.v. "Plataiai," *RE* 40 (1950): 2284–86 and particularly 2285, makes the point that Athens was not in a position to be making contentious alliances in the political turmoil of 509, a fatal objection to that date in my estimation.

7. Herodotus 5. 63–79. Another expedition (the first) was sent (by Cleomenes?) with Anchimolius in command of a fleet (Hdt. 5. 63. 2). Whether or not it was the will of heaven (as expressed through Delphi) that there be strong Spartan influence in the region of Attica and the isthmus, the Spartans, especially Cleomenes, seem to have found no objections to the idea.

8. See note 6, above. The emendation to ὀγδοηκοστῷ is noted and briefly discussed by A. W. Gomme, *HCT* 2: 358. Gomme's comment, "... there is no good evidence against 519 . . .," is refuted by French, "A Note on Thucydides."

It might be worthwhile to try the bold step of disregarding Thucydides for the moment to permit consideration of ca. 506. To this year belongs the first attested border dispute between Thebes and Athens. Cleomenes invades Attica in force, bringing Peloponnesian allies, including Corinthians, who do not know where they are being led until they come to Eleusis. Cleomenes' plan calls for simultaneous operations by the Boeotians and Chalcidians. The Theban move is to capture from Athens Hysiae and Oenoe, near neighbors of Plataea, but no mention is made of operations against Plataea herself (Hdt. 5. 74. 2).⁹ This is noteworthy because, in later days, the Thebans always saw Plataea as the key to the region and moved directly against her. We must not force an argument *ex silentio*; but still, let us note that there is nothing that obliges us to assume that Plataea was with Athens by the beginning of 506, and the easiest explanation of Herodotus' silence is that she was still at least nominally with Thebes.

If we wish to date the affiliation of Plataea with Athens to the year 506, we are forced to consider in detail whether the events in Herodotus 6. 108 can be successfully harmonized with the narrative of 5. 74–80 to produce a believable sequence. It was suggested above that Plataea was at least nominally with Thebes when the Boeotian army took Oenoe and Hysiae (Hdt. 5. 74). The presence of the Boeotian army passing by or through their territory and, no doubt, demanding support might well have prompted the Plataeans to consider (or reconsider) their relationship to Thebes. By this time, the Peloponnesians must have been at or near Eleusis, for the Athenian army at Eleusis encounters the Peloponnesians but not the Boeotians (5. 74), who were marching through Oenoe (or toward Oenoe, depending on the exact sequence of events), about sixteen kilometers from Eleusis; so the Plataean ambassadors will not have needed to travel far before coming into contact with Cleomenes. Cleomenes' advance, however, was halted by Corinthian protests as soon as he arrived at Eleusis, and the dissolution of his army must have become immediately apparent to the Athenians, for their position at Eleusis, with the Boeotians advancing on their flank from Oenoe, would not be tenable for long. As for the Boeotians, they must have heard of the loss of cohesion of the Peloponnesian force while they were at Oenoe and withdrawn. Otherwise, the failure of the invading forces to link up after being within a few

9. Herodotus (5. 74) describes Hysiae and Oenoe as δῆμους τοῦς ἐσχάτους τῆς Ἀττικῆς. Thucydides (2. 18) makes Oenoe a fort ἐν μεθορίοις τῆς Ἀττικῆς καὶ Βοιωτίας. Oenoe was a deme of Attica in the Cleisthenic constitution (J. S. Trail, *The Political Organization of Attica* [Princeton, 1975], table 8 and maps); Hysiae was not. In fact, the exact location of Hysiae is uncertain. W. K. Pritchett, "New Light on Plataia," *AJA* 61 (1957): 9–28 and "Plataia Revisited," *Studies in Ancient Greek Topography*, part I (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1965), pp. 103–6, rightly places it somewhere between Plataea and Erythrae. Locating Hysiae slightly above Plataea on the Pantanassa ridge (Thuc. 3. 24. 2), Pritchett ("New Light," p. 22) argues that it would have made a logical extreme outpost of Attica in the late sixth century, a judgment he did not change substantially in his later study. This view puts Plataea (lower down and in the plain, as its name implies) in Boeotia. One is forced to wonder why Hysiae and Oenoe are mentioned by Herodotus and Eleutherae and Erythrae are not, since both communities are important sites along the way from the region of Plataea and Hysiae to Oenoe. We might suggest that the places mentioned by Herodotus mark the two extremities of Attic territory taken by the Boeotians, Hysiae being the point of entry and Oenoe where they stopped. Indeed, if they had gone much beyond Oenoe, the Athenian army that went out to face the Peloponnesians at Eleusis (Hdt. 5. 74. 2) would have encountered the Boeotians as well.

On the date 506, it should be noted that the appearance of precision is illusory. It is a guess. Hereinafter, by "506" we simply mean the year Athens first became internationally active upon the completion (or near completion) of the substance of Cleisthenes' reforms, i.e., ca. 506.

kilometers of each other is inexplicable. They went to the Euripus, no doubt looking for the Chalcidians, where they were overtaken and defeated by the pursuing Athenians (Hdt. 5. 77). Now, if all the Peloponnesian contingents, including Demaratus, marched immediately for home, then the Plataean request for an alliance with an abandoned Cleomenes would seem anomalous, to be sure, nor would there be Corinthians nearby to act as arbiters. However, there is nothing in Herodotus 5. 75 that forces us to believe that any Peloponnesian contingent made straight for home. The Corinthians are described as leaving their battle station (5. 75. 3 τάξις) and “setting off” (ἀπαλλάσσοντο), but we are not told whether they went. Demaratus and Cleomenes “fell out” (οὐκ ὁμολογέοντας), but there is no reason to assume that either immediately left for home. Nor is a prompt departure likely. The army will want a day or two to rest before commencing the long return march, and Cleomenes was too determined a man to give up so easily. With the possibility of prosecution or, at least, a political backlash organized predictably by Demaratus to be faced when he got home, his only hope for defense would come through salvaging as much as possible from the ruins of his crumbling situation in the field. That he would have gone home while there remained any hope that Athens might be worsted either by Chalcis or Boeotia seems to me unthinkable. If he stayed, there seems no reason to deny the possibility that the Corinthians (or, at least, some of them) would have elected to stay and watch him and even intervene if he tried to do anything daring with whatever remained to him of his Peloponnesian army. However, after the victories of the Athenians over the Boeotians and Chalcidians in a single day, his usefulness as an ally must have diminished considerably in the eyes of the Plataeans, and Athens must have looked far more attractive than ever before to them. The subsequent approach to Athens by Plataea, the acceptance of the offer by Athens, and the ensuing military confrontations, first between Plataea and Thebes, and then, when Athens lent aid, between herself and Thebes, could all have taken place easily within the space of a few days. The distances traveled are very short and the necessary decisions made first by Plataea (to redirect the application from Sparta to Athens), then by Athens (to accept the offer), were likely made with little or no hesitation. It would perhaps seem surprising to see the Thebans take the field again (6. 108. 4) so shortly after the defeat at the Euripus recorded in 5. 77. 2 (οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι καὶ πολλῶ ἐκράτησαν, κάρτα δὲ πολλοὺς φονεύσαντες ἑπτακοσίους αὐτῶν ἐζώγησαν). On the other hand, the Thebans came out against Plataea, not Athens (Hdt. 6. 108. 4), and, when the Athenians were ultimately attacked, it was as they were withdrawing (6. 108. 5 ἀπιούσι: one imagines cavalry being sent against the rear of their column). In short, there seem to be no insuperable difficulties in harmonizing these two parts of Herodotus’ narrative, nor is it incredible that remnants of the Peloponnesian army were still nearby when, on the assumptions of the present argument, Athens won Plataea from Thebes in 506.¹⁰

10. We should not expect the Cleomenes described by Herodotus in 6. 73–85 to have gone home meekly as soon as his control of the army at Eleusis ran into difficulty. He seems to have been a daring man, to the point of outrage and, according to the traditions, ultimate insanity. That legal problems would be waiting for him at home seems natural. However, the statement in Herodotus 5. 75. 2 would seem to show that he survived any storms. That the Corinthians would have stayed to keep an eye on any vestigial Peloponnesian forces in the region is in keeping with their apparent policy of restricting Spartan intervention in Athenian affairs (Hdt. 5. 75. 1 and 92–93). Herodotus 5. 79–82, where the story is taken

In fact, it is possible to show that acceptance of the proposed date helps make better sense of Herodotus. Cleomenes' response to the Plataeans best fits his most likely mood after Demaratus and his allies (including the Corinthians) had abandoned him and, indeed, after the news of the outstanding success of the Athenians, first crushing the Boeotians, then crossing to Euboea and defeating the Chalcidians all in one day, had been reported to him. Suddenly it must have become clear to Cleomenes that he would not be able to establish an abiding Spartan presence in the region, and that the Athens he had helped to create might be in danger of becoming something of a monster. Hence his defeatist response (6. 108. 2–3):

"We live a great way off, and as such would be a cold comfort to you. You might be enslaved many times before any one of us heard of it. We advise you to give yourselves to the Athenians, men who are your neighbors και τιμωρέειν ἑοῦσι οὐ κακοῖσι." The Spartans gave this advice not out of good will to the Plataeans so much as from a desire to see the Athenians embroiled with the Boeotians.

If the Corinthians who had come with Cleomenes had not gone home straightway, but remained to watch Cleomenes and observe the progress of the ensuing dispute, it would be they who παρατυχόντες, as Herodotus says, offered their services as arbiters. Here is Herodotus' description of events after Plataea, on Cleomenes' advice, went over to Athens (6. 108. 4–5):

The Thebans heard about it and marched on Plataea. The Athenians came to their aid, but as they were about to join battle the Corinthians did not permit it. Being near by chance, they separated the forces, and when both sides turned it over to arbitration they divided the region as follows: "The Thebans are to leave alone those Boeotians who do not wish to be enrolled amongst the Boeotians."

In 506, the award is understandable as expressed, for all parties must have understood that, with Plataea in the Athenian camp, Hysiae would certainly be lost to Thebes as well. Corinth's pro-Athenian award should surprise no one, for this was the period of Corinthian-Aeginetan hostility and growing friendship between Thebes and Aegina. Athens and Aegina were embarking on the "Unheralded War" at about this time, and Corinth was cultivating Athenian strength to offset Aegina in the Saronic Gulf. Probably in 505 the alliance between Thebes and Aegina was concluded, but Corinth had already forestalled its effectiveness by helping Plataea into the Athenian camp. With a hostile Plataea blocking the main pass over Cithaeron, the new allies would have difficulty joining forces.¹¹

up from the Theban point of view after the defeat at the Euripus (5. 79. 1 μετὰ ταῦτα), deserves discussion. Hostilities against Athens are resumed only after a consultation with Delphi and the transfer of the Aeacidæ from Aegina to Thebes. The resumption of hostilities by Thebes (5. 81. 1) proved disastrous again for them. If this resumption of hostilities were to be identified with the struggle for Plataea, then we would have to allow for a very long delay. The Thebans must communicate with Delphi and then negotiate the transfer of the Aeacidæ. We cannot keep the Corinthians and Cleomenes in the area of Eleusis for the length of time needed for those activities. Fortunately, the evidence is against such an identification. Herodotus 5. 81. 1 refers to an attempt by Thebes to get revenge on Athens for the defeat at the Euripus, while 6. 108. 4 is a move against Plataea thwarted by prompt action from Athens (Θηβαῖοι . . . ἐστράτευον ἐπὶ τοὺς Πλαταιᾶς: Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ σφί ἐβοήθηον).

11. For a recent study of the outbreak of the "Unheralded War" and an attempt to sort out some of its chronological problems, see R. J. Buck, "Epidaurians, Aeginetans and Athenians," in G. S. Shrimpton and D. J. McCargar, eds., *Classical Contributions: Studies in Honour of Malcolm Francis McGregor* (New York, 1981), pp. 5–13.

To return to Thucydides, our information from 3. 68. 5 is that 427 was the ninety-third year since the Plataeans became allies (ξύμμαχοι) of the Athenians. The word ξύμμαχοι itself raises a question, because it is not clear that Herodotus thought of the initial relationship between Athens and Plataea as a formal alliance. He never uses the term συμμαχία or any of its cognates in the context of this relationship. He says that the Plataeans “gave themselves” to Athens, an expression that might be taken to imply the surrender of territory and independence more than the negotiation of an alliance. In addition, he uses only the vaguer βοηθῶντες when he describes their cooperation at Marathon.¹² When other sources are consulted, it becomes clear that later traditions did not think of the initial relationship as a formal alliance between two independent states. Plutarch believed that the battle of Plataea was fought on Attic soil, something that would be possible only if the Asopus, the ultimate “boundary between the Thebans and Plataea and Hysiae” of Herodotus 6. 108. 6, is identified with the Attic-Theban border.¹³ Did the Plataeans hope for enrollment as a deme of Attica? Taking certain statements of Thucydides at face value, we might conclude that they possessed Athenian citizenship for a while. He speaks of them as having had a share in the Athenian πολιτεία, and in another place he refers to them as sometime πολῖται of Athens.¹⁴ Nevertheless, it is clear that a formal alliance existed between the two states when Archidamus invaded Plataea in 429.¹⁵

The evidence is puzzling. It is difficult to believe that the Plataeans were at once σύμμαχοι and πολῖται of Athens. If they were σύμμαχοι in 429, then they must have been πολῖται at an earlier date and the relationship must have changed at some time, for Thucydides characteristically uses the word ξύμμαχος of an

12. Herodotus 6. 108. Βοηθῶ can be used of citizens supporting their own country in war: 1. 30. 5, 2. 141. 2, 3. 58. 4, 6. 77. 1.

13. Plut. *Aristid.* 11. The story in *Aristid.* 11. 8 that the Plataeans voted to remove their boundaries on the Athenian side on the eve of the battle in 479 deserves attention, for it seems implicit in Herodotus 6. 108 that Plataea had been an Athenian possession for decades by 479. As is argued below, Herodotus' story that the Plataeans “gave themselves” to Athens suggests the turning over of γῆ and πόλις, not the negotiation of an alliance. Therefore, the need to remove the Attic-Plataean border seems otiose. On the other hand, there would seem to be no great difficulty in assuming that Plataea would keep her boundaries like any Attic deme. Plutarch's story may be a chronological mistake, then, or, more likely, the record of an attempt to remove all doubt that the battle would be fought on Attic soil. Finally, if Plataea had really been an independent ally and not a possession of Athens before 479, the story in Plutarch, if true, is of an uncomfortably artificial gesture.

14. Thuc. 3. 55. 3 προσηγάγετο συμμάχους καὶ πολιτείας μετέλαβεν (of a hypothetical Plataean); the order cannot be chronological. This passage, and the later use of πολῖται (3. 63. 1–2) to describe the Plataean relationship to Athens, has provoked comment. G. Busolt, *Griechische Geschichte bis zur Schlacht bei Chaeroneia*, vol. 3 (Gotha, 1904), pp. 1038–40 (note), regarded πολῖται as an anachronistic mistake by Thucydides. Gomme (*HCT* 2: 340) rejected Busolt's notion, citing the parallel of the Samians (becoming simultaneously citizens and allies of Athens) in 405 (*IG* 2².1 = *ML* 94). However, Athens' situation after Aegospotami in 405 is not to be compared with that of 427 and before, nor are there many similarities between her relationship to Samos and that with Plataea. Experiments with isopolity were rare in the fifth century and, generally, not spearheaded by Athens. Her desperate acts in 405 are not typical of the period and can tell us nothing of what could have been constitutionally feasible a full century before. On balance, Busolt seems more compelling than Gomme. Either Thucydides is in error, or we must explain the Thucydidean terms along the lines suggested in the present argument. From the point of view of Plataea and her neighbors, the sweeping reforms of Cleisthenes might well have raised the hope of gaining citizenship or, at least, some status in the Athenian state. It is of interest to note Pausanias 1. 38. 8, where we are told that Eleutherae joined the Athenians in the hope of gaining a share of their πολιτεία. Buck, *A History of Boeotia*, p. 113, believes that Plataea and Eleutherae joined Athens at about the same time.

15. Thuc. 2. 73. 3 ἀφ' οὗ ξύμμαχοι ἐγενόμεθα . . . μηδὲν νεωτερίζειν περὶ τὴν ξυμμαχίαν.

autonomous ally.¹⁶ In his account of Archidamus' initial intrusion into Plataean territory, Thucydides makes the Plataeans tell the story of their recovery of independence. It had been restored and sworn to by the Hellenic allies on the prompting of Pausanias, the Spartan regent, after the defeat of the Persians in 479.¹⁷ The language of the Plataeans as ascribed to them by Thucydides deserves attention. Pausanias restored their territory (γῆ) and "their own city to have and manage with autonomy" (πόλιν τὴν σφετέραν ἔχοντας αὐτονόμους οἰκεῖν). Γῆ and πόλις are not necessarily synonymous terms. The Athenians had lost their land and homes (γῆ) in the days before the battle of Salamis. Accordingly, Adeimantus, the Corinthian, tries to disenfranchise Themistocles in the allied camp on the grounds that he is a man without a city (Hdt. 8. 61 οὐκ ἔῶν ἐπιψηφίζειν ἀπόλι ἀνδρί). Themistocles' response silences Adeimantus. The two hundred ships of the Athenians are πόλις (something to regulate for themselves) and γῆ (territory to call home and for which to fight). The Plataeans at Salamis had lost their territory, too, but the Persian invasion no more deprived them of their πόλις than it did the Athenians of theirs. More emphatically, the Plataeans had joined in the reoccupation and successful defense of their own homeland by fighting in the battle of 479 (Hdt. 9. 28. 6). Therefore, we conclude either that Thucydides' expression in 2. 71. 2 ignores the distinction made in Herodotus 8. 61 and the fact that the Plataeans participated in the battle of Plataea (making the Greek army guests on Plataean soil) or else that an occasion other than the Persian war for the Plataeans' losing or surrendering "their city to have and manage with autonomy" (i.e., their πολιτεία) must be found. With their city restored, the Plataeans were free to make a formal alliance with whomsoever they would. That they chose Athens is clear from Thucydides (2. 73). So the alliance belongs to the period between 479 and 427; but what was the relationship between Athens and Plataea before 479?

It is to this period, whose starting point is still in dispute, that we must date the Plataeans' involvement in the πολιτεία of Athens mentioned by Thucydides. But were they πολῖται in the fullest sense of the word? It is probable that the arguments of J. A. Notopoulos take us as far as the evidence permits. Using scattered clues, largely in Pausanias, he constructs a picture of the status of a number of slaves who were buried separately from the fallen Athenian citizens at Marathon, but with the Plataean dead. The main conclusions reached by Notopoulos are "(1) the tomb of the slaves was separate from that of the Athenians, whose names were inscribed on stelae according to tribes; (2) slaves were used by the Athenians at Marathon for the first time; (3) the slaves were enfranchised before the battle." However, the enfranchisement was not quite complete, for the enrollment into phratries would take place in Πυανοψιών, the month after the battle (Βοηδρομιών). "The emancipated slaves" would thus be "*de facto* but not *de jure* citizens

16. In 3. 38. 1 the subject states of the empire are called allies by Cleon, but this is ironic (HCT 2: 303). Gomme (HCT 3: 634) suggests that ξυμμάχους could mean "friends" in 5. 4. 5, but even there "autonomous allies" seems equally possible. See also n. 14, above.

17. Thuc. 2. 71. 2 Παισανίας . . . ἐυκαλέσας πάντας τοὺς ξυμμάχους ἀπέδιδου Πλαταιεῦσι γῆν καὶ πόλιν τὴν σφετέραν ἔχοντας αὐτονόμους οἰκεῖν; 2. 71. 4 λέγομεν ὑμῖν γῆν τὴν Πλαταιίδα μὴ ἀδικεῖν μηδὲ παραβαίνειν τοὺς ὄρκους, ἔαν δὲ οἰκεῖν αὐτονόμους καθάπερ Παισανίας ἐδικαίωσεν.

at the time of the battle."¹⁸ What are we to conclude about the status of the Plataeans at Marathon whose fallen were apparently buried with *de facto* but not *de jure* citizens? N. G. L. Hammond, after considering much of this evidence, suggests that there existed a form of restricted isopolity between the two states,¹⁹ but there seems little reason to assume that an essentially fourth-century political arrangement was in existence in the late sixth century, even in modified form.

The relationship in question began when the Plataeans "gave themselves" to the Athenians. Did they give themselves as ἄνθρωποι, πολῖται, or σύμμαχοι? Not ἄνθρωποι, for that would have made them slaves. If as σύμμαχοι, then Herodotus' language is strange, perhaps anachronistic. A small state offering itself as an ally to Athens at the height of her imperial power might be described as giving itself to Athens and her empire. But, if the language is not anachronistic, we must assume that they "gave themselves" as πολῖται. To understand the implications of that assumption in terms of the political terminology of the period we should refer back to the exchange between Themistocles and Adeimantus reported by Herodotus (Hdt. 8. 61; see p. 301, above). In order to show that he is not an ἄπολις ἄνηρ (in other words, that he is in fact a πολίτης), Themistocles claims to have γῆ and πόλις thanks to the presence of the Athenian fleet. In the straightforward thinking of the age reflected by Adeimantus' attack on Themistocles, only a πολίτης can vote, and, to be a πολίτης, a man must have a πόλις. In turn the πόλις must exist somewhere—it must have γῆ (territory). Therefore, to the extent that the Plataeans, acting as an entire citizen body, "gave themselves" as πολῖται to the Athenians, we must understand that they were surrendering their γῆ and πόλις to that same extent. This is why Pausanias had to restore to them γῆ and πόλις after the battle of Plataea.²⁰ There is no need to assume that the Athenians, in the euphoria of victory, would have taken the loss of territory as an affront. There would be no reason to doubt that Plataea would stay with them as an ally. What, then, would have been the status of the Plataeans in the Athenian state before 479? Perhaps it was essentially that of metics; or were they an experiment in developing *perioikoi* for Athens along Peloponnesian lines? If so, the experiment seems to have borne no fruit. In any event, there seems to be a number of widely scattered clues which all suggest a period of probably limited involvement in the Athenian state by Plataeans before 479. To designate them σύμμαχοι before 479, as Thucydides (3. 68. 5) clearly does, seems awkward to say the least, if not quite wrong. The formal alliance began in or after 479, when Plataea's independence was restored. So 427 could be the fifty-third but not the ninety-third year of the alliance.

18. "The Slaves at the Battle of Marathon," *AJP* 62 (1941): 352–54; also A. E. Raubitschek, "Two Notes on Athenian Epigrams," *Hesperia* 14 (1945): 368.

19. *A History of Greece to 322 B.C.* (Oxford, 1959), pp. 191–92.

20. There is no argument to be built from Thucydides' use of αὐτονομίους in 2. 71. 2. The meaning of αὐτονομία has been clarified in studies by E. J. Bickerman, "Autonomia. Sur un passage de Thucydide (1, 144, 2)," *RIDA* 5 (1958): 313–43, and M. Ostwald, *Autonomia: Its Genesis and Early History*, APA Monographs, no. 11 (Chico, Cal., 1982). Whatever the words actually used by Pausanias when he restored γῆ and πόλις to the Plataeans, Ostwald's general conclusion on the status given Plataea seems unavoidable: "... it is not likely that the city where the liberation [i.e., of Greece] was to be commemorated by the worship of Zeus Eleutherios, should at the same time have been guaranteed a status other than that of the full enjoyment of the ἐλευθερία which she had won along with the other members of the Hellenic League" (p. 22).

In summation, the early relationship of Plataea with Athens can be reconstructed most successfully, I think, if Thucydides 3. 68. 5 is ignored, at least at first. From ca. 520 the Thebans may well have been actively building the Boeotian League, but the known activity is in the northwest against Orchomenus in alliance with Thessaly. Hysiae and Oenoe were already with Athens, in all probability, but Plataea was Boeotian or uncommitted. The Plataean approach to Athens cannot be conveniently dated to the Peisistratid period, nor is it likely to have happened or succeeded during the turmoil that followed the expulsion of the tyrants. In 507–506, however, Spartan hopes of controlling the region had faded and the Athenians were reorganizing their state under Cleisthenes. The new deme-structure of the tribes and enrolling of citizens along the Boeotian border is likely to have brought Athens into conflict with Thebes, herself seeking to build her Boeotian League. It is in this context, and in the light of the Athenian military successes of 506, that the Plataean move to Athens finds its most convenient place.

If we may trust the tradition that the fallen Plataeans were buried with manumitted slaves at Marathon, then their status in the Athenian state resembled that of metics, free and protected but not full citizens. The word for this relationship might be συμπολιτεία, not συμμαχία in the strict sense. In 479, however, the Spartans restored to the Plataeans their state and guaranteed their independence. If the Plataeans allied themselves to Athens immediately, as might well be expected, then 427 was the fifty-third (τρίτῳ καὶ πεντηκοστῷ) not ninety-third (ἐνενηκοστῷ) year since the Plataeans became formal allies of the Athenians. The emendation to Thucydides' text that suggests itself looks easy, almost natural.²¹

If that reading seems attractive on historical grounds, we might conclude by noting its literary appeal. Thucydides concludes his account of the Melian affair, featuring the famous protracted debate, with a brief, almost casual-sounding statement recording the brutal fate of the Melians. At the end of a list of sundry events of the winter of 416/15 we find the note: "They killed all the grown men of the Melians whom they had captured and sold the women and children into slavery. The territory they occupied themselves, later sending out five hundred settlers" (Thuc. 5. 116. 4). It seems to me that the proposed emendation produces a statement similar to the pithy comments about the fate of Melos. After the grim description of the slaughter of the captured Plataeans by the Spartans, a curt reminder of the alliance that had been made possible by a guarantee of autonomy given and sworn to by Sparta seems very much to the point.²²

GORDON S. SHRIMPTON
University of Victoria

21. Something is wrong with Thuc. 3. 68. 5 if the argument advanced above is acceptable. The choice is between ξύμμαχοι or ἐνενηκοστῷ. Either could be a mistake; in addition, the number might easily be a corruption. Admittedly, ν (fifty) will not become ς (ninety) very readily, but confusion of ἐνενη- with πεντη- looks easy in majuscule, or minuscule. We might suggest that the accidental omission of the first τ or the gemination of εν could easily lead to the corruption. An uncertain copyist who knew a little history would want to restore a number that made the alliance extend to before 490, the date of Plataean and Athenian cooperation at Marathon. Indeed, learned copyists who might still be ignorant of the special circumstances argued for in this essay would find πεντηκοστῷ very suspicious indeed.

22. A detailed response to J. Wells, "Some Points as to the Reign of Cleomenes I," *JHS* 25 (1905): 193–203 seems unnecessary. Furthermore, since the main thrust of my argument has been to demonstrate the circumstantial case in favor of 506 and to suggest that there is something amiss with Thuc. 3. 68. 5,

there seems to be no good reason to reopen the question of the date of the altar of the twelve gods: see, e.g., N. G. L. Hammond, "Studies in Greek Chronology of the Sixth and Fifth Centuries B.C.," *Historia* 4 (1955): 393. I should like to thank K. R. Bradley and M. F. McGregor for commenting on versions of this paper. The substance of it was read to the Classical Association of Canada in June 1982. It is a pleasure to acknowledge the searching criticisms of my anonymous readers, which resulted in a number of improvements to my argument.

A NOTE ON *AENEID* 1. 613

The first book of the *Aeneid* is carefully constructed to introduce the reader to the crucial issues and the most significant characters of Virgil's epic. In particular, this book points to Dido. The reader's apprehensions of her eventual disaster will lead him to attach special significance to Dido's first sight of Aeneas (*Aen.* 1. 613–14):

obstupuit primo aspectu Sidonia Dido
casu deinde uiri tanto.

The passage, of course, has a precedent in the *Odyssey*, but another model, not noted by commentators, is important here. In the third book of the *Argonautica* Apollonius describes the meeting of Jason and Medea. The hero approaches the palace of Aeetes with his crew protected by a cloud (*Argon.* 3. 210 ff.), in a scene which is also informed throughout by reminiscences of the entrance of Odysseus into the city of the Phaeacians in the seventh book of the *Odyssey*.¹ Jason's sudden appearance has a specific precedent in the emergence of Odysseus from his sheltering cloud and the stunned silence of the Phaeacians (*Od.* 7. 144–45):

οἱ δ' ἄνεφ' ἐγένοντο δόμον κατὰ φῶτα ἰδόντες,
θαύμαζον δ' ὀρόωντες.

In the *Argonautica*, after the newcomers have surveyed the palace before them, Medea comes out of her room. But Apollonius has made a significant change (3. 250–53):

Ἥρη γάρ μιν ἔρυκε δόμῳ· πρὶν δ' οὐ τι θάμιζεν
ἐν μεγάροις, Ἐκάτης δὲ πανήμερος ἀμφεπονεῖτο
νηόν, ἐπεὶ ῥα θεῆς αὐτὴ πέλεν ἀρήτειρα.
καὶ σφεας ὥς ἴδεν ἄσσον, ἀνίαχεν.

Medea's sudden, involuntary cry, caused by the sight of Jason, is the first sign of her passion.² This scene serves as a bridge to, and a justification for, the intervention of the god Eros which soon follows (3. 281–84):

αὐτῷ δ' ὑπὸ βαιῶς ἔλυσθεις
Αἰσονίδῃ γλυφίδας μέσση ἐνικάτθετο νευρῇ,
ἰθὺς δ' ἀμφοτέρησι διασχόμενος παλάμῃσιν
ἦκ' ἐπὶ Μηδείῃ· τὴν δ' ἀμφασίῃ λάβε θυμόν.

1. See, conveniently, F. Vian, *Apollonius de Rhodes: "Argonautiques,"* Chant III (Paris, 1980), pp. 118–19, in his notes on *Argon.* 3. 214, 217, 218, 219.

2. Thus Vian, *"Argonautiques,"* p. 39.