

### Where was Simplicius?

In *Simplicius: sa vie, son oeuvre, sa survie* (Berlin 1987, reviewed in *JHS* cx [1990] 244-45), the editor, Mme I. Hadot, in the first part of the biographical introduction, cites Agathias *Hist.* ii 31, 4. This is usually taken to show that the Neoplatonists, who had fled to the Persian court when Justinian closed down the Academy in 529, went back to Athens after 532. That view, she holds, rests on a misreading of the text (...δεῖν ἐκείνους τοὺς ἀνδρας ἐς τὰ σφέτερα ἦθη κατιόντας βιοτεθεῖν ἀδεῶς τὸ λοιπὸν ἐφ' ἑαυτοῖς...). However, she herself misconstrues ἐφ' ἑαυτοῖς as 'selon leur choix': that is, on returning from exile to their own accustomed places, these men should henceforth live without fear as they might choose. To yield that version, the Greek would have to be καθ' ἑαυτοῦς. The actual expression means 'amongst themselves': they might philosophise, but not in public. That a touch of private heterodoxy amongst the learned few is harmless if it does not stir up the ignorant many was well understood, indeed explicitly so later, in Islam and mediaeval Christianity.

Where, then, did the returned exiles settle? We do not know. That the Persian king sought to ensure protection for them in their previous habitat neither shows nor refutes that they went back there, or to any other nameable place.

Mme Hadot certainly cannot well enlist M. Tardieu's inference, in the second part of the introduction, from Simplicius on the four calendars (*Comm. in Arist. Graeca* x 875, 19-22). Simplicius there states that 'we <humans> posit the beginning of the year' (ὅς δὲ ἡμεῖς ποιοῦμεθα ἀρχὰς ἐνιαυτοῦ) to fall at four times, namely the summer solstice, as at Athens, the autumnal equinox, as in the then province of Asia, the winter solstice, as with the Romans, or the vernal equinox, as with the Arabs and Damascenes.

In context, Simplicius here contrasts beginnings that are natural (φύσει) and imposed (θέσει). Adding the sentence before and after the one on the four types of year, the passage runs thus: 'As regards time, flow or becoming, the natural beginning comes first. We ourselves put the beginning of the year at (1) or (2) or (3) or (4). Likewise, those who say that a month begins at full-moon or new-moon, will be imposing this'. The passage figures in his comments on *Arist. Ph.* 226b34-227a10, on consecutiveness.

Simplicius never says that all four types of year were in use at one place, nor does his text imply it. Of the two solstitial years, Academics would use the summer one from tradition, while the winter one is Roman imperial. The equinoctial years were used in the areas stated.

If the equinoctial and Roman calendars existed together in some place where the Neoplatonists did settle, then in that place there must have been four calendars. Clearly, though, the reverse inference is invalid: that the four calendars co-existed does not prove the presence of Neoplatonists. The Athenian calendar may have existed there for other reasons: its being there is necessary, but not sufficient, for the Neoplatonists' presence.

As to Harran (Carrhae), which Tardieu argues is where Simplicius settled, Arab sources confirm that the

equinoctial calendars and the Roman one did exist there. We have no independent evidence that the Athenian one did. We have only Simplicius's statement, if he was at Harran. That, however, is precisely what must be established. To cite the four-calendar passage as proof that he was, begs the question and ignores the context.

Where Simplicius wrote his commentaries thus remains unclear, for lack of evidence.

PAUL FOULKES

24 Granville Park  
London SE13 7EA

### Plataea's relations with Thebes, Sparta and Athens

Plataea was an ancient city of 'Boiotoi' (*Iliad* ii 494 and 504; cf. *Thuc.* iii 61.2). Throughout its chequered history the citizens were always described as 'Boiotoi' (e.g. *Thuc.* iii 54.3; *Isoc. Panath.* 93; [D.] lix 95; *Arr. An.* i 8.8; *Paus.* i 15.3). The citizens were 'the Plataeans', whether they were in possession of their city or not. They figured as Πλαταιες on the serpent column of 479/8 (M-L 27,7), as Πλαταιης in the list of Athens' allies in 431 (*Thuc.* ii 9.4), and as Πλαταιης ψιλοῖ fighting alongside Athenians in 424 BC when their city was in enemy hands (*Thuc.* iv 67.2 and 5). Although the majority of the Plataeans lived as refugees in Attica between 428 and 382, and again from 373 to 338, they continued to be 'Plataeans' and were never described in our sources as Athenians. The ability of the Plataeans to survive as a refugee community was paralleled, for example, by the ability of the Aeginetan refugees between 431 and 405 and the Samian refugees between 366 and 322 (*Diod.* xviii 18.9) to survive and ultimately to reoccupy their homeland. It was as such a community that 'the Plataeans' were brought back 'from Athens' to their ruined city in 382 (*Paus.* ix 1.4).\*

#### I. The period from c. 520 to the Battle of Plataea

The Plataeans were immediate neighbours of the Thebans. Indeed their cities were only eight miles apart (*Thuc.* ii 5.2). Plataea and Thebes were each a long

\* This article owes a great deal to the comments of the Editor and his readers on an earlier draft. I am most grateful to them. The following special abbreviations are used: Badian = E. Badian, 'Plataea between Athens and Sparta', *Boiotika*, edd. H. Beister and J. Buckler (Munich 1989). Buck = R.J. Buck, *A history of Boeotia* (Edmonton [Alb.] 1979). Burn = A.R. Burn, *Persia and the Greeks* (London 1962). Gomme C = A.W. Gomme, *A historical commentary on Thucydides* (Oxford 1945-56). Gomme-Andrewes-Dover C = A.W. Gomme, A. Andrewes and K.J. Dover, *A historical commentary on Thucydides* (Oxford 1970). Koumanoudes = S.M. Koumanoudes, *AAA* xi (1978) 232 ff. Shrimpton = G.S. Shrimpton, 'When did Plataea join Athens?', *CP* lxxix (1984) 295 ff. *Studies* = N. G. L. Hammond, *Studies in Greek history* (Oxford 1973). Themeles = P.G. Themeles, *AD* xxix (1974) μελέται 244. Welwei = K.-W. Welwei, 'Das sog. Grab der Plataier im Vranatal bei Marathon', *Historia* xxviii (1979) 101 ff. Worthington = I. Worthington, 'Aristophanes' 'Frogs' and Arginusae', *Hermes* cxvii (1989) 359 ff. I am most grateful to Professor Badian and Dr Worthington for giving me offprints of their articles.

day's walk from Athens;<sup>1</sup> but they were several days' march from Sparta. Whereas most of the numerous Boeotian cities were members of a federal Boeotian system, Plataea stayed outside it. Around 520 Thebes, the leader of the Boeotian system, was pressing Plataea to join (Hdt. vi 108.2; Thuc. iii 55.1) and to accept her hegemony, i.e. her military command (Thuc. iii 61.2 ἡγεμονεύεσθαι). The Plataeans sought help. 'First they tried to give themselves' to Cleomenes and the Lacedaemonians, but they were advised by them 'to give themselves' to the Athenians (Hdt. vi 108.2. δοῦναι ὑμᾶς αὐτούς and ἐδίδοσαν σφέας αὐτούς). So Plataean envoys went to Athens, sat as suppliants and 'tried to give themselves' to the Athenians (vi 108.4 ἐδίδοσαν σφέας αὐτούς). Thebes then attacked Plataea, and Athens went to its defence. Thus, wrote Herodotus, 'the Plataeans gave themselves to the Athenians' (vi 108.6 ἔδοσαν σφέας αὐτούς).

In these passages Herodotus was using a colloquial term.<sup>2</sup> What it meant is clear from the relative positions of Sparta and Plataea at the time. Sparta was exercising military hegemony over a network of allies with whom she had a treaty of alliance, and she was too far away to offer more than that to Plataea. This meaning applied also in the case of Athens. Precise terms were used by Thucydides with reference to the situation in 519: Plataea asked Sparta for 'alliance' (iii 55.1 ξυμμαχία), and the Plataeans became 'allies' of Athens (ii 73.3 ξύμμαχοι ἐγενόμεθα). In 431 Plataea was 'an ally of Athens'; (ii 2.1 Ἀθηναίων ξυμμαχίδα; cf. ii 9.4). Under the treaty Athens, we may assume, exercised military hegemony whenever the two states were engaged in a joint action.

During the negotiations of 519<sup>3</sup> Corinth acted as arbitrator in the dispute. She proposed territorial frontiers on the condition that 'Thebes was to respect those Boeotians who were not willing to belong to the Boeotians' (Hdt. vi 108.5). This suited Athens but not Thebes. When the Athenians were withdrawing, they were attacked by the Boeotians (not just by the Thebans); but they defeated the Boeotians and thereupon advanced the frontier of Plataea with Thebes and also the frontier of Hysiae with Thebes to the river Asopus (Hdt. vi 108.6). Then or later Athens became an immediate neighbour of Plataea. For in 506 Hysiae and Oenoe<sup>4</sup> were described by Herodotus as 'demes' of Attica (Hdt. v 74.2), and in 479 Attica had a frontier with the Plataeis (Plu. *Arist.* 11.8, cited in the next paragraph). That frontier, as we shall see in the next paragraph, faced towards Hysiae,

<sup>1</sup> Heurtley, J.D.S. Pendlebury, T.C. Skeat and I walked from near the British School of Archaeology to Thebes via Phyle, leaving at midnight and arriving about 6 p.m.

<sup>2</sup> Commentators have sometimes expanded the literal meaning; e.g. E. S. Shuckburgh 'committed themselves to the protection of Athens'. The literal translation is better: 'offered themselves to Athens', as in Burn 178 and Shrimpton 205 and 300.

<sup>3</sup> The date which Thucydides provides has been disputed. My reasons for accepting it were stated in *Historia* iv (1955) 393 f.; so also Buck 112. Shrimpton emends the text of Thucydides to suit his own preferred date, 506; Badian 103 (n. 16) comments on recent views.

<sup>4</sup> For the location of Hysiae and Oenoe see *Studies* 444-6 with fig. 18. I do not understand the geographical aspect of Badian 104.

since the shrine of 'Eleusinian Demeter and Kore was near Hysiae'.

It was just before the Battle of Plataea that an oracle was issued by Delphi to the effect that the Athenians would defeat their enemy (the Persians), if they made sacrifice to Androcrates and other Plataean heroes and if they fought 'on their own soil in the plain of Eleusinian Demeter and Kore' (Plu. *Arist.* 11.3). In order that the Athenian position could coincide with the oracle's specification, the Plataeans voted to make a free gift to the Athenians of a piece of Plataeis, in which an ancient shrine existed of 'Eleusinian Demeter and Kore'. This was easily arranged; for the piece of land was facing the Attic frontier and its frontier-markers were simply removed. The Plataeans passed a decision to that effect (*ibid.* 11.8 ἀνελεῖν τὰ πρὸς τὴν Ἀττικὴν ὄρια τῆς Πλαταιίδος). Later the Greek troops, moving past Hysiae, took position near the precinct of Androcrates (Hdt. ix 25.3).<sup>5</sup>

The gift of that piece of the Plataeis was presumably for the duration of the campaign in the cause of Greek freedom and not in perpetuity. Even so, given the intense possessiveness which any city-state felt for its territory, the action of the Plataeans became proverbial, so much so that Alexander undertook to rebuild Plataea's walls in 331/0 in celebration of it (Plu. *Alex.* 34.2).<sup>6</sup>

It has been argued sometimes that Thucydides was mistaken in his statements that Plataea asked Sparta for 'alliance', and that Athens became the 'ally' of Plataea in 519 (iii 55.1, ii 73.3 and iii 68.5). Yet Thucydides must have known Plataeans and Athenians who were the sons of the men of 519, and there is no reason to suppose that they and he were mistaken. Another argument has been that Herodotus is to be preferred to Thucydides but with a different interpretation of what Herodotus wrote. That interpretation is that when Herodotus wrote of the Plataeans 'giving themselves' he meant that the Plataeans became the subjects or slaves of Athens and that their territory was incorporated in Attica, i.e. in 519.<sup>7</sup> But the best indication of Herodotus' meaning is the immediate context in which the phrase was used of the Plataeans trying to 'give themselves' to Cleomenes and the Lacedaemonians (vi 108.2);<sup>8</sup> for the phrase certainly did not mean the Plataeans becoming Helots or slaves and their territory being incorporated

<sup>5</sup> It is impossible to decide whether Plutarch's oracle from Delphi was issued before or after the battle. That it was in circulation when Herodotus collected information in the mid-fifth century is indicated by his mention of the shrine of Androcrates (ix 25.3). H. W. Parke, *A history of the Delphic oracle* (Oxford 1939) 189 f. judged it to be 'certainly historical' and 'clearly an original oracle', issued before the battle.

<sup>6</sup> In the context of Plu. *Arist.* 11.6-8 'the land' which Plataea gave to Athens was the area round the shrine of Androcrates. B. Perrin in the Loeb edition indicated so by translating τὴν χώραν at 11.8 as 'this territory'. In Plu. *Alex.* 34.2 the Plataeans were said to have provided τὴν χώραν for the battle, which could mean either the territory on which the battle was fought or all their territory.

<sup>7</sup> So Badian 104 has argued that the Plataeans became not military allies but subjects of Athens, reduced to the condition of δουλεῖα.

<sup>8</sup> Badian 104 did not discuss this instance.

in Lacedaemonia. Another argument turns upon the meaning of a passage in Thucydides at ii 71.2, which we shall now discuss.

## II. *The proposal of Pausanias after the battle of Plataea*

After the victory at Plataea in 479 Pausanias, as commander-in-chief, sacrificed to Zeus Eleutherios in the square of Plataea and convened all the allies. Thucydides then continues his sentence at ii 71.2 as follows: ἀπεδίδου Πλαταιεῦσι γῆν καὶ πόλιν τὴν σφετέρην ἔχοντας αὐτονόμους οἰκεῖν, στρατεῦσαί τε μηδ' ἓνα ποτὲ ἀδίκως ἐπ' αὐτοὺς μηδ' ἐπὶ δουλείᾳ· εἰ δὲ μή, ἀμύνειν τοὺς παρόντας ζυμμάχους κατὰ δύναμιν.

Jowett translated the passage thus:-

'Pausanias ... restored to the Plataeans their country and city to be henceforth independent; no man was to make unjust war upon them at any time or seek to enslave them; and if they were attacked, the allies who were present promised that they would defend them to the utmost of their power'.<sup>9</sup>

Similar translations or paraphrases (for Jowett's last sentence is a paraphrase) have been given for instance, by Croiset, Arnold, Shilleto, and Badian.<sup>10</sup> There is, however, a grave defect. If one takes ἀπεδίδου to mean 'restore', that verb cannot govern the three infinitives which follow. For while Thucydides uses ἀποδίδωμι in that sense some forty-eight times, it was not followed, even once, by an infinitive. In our sentence the three infinitives are left hanging in the air. This defect was faced by Croiset alone of the authors I have mentioned. He added the comment 'Construisez: ἀπεδίδου Πλαταιεῦσι γῆν τὴν σφετέρην ὡστε αὐτοῦς ἐκείνην αὐτονόμους ἔχοντας οἰκεῖν στρατεῦσαί τε. Cet infinitif, comme ensuite ἀμύνειν, dépend de l'idée de προεῖπε, impliquée dans ἀπεδίδου'. However, the sense 'restore' has no connotation of 'foretelling', 'proclaiming' or the like. What Jowett and his followers need to produce are other passages in Thucydides where ἀποδίδωμι is found with their meaning and with dependent infinitives. There are in fact no such passages.

The interpretation which I believe to be correct is that ἀπεδίδου was being used with the meaning 'concede', as suggested by Bétant 'dare, concedere', Steup-Classen 'verlieh die Vergünstigungen', Arnold 'proceed to grant', and Rhodes 'gave back ... the right'.<sup>11</sup> I therefore translate the passage thus:-

<sup>9</sup> B. Jowett, *Thucydides* (Oxford 1881) i 141. He did not comment on the passage in his second volume.

<sup>10</sup> A. Croiset, *Thucydides livres I-II* (Paris 1886); T. Arnold, *Thucydides* (Oxford, no date), citing D.ii 30, where ἀποδίδωμι governs a dative and four infinitives; R. Shilleto, *Thucydides II* (Cambridge 1880); Shrimpton 301 'restored'; Badian 106 'restored'.

<sup>11</sup> E.-A. Bétant, *Lexicon Thucydeum* (Geneva 1893); J. Steup-J. Classen, *Thucydides II* (Berlin 1914); Arnold, see n. 10; E.C. Marchant, *Thucydides II* (London 1907) 216 'conceded' the right; P.J. Rhodes, *Thucydides History II* (Warminster 1988), 'gave back to the Plataeans the right to occupy'. The passage in Thucydides was written with great care, emphasis being given by the juxtaposition of rough consonants (γῆν καὶ πόλιν τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ παρόντος ζυμμάχους) and by hiatus (after ποτὲ, δουλείᾳ and μή), and the infinitives were

'Pausanias ... proposed <to the allies> to concede to the Plataeans that they were to inhabit their land and city, possessing it <as> their own, in independence, that no one was ever to campaign against them with aggression or with subjection in mind, and that, if any did not <refrain>, the present allies were to defend <the Plataeans> to the limit of their power'.

The construction after ἀπεδίδου is a dative of the person to whom the concession is made, and an accusative and infinitive, or simply an infinitive, to describe the concession. There are exact parallels in Thuc. i 144.2 (with the dative and then the infinitive) and iii 36.5 (with an accusative and infinitive). Our sentence at ii 71.2 was followed by the granting of the concession. There were two back-references to the concession: at ii 71.4 the Plataeans were to be allowed to inhabit the land Plataeis in independence 'as Pausanias deemed right', and at ii 72.1 the Plataeans were to be independent 'as Pausanias conceded' (Παυσανίας ὑμῖν παρέδωκεν). Neither back-reference refers to any 'restoration'.

The stress on inhabiting their own land and on being independent was due to the fact that the land had been seized and Plataea town had been burnt by the Persians at the prompting of the Thebans (Hdt. viii 50.2). The Plataean refugees, who had wintered in the Peloponnese (Diod. xi 14.5), returned as soldiers of the Greek army (Hdt. ix 28.6). Victory automatically liberated Plataeis and 'restored' the land to its people.<sup>12</sup> It was very fitting that the victors should undertake for the future, as Pausanias proposed, not to commit aggression against or seek to subject Plataea, and that they should agree to protect Plataea if so attacked. In this sense Plataea was to be set apart as 'inviolable and consecrate' (Plu. *Arist.* 21.1). And there was implicitly the corollary that Plataea would be a champion of independence for others and would go to the aid of any of the victor states which was itself the victim of aggression.

## III. *The Pentekontaetia and the Peloponnesian War*

For some twenty years Plataea, Athens and Sparta were loyal members of 'the alliance against the Mede'. It was probably in accordance with it that Plataea sent one-third of its army and Athens sent a large force to help Sparta against the Helots at Ithome in 464/3 (Thuc. iii 54.5 and i 102.1).<sup>13</sup> But in 462/1 Athens left the alliance by joining Argos and Thessaly (i 102.4), and Plataea 'transgressed' the alliance by helping Athens to subjugate Aegina in 458/7 (iii 64.3 παραβάντες). Thereafter she sided with Athens against Sparta and Thebes in the First Peloponnesian War, and she helped Athens to reduce some other states (iii 64.3), thus inc-

so placed as to provide a chiasmus and then a parallel order. See my article in *CQ* ii (1952) 129.

<sup>12</sup> The suggestion of Badian 104 and 107 that Plataeis had been made subject to Athens and the Plataeans were in a position of δουλείᾳ and that Plataeis was liberated from Athens by Pausanias in 479, is based in my opinion on a misconception of the meaning of ἀποδίδωμι at Thuc. ii 71.2 and of the feelings of the victors towards each other immediately after their united victory over the Persians.

<sup>13</sup> The dates which I give for the Pentekontaetia are those for which I argued in *Historia* iv (1955) 371 f.

urring the anger of Sparta for betraying the principles enunciated by Pausanias at Plataea.

Plataea was protected from her enemies by the terms of the Thirty Years Treaty of 445 until March 431 when Thebes made a treacherous attack on the city by night. As an ally of Athens (ii 2.1 Ἀθηναίων ζυμμαχίδα) she received help from Athens, and 'the less capable men together with the women and children' were moved at once to Athens for safety (ii 6.4). Subsequently other Plataeans were evacuated to Athens, because it was obvious that the city would be attacked. In 429 the Spartans and their allies invested the city. The only Plataeans in Plataeis then were 400 soldiers and 110 women in the city, helped by 80 Athenian soldiers (ii 78.3). Thus from March 431 until the city fell in 427 the bulk of Plataea's population lived in Athens. It was during these years that some citizen rights at Athens were granted to them.

Contemporary evidence for the granting of those rights is provided by Thucydides in the course of two speeches, respectively by the Plataeans who had surrendered at Plataea and by the Thebans, both addressing the Spartan assessors. As this evidence has been misconstrued, it is necessary to consider it closely.

The speeches were not a record of what was said after the surrender in 427. They were composed by Thucydides himself in order to convey the arguments which he thought to be appropriate (τὰ δέοντα) and to reflect the general purport of what was actually said (i 2.1).<sup>14</sup> They were written as a pair in antithesis to one another, the second speakers (the Thebans) resuming point after point which had been made by the Plataeans. They thus supplement one another.

The statements about Plataeans being citizens of Athens and participating in Athenian citizenship will be seen to refer to the period 431-427, when we match one speech against the other. In my translations I underline the linking words between the speeches.

1. The Plataean speakers naturally complained of Theban acts of aggression. At iii 56.1 they said 'the Thebans have committed many acts of aggression (πολλὰ μὲν καὶ ἄλλα ἡμᾶς ἠδίκησαν); and particularly the last one which has reduced us to this stage of suffering ... and we rightly took *revenge*'.<sup>15</sup>

To this the Theban speakers replied at iii 63.4 'You say that because you were the victims of *aggression* you brought them in' (ὅμεις... ἀδικούμενοι αὐτοὺς... ἐπηγάγεσθε); and at iii 63.2 ... 'You say it was for *revenge* against us that you became allies and citizens of the Athenians' (2, ἐγένεσθε ἐπὶ τῇ ἡμετέρᾳ τιμωρίᾳ, ὡς φατέ, Ἀθηναίων ζύμμαχοι καὶ πολῖται).

The Plataeans were referring specifically to the affair of 431, in which a force of Thebans committed 'aggression' by entering Plataea in time of peace. The attack failed. The surviving Thebans surrendered and were held as hostage. When a large force of Thebans arrived, the Plataeans persuaded the Thebans to withdraw by promising to send the hostages back. They then broke faith

and killed the hostages. That was the beginning of 'the revenge'. The Thebans in their reply referred to the same affair and its immediate sequel, the Plataeans becoming 'allies and citizens of the Athenians'.

2. In iii 55 the Plataeans spoke of events of two periods. They blamed Sparta for the events of 519 (iii 50.1). They dealt with events of 'the war' in iii 55.2-4. The transitional sentence was emphatic, with a strong hiatus:<sup>16</sup> ἐν μέντοι τῷ πολέμῳ οὐδέν. The events of the war were that Sparta ordered Plataea to abandon Athens, and that Plataea refused to do so. 'For they (the Athenians) were helping us against Thebes while you (the Spartans) were hesitating' (ἐβόηθουν... ἀπωκνεῖτε being contemporary imperfects), and it was no longer *honourable to abandon them*, especially since one brought them in as allies after good experience and at one's own request and since one participated in (their) citizenship. Rather it was appropriate to obey their orders zealously'.

In iii 63.3 the Thebans took up one of these points. 'You say it was *dishonourable to abandon your benefactors* ... but it was more dishonourable ... to join in the enslavement of Greece'.

In these exchanges it is clear that in March 431 Plataea asked Athens to intervene (in the narrative at ii 6 there is no mention of a request for military help), and that she did so because she had had good experience of the Athenian alliance in the past (from 519 onwards). Athenian troops arrived at once (ii 6.4). Sparta ordered Plataea to renounce its alliance with Athens, and on Plataea's refusal Sparta procrastinated. Thebes did not act against the combination of Plataea and Athens. While Sparta 'hesitated',<sup>17</sup> the Plataeans at Athens were granted some part in Athenian citizenship.

Thus the Plataean refugees in Athens remained Plataeans. They were then, as in the past, allies of Athens. The evidence we have adduced is supported by later passages. In 421/0 Athens granted Scione to 'Plataeans', that is to the Plataeans in Athens, of whom a part went out to occupy the site.<sup>18</sup> Lysias, born c. 459, delivered a speech against a man who claimed to be a Plataean in Athens and wrote of the place where 'the Plataeans met together once a month' (xxiii 6). It was by such meeting that they preserved themselves as a community of Plataeans.

How far was it true that Plataeans 'participated in Athenian citizenship' as the two Plataean representatives said according to Thucydides at iii 55.3? The answer seems to emerge from two passages which date around 340. Isocrates limited the grant of Athenian citizenship and 'a share in all that the Athenians had' to those Plataeans 'who were able to escape' during the siege of

<sup>16</sup> For the effect of the juxtaposition of rough consonants and hiatus see my article cited in n. 11.

<sup>17</sup> Gomme C ii 339 was in two minds about the application of the phrase which, he said, 'appears to go back to the original alliance'. But ἐν μέντοι τῷ πολέμῳ is decisive in my opinion.

<sup>18</sup> Gomme-Andrewes-Dover C iv 30 emphasised that 'citizens of another city could be given πολιτεία *en masse* without losing their original identity'. They seem to make the point as if it was a novelty in 421/0. It happened in the case of Plataea in 431 on my interpretation of the relevant passages in Thucydides.

<sup>14</sup> My interpretation of this passage was put forward in my chapter in *The speeches of Thucydides*, ed. P. A. Stadter (Chapel Hill 1973) 49 f. It is a controversial matter.

<sup>15</sup> Gomme C ii 348 makes the point that ἐτιμωρησάμεθα in this context connotes 'vengeance' rather than 'defence'.

Plataea, i.e. in 428 (*Panath.* 93 τῶν ἀποδρᾶναι δυνή-θέντων). The unknown author of the speech *Against Neaera* ([D.] lix) stated that it was 'those who escaped hither' (διασφύζονται δεῦρο) during the siege to whom Athens gave a share in the citizenship (μετέδοτε τῆς πολιτείας). Thus although the speech *Against Neaera* is far from dependable in itself,<sup>19</sup> the agreement between the two passages is striking. I conclude, then, that the 212 Plataeans who did escape during the siege of Plataea (Thuc. iii 24.2) were made Athenian citizens forthwith, in 428, and that other Plataean refugees in Athens did not receive that status. If the speech *Against Neaera* 106 fin. is to be trusted, the sons of those 212 Plataeans inherited Athenian citizenship only if the mother was Athenian by birth. Thus there were at Athens two groups of Plataean citizens, one with and one without Athenian citizenship.

We turn now to January 405, five months after the battle of Arginusae, when Aristophanes produced *Frogs* and gave serious advice to his fellow-citizens in the *parabasis* (686-7). He compared the lot of disfranchised Athenian citizens with the enfranchisement as Plataeans of slaves who had been liberated after service in the battle:

καὶ γὰρ αἰσχρὸν ἔστι τοὺς μὲν  
ναυμαχήσαντας μίαν  
καὶ Πλαταιᾶς εὐθὺς εἶναι κἀντι  
δοῦλων δεσπότης

'It is shameful that on the one hand those who joined in a single naval action should at once be both Plataeans and masters instead of slaves' (693-4).

The meaning is unambiguous: the liberated slaves were made not citizens of Athens but citizens of Plataea.<sup>20</sup> Thus they were enrolled in the Plataean community, which was residing in Athens. As free men they became masters instead of servants. This was done, no doubt, by arrangement with the Plataeans. The advantage of this accession of new citizens for the Plataean community in Athens (with its outpost in Scione) was that its numbers of tough adult males was increased—something which was very desirable after the massacre of some 200 Plataean soldiers in 427, the effects of the

<sup>19</sup> For example, the speech states that the Plataeans fought at Thermopylae and at Salamis, whereas Herodotus did not include them in the list of the Greeks at Thermopylae (vii 202; for they fought at Artemisium, viii 1.1), and he said that they were not at Salamis (viii 44.1). The psephisma cited at 104, which mentioned the allocation of Plataeans to the demes and the tribes, is therefore suspect, especially as the speaker did not later mention this point.

<sup>20</sup> The lines have been interpreted otherwise, and most recently by Worthington. He saw 'two levels of manumission: those who became Plataeans (or like Plataeans) and those who became masters'. But the force of the double καὶ is that they became both things and not one or the other, i.e. both Plataeans and, as we should say, masters instead of servants. Worthington agrees with the *communis opinio* that the ex-slaves 'received the same form of civic (i.e. Athenian civic) rights as the Plataeans'. He cites as proponents of this view the editions of *Frogs* by F. V. Fritsche, T. Kock, J. van Leeuwen, L. B. Stanford, to whom W. W. Merry may be added. But that is not what Aristophanes says. To be a 'Plataean' is to be a citizen of Plataea. To be an Athenian with similar rights to those of a Plataean resident at Athens needs to be spelt out in Greek. Aristophanes' argument would have been stronger if he had said 'Athenians' at line 687.

plague in Athens and the losses in the course of war.

A scholiast made the following comment on these two lines of *Frogs*: 'Hellanicus says the slaves who joined in the naval battle were liberated and being enrolled as Plataeans they live as fellow-citizens with them', i.e. with the Plataeans<sup>21</sup> (ἐγγραφέντας ὡς Πλαταιεῖς συμπολιτεύσασθαι αὐτοῖς). Jacoby accepted this as a genuine fragment of Hellanicus (*FGrH* 323 a F 25). If it is not genuine, that does not affect the validity of *Frogs* 693-4. If it is genuine, the existence of a *political* community 'The Plataeans' at Athens in 406/5 has to be accepted; for Hellanicus or the continuator<sup>22</sup> of his *Atthis* were writing for contemporary Athenians, to whom the status of the Plataean refugees in Athens was common knowledge.

If our interpretation of the passages in Thucydides, Isocrates, pseudo-Demosthenes and Aristophanes is correct, the granting of Athenian citizenship to Plataeans took place not in the earlier period but only in 428, when those who escaped from the siege received that honour. Before that date the Plataeans were allies of Athens. As allies, they may have been given some privileges at Athens, but they were not given 'participation in Athenian citizenship'.

#### IV. The Mound of the Plataeans and slaves at Marathon

It was stated by Pausanias that slaves were liberated before the action at Marathon, and that 'Athenians including those of unserviceable age and slaves came to Marathon not more than 9,000' (vii 15.7 and x 20.2). The slaves 'fought' (ἐμαχέσαντο) in the battle, this happening 'for the first time' in Athenian history (i 32.3); thus the slaves were not serving as porters or 'armour-bearers'<sup>23</sup> (a service which slaves had no doubt carried out on previous occasions) but as fighters.<sup>24</sup> According to Herodotus vi 112.2, from the Persian point of view there were no cavalry and no archery on the Athenian side in the battle, and it is generally agreed that Athens relied solely on hoplite infantry. Such infantry had to be trained in hoplite weaponry and tactics. It seems probable, then, that the liberated slaves were trained as a group in the late 490s and fought as a separate hoplite unit in the battle.<sup>25</sup> If so, it will help to explain why 'the slaves' were given the remarkable honour of heroic burial, something which would not have been accorded to porters or 'armour-bearers'. The term 'the slaves' should strictly be 'ex-slaves'; but I shall use the simple term in that sense, since Pausanias did so.

The mass burials 'in the plain' of Marathon were exceptional marks of honour. Writing of Athenians killed in war, Thucydides and Pausanias said that the normal practice was to bury the fallen at Athens, and that the exception was due to the 'outstanding valour'

<sup>21</sup> The scholiast was commenting not on Athenians but on 'Plataeans'. In the words of the passage cited from Hellanicus αὐτοῖς refers to the Plataeans; there is nothing in the context to suggest that it refers to Athenians.

<sup>22</sup> See Gomme C ii 6 n.3.

<sup>23</sup> As was supposed, for instance, by Burn 242.

<sup>24</sup> So too Welwei 103 'Kombattanten'.

<sup>25</sup> They were probably stationed in the line between the Plataeans of the left wing and the Athenians of the centre and right wing.

and 'bravery' of those who fought at Marathon (Thuc. ii 34.5; Paus. i 9.4). The Mound, 45 m. in diameter and originally more than 12 m. high, which covered the Athenian dead, was fully excavated by Staës.<sup>26</sup> The burial had been conducted in the following stages. At ground level the surface was covered with a layer of sea-sand and greenish earth; on the central part of this layer a great pyre on a brick tray was prepared; the corpses, not arranged in any order, were cremated on the pyre, and the bones of the men were left there in the ash; then a funerary sacrifice was held, and the remains of the sacrifice—ash, bones of animals and birds, and sherds (these made up some 30 ληκόθια)—formed a layer above the layer of cremated remains; above all this a mound of soil was so constructed that the pyre was at the centre of its circular periphery. Stelai were set up on the Mound; they recorded the names of 192 Athenian dead 'by tribes' (Paus. i 32.3; the number is in Hdt. vi 117.1).<sup>27</sup> Low on the side of the Mound there was a place for offerings, where Staës found animal bones and sherds. We know from an inscription<sup>28</sup> that Athenian *epheboi* laid wreaths there, and that the Marathonii and the descendants of the fallen honoured the dead, calling them 'heroes' (Paus. i 32.4)—still in the lifetime of Pausanias, more than 600 years after the battle.

When Pausanias visited the plain of Marathon, he went from the Mound of the Athenians to a second such burial.<sup>29</sup> If he did not know already, he certainly learnt from the Marathonii that it commemorated 'Plataeans of Boeotia and slaves' (i 32.3 τάφος δὲ ἐν τῷ πεδίῳ...καὶ ἕτερος Πλαταιεῦσι Βοιωτῶν καὶ δούλοις). A second such burial was discovered by S. Marinatos late in the 1960s. The mound, some 30 m. in diameter and 4 m. high, was made up of stones from the nearby riverbed, and it had been broken into on its east side. Marinatos left the rest of the rim of the mound unexcavated, because he wished to leave that part of the memorial intact; he excavated the interior area; and he rebuilt the mound over a frame, made a *dromos* and gateway, and so enabled visitors to enter and see the graves. He made preliminary reports;<sup>30</sup> but sadly he died without composing a final report. The following stages of funerary procedure were revealed in the excavated area.

Eleven individual pits, varying from 1 to 1.5 m. in depth, were dug in the virgin ground, close to one an-

other and roughly in three parallel rows.<sup>31</sup> One pit contained the burial of a boy aged 10; eight pits contained inhumations of a male adult; and in two pits a male adult had been cremated within the pit, the ash being on its floor. The pits were then filled with earth and topped with stones up to the original ground level, and a stone was set upright to be a marker for each grave, only one being inscribed with a name. In one of the cremations there was a lekythos of 500-480, and in the inhumation with the inscribed marker two pots had been placed beside the head. There were no offerings at all in the other pits. The next stage was the creation of 'a great pyre on the shaped surface'.<sup>32</sup> When it was fired it left a severely burnt layer of soil 'almost everywhere' in the area cleared by Marinatos.<sup>33</sup> On this layer there were further burnt remains including bits of charcoal, burnt animal bones (but no bones identified as human) and many sherds which made up more than twenty-five vases; these remains were interpreted as those of 'sacrificial meals and gifts'.<sup>34</sup> Next, a layer of good-sized stones was laid over the burnt remains, and finally the mound of stones was so made that the great pyre and not the group of pit-burials was at the centre.<sup>35</sup> On the outside of the mound Marinatos found a small circular area for offerings to be made to the dead.<sup>36</sup>

The points of similarity between the two mounds make it certain that they were constructed at the time of the Battle of Marathon and were intended to be memorials to the Marathonomachae. The raising of a circular mound so that the pyre was at its centre was in the tradition of the burial of the hero Patroclus in *Iliad* xxiii 255-7; and the special place for offerings on the side of the mound was for continuing homage to the dead heroes. In both mounds the pottery was Attic, except that a kotyle in the pit-burial with two pots 'seemed to be rather Boeotian than Attic owing to its poor work-

<sup>31</sup> AAA iii 358 fig. 15 and Πρακτικά 1970. Pl. 35.

<sup>32</sup> Πρακτικά 1970. 22 μεγάλη πυρά ἐκάη εἰς τὴν διαμορφωθεῖσαν ἐπιφάνειαν ὑπὲρ τοὺς νεκρούς.

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.* 20; 22 ἡ χωματινὴ ἐπιφάνεια τοῦ τύμβου σχεδὸν παντοῦ ἰσχυρῶς κεκαυμένη (the fill of the pits being ākautā).

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.* 22 θυσία (ἀνθρακες, ὄστρα ζῶων. Welwei 101 'über den Gruben eine deutliche Brandschacht mit den Resten von Opfergaben'. Such sacrifices were common in earlier tumuli (see *Studies* 3 and 15 for animal bones) and were a feature in the Mound of the Athenians (*Ath. Mitt.* 1893. 53).

<sup>35</sup> The pyre was the central point from which a circle was drawn, and stones were laid to form the periphery or 'stone circle' (see *Iliad* xxiii 256 τὸν ὄσαντο δὲ σῆμα θεμελίᾳ τε προβάλλοντο ἀμφὶ πυρῆν). This was done at our Mound; for Marinatos noted the circular low wall (Πρακτικά 1970. 20 with Pl. 26b). Here too the pyre was the central point. When a burial was the central point as in many tumuli (see *Studies* 2 f. and 7 fig. 2 for examples), the other burials were on all sides of it. But in our Mound they were grouped from the centre to the north (see the plan in AAA iii 353 in which A and B are the cremations). Marinatos reported that the southern part had no burials (*ibid.* 27 πολὺ μέρος τοῦ ἀνασκαφέντος τμήματος (τὸ πρὸς Νότον) εἶναι κενὸν τάφον).

<sup>36</sup> This is still visible. I visited the site in 1971 and many times since then. See *Studies* 197 n. 2 for my first impressions.

<sup>26</sup> The fullest report is in *Ath. Mitt.* xviii (1893) 46 ff., and there is a summary in *Studies* 173 f. with fig. 9.

<sup>27</sup> For the genuineness of the figure see my article in *JHS* cix (1989) 56.

<sup>28</sup> *IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 1006, 26.

<sup>29</sup> Pritchett 128 with n. 104 seems to be puzzled by Pausanias walking a couple of kilometres from the Mound of the Athenians to look at the Mound of Plataeans and slaves. I see no alternative, since Pausanias went first—as most of us do—to the Mound of the Athenians. Pausanias must have been a far from feeble walker. For the locations of the Mounds see *CAH* iv<sup>2</sup> (1988) fig. 43 (superseding fig. 10 of *Studies*). The Mound of the Plataeans was placed near to the prehistoric tumuli of legendary heroes on the route from Plataea to Marathon, and not on anyone's arable land.

<sup>30</sup> AAA iii (1970) 164 ff; *Ergon* 1970 5 ff; Πρακτικά 1970. 5-28 (the fullest report); see also Mastrokostas in AAA iii (1970) 14 ff.

manship'.<sup>37</sup> The dateable pieces in both mounds were of the decade 500-490, and the same range of shapes occurred in each. In each mound there was a burnt layer containing sherds and burnt animal bones. It seems, therefore, to be unavoidable that Marinatos' mound was that 'for Plataeans of Boeotia and slaves', which Pausanias saw and mentioned (i 32.3).<sup>38</sup>

Yet there are striking differences between the discoveries within the two mounds. In the Mound of the Athenians the cremated bones of the dead were left in the burnt layer; in the second mound there were no cremated bones of the dead in the burnt layer. On the other hand, there were in the second mound eleven pit-burials beneath the burnt layer; but in the Mound of the Athenians there was under the burnt layer only a layer of sand and greenish earth, itself on undisturbed virgin ground. Those who have concentrated their attention on the differences have been inclined to distrust or even to reject the idea that the second mound served the same purpose as the Mound of the Athenians.<sup>39</sup> In what follows I try to account for those differences within the premise that the second Mound is that of the Plataeans and the liberated slaves.

The pit-burials were poor in construction. There were no shaped stones, not even the markers being squared, and only one of the eleven burials had a name roughly inscribed on the marker.<sup>40</sup> The nine inhumations were the cheaper form of burial; for cremation required wood, which was expensive. The burials were poor also in that nine had no offerings at all. We may explain the poverty of these burials by supposing that they were burials of the slaves who had been freed by the Athenians and who had lost their lives fighting at Marathon. Their fellow ex-slaves had no resources. Their relatives, being slaves in Athens, were either not able to come to the site, or if they did come were too poor to provide cremation, except for two of the dead.<sup>41</sup>

<sup>37</sup> For the pottery see AAA iii 361 and iv (1971) 99 ff., where however D. Callipolitis-Feytmans did not comment on the poor-quality vase in the pit of Archias. For animal bones see n.34, and for the bones of animals and birds in the Mound of the Athenians see *Ath. Mitt.* xviii 53 ὄστρα ζώων καὶ πτηνῶν (and 55 for animal bones on the offering place outside the Mound).

<sup>38</sup> Pritchett (128) argued that the Mound of Plataeans and slaves was where Leake, following a report by E. D. Clarke, wrote of 'a heap of earth and stones, not indeed of any considerable height, but having much the appearance of being artificial' 'at a very small distance' from the Mound of the Athenians. No trace of it, whether of sherds or burnt remains, have been seen since early last century. Pritchett then had to explain who were honoured as heroes at the time of the battle in Marinatos' Mound. He supplied 'some persons of the region ... who would have resisted the occupation of their homes', i.e. in the days before the battle; but such persons would surely have been buried individually at the time in the cemeteries of Marathon which have been found to the south of Marinatos' Mound, i.e. behind the Greek line of battle.

<sup>39</sup> For instance, Welwei, Koumanoudes, Themeles and Pritchett.

<sup>40</sup> Πρακτικά 1970. 21; the markers were ἀκατέργαστοι. *Ergon* 1970. 13 προχείρωσ καὶ ἀδεξίως ἐγκολαφθέν; see AAA iii 359 fig. 16 and AAA iv (1971) 413.

<sup>41</sup> The dead were presumably of different racial and cultural backgrounds, and their preferred mode of burial was not uniform.

We have an analogy from an earlier period. Inhumations of adults without offerings were found in family cemeteries in Pithecusa alongside inhumations of children with offerings and cremations of adults with offerings; the conclusion of the excavator was that the inhumations of the first category were those of slaves of the family.<sup>42</sup>

The ages of the dead in the pit-burials have been inferred from the bones.<sup>43</sup> The boy of ten is likely to have been a slave or son of a liberated slave rather than a citizen boy (for they were never recruited so young). Nine adults were 'in the prime of youth', the age being variously defined as 20 to 25 and 25 to 35.<sup>44</sup> The point of importance is that the age of the nine men is natural, if only the fittest slaves had been selected for hoplite service. The last adult was aged about 40. His marker was inscribed with the name Archia(?) in Attic, not Boeotian script,<sup>45</sup> which carries more weight than the suggestion that one of the vases by his head 'seemed to be rather Boeotian than Attic'. Maybe he was an officer, as Marinatos suggested, but a liberated slave of the ex-slave unit.

The great pyre and the sacrificial meal and offerings, which took place over a larger area than that of the pit-burials and were sealed off from them by a layer of stones, were clearly dissociated from the impoverished pit-burials.<sup>46</sup> They were in honour of the Plataean dead. I take it that the Plataean dead were cremated on the great pyre, and that their bones were carefully collected, like those of Patroclus (*Iliad* xxiii 252-3; cf. xxiv 793), and taken home, like the bones and ashes of the Achaeans dead at Troy in A. Ag. 434-6 and of the Megarians in the Persian war (Paus. i 43.3). It was at Plataea (I assume) that their names were recorded, probably on stelae. But the celebration of their heroism in battle was rightly conducted in the plain of Marathon, and there the Mound was a lasting memorial. For the native Plataean dead it was a cenotaph; for the liberated slaves who had become Plataean citizens it was a final resting-place. Both were honoured by subsequent generations who made offerings on the side of the Mound.

Those who have claimed that the liberated slaves were given Athenian citizenship have been surprised that their dead were not buried in the Mound of the Athenians. Reasons have been advanced, for instance that the new citizens had not yet been allocated to tribes and so

<sup>42</sup> Professor A. J. Graham kindly mentioned this to me when I was discussing with him similar poor graves at Epidamnus (Durrës) in one of which the skeleton still carried the ankle-chains of slavery. See Graham's remarks in *CAH* iii<sup>2</sup> 3 (1982) 99 with reference to G. Buchner in *Cahiers du centre Jean Bérard* 2 (Naples 1975) 69 ff.

<sup>43</sup> By Professor E. Brietinger; see AAA iii 360.

<sup>44</sup> *Ergon* 1970. 13 ἐν τῇ ἀκμῇ τῆς νεότητος; Koumanoudes 235, 20-25 ἐτών; Pritchett 127, 20-30; Marinatos in Πρακτικά 1970. 24; about 25. Marinatos *ibid.* 26 made a comparison with the Spartan Eirenes, men of a young age, who were buried separately from other Spartans at Plataea in 479.

<sup>45</sup> Welwei 105 'nicht boiotisch (ψ) sondern attisch (χ)'. One imagines the name was inscribed by a member of the ex-slave unit.

<sup>46</sup> The two cremated ex-slaves had been cremated previously, each within his own pit. The large area of the pyre and the severe burning of the soil can hardly be attributed to the preparation of a sacrificial meal.

could not be entered on the stelae.<sup>47</sup> But that was no ground for failing to bury them with their fellow-citizens; and as far as casualty-lists go, their names could have been entered as a separate category on a separate stela. Some of those who believed the liberated slaves were Athenian citizens have expressed surprise that these Athenian citizens were buried together with Plataean citizens. Marinatos considered that the Athenians were guilty of ὑβρις in 'burying their slaves together with the dead of their most loyal allies'.<sup>48</sup> E. Meyer thought that the Plataeans and the liberated slaves were both treated by Athenians as second-class persons and so were buried together;<sup>49</sup> but that was hardly the way to ensure the future loyalty of the Plataeans.

My present suggestion is that on liberation the slaves of the Athenians were given not Athenian citizenship but Plataean citizenship. At the time Athens and Plataea were in close alliance. If the Persians should invade by land in 490/489, as Athens expected,<sup>50</sup> Plataea would be in the front line, and it had good reason to wish to strengthen its military forces. When Xerxes did invade by land, Sparta had already trained very large numbers of serfs who fought in battle alongside Spartan troops at Themopylae and at Plataea. To have the liberated slaves receive Plataean citizenship was an excellent way of removing them from Attica, where their sympathy with any escaping slaves or with any slave rising might be dangerous.<sup>51</sup> If my suggestion is correct, the burying of the liberated slaves in the Mound of the Plataeans is self-explanatory; for they were Plataean citizens.

At the same time we can explain the grant of Plataean citizenship to the liberated slaves who had fought in the Athenian navy at Arginusae. The Athenians were following a time-honoured precedent. Had they regained sea power in the Aegean in 405 and even gone on to win the war, they would probably have sent these new Plataean citizens to join the Plataeans at Scione or to help in refounding Plataea.<sup>18</sup>

N. G. L. HAMMOND

*Clare College, Cambridge*

#### *Appendix on the number of liberated slaves*

Because the excavation was incomplete, one is dealing inevitably with approximations. Marinatos wanted to keep a part of the original Mound intact as 'the memorial' of the great battle (*PAE* 1970.25). This part was especially the northern arc beside three of the excavated graves (see *Ergon* 1970.11 fig. 6 and *AAA* iii 358 fig. 15), and Marinatos did not exclude the possibility of more graves (*PAE* 1970.25). If we discount the

<sup>47</sup> A. Notopoulos in *AJPh* lxii (1941) 352 ff.

<sup>48</sup> *AAA* iii 362. His proposal there to emend ἔτερος to ἔτερον in Paus. i 32.3 has won no approval.

<sup>49</sup> In *RE* xiv (1950) 2286 'als Leute zweiter Klasse'; Badian 104 went further: 'the Athenians regarded the Plataeans as in some sense δοῦλοι and showed it by burying them with the liberated slaves'.

<sup>50</sup> See my account of the campaign in *CAH* iv<sup>2</sup> (1988) 503f.

<sup>51</sup> Sparta preferred to use these troops outside Laconia (*Thuc.* iv 80), and in 421 she settled Helot and Neodamodeis soldiers at Lepreum, as far as possible from Laconia (v 34.1).

boy of ten who cannot have been a slave liberated for military service, we have ten casualties for the ex-slaves and a possibility of say three more undiscovered by Marinatos. A rough rate of losses may be taken from the Athenian numbers, being 192 dead out of some 9,000 (see *Studies* 206 for the figure), i.e. c. 2%. On the reliability of the casualties-figure see Hammond in *JHS* clx (1989) 56 f.

The number of Plataeans in the battle was given as 1,000 by Justin ii 9 and Nepos *Milt.* 5, the former following probably a 'highly rhetorical Hellenistic writer' and the latter following Deinon, who reported the local Attic tradition (*Studies* 234-9). It was judged too high by How and Wells ii 114, because at the Battle of Plataea the Plataean troops numbered only 600 (*Hdt.* ix 28.6, which How and Wells accepted). But it may be that 400 Plataeans served on the large Greek fleet (then in the eastern Aegean), as Plataeans had already served on Athenian ships for the Battle of Artemisium (*Hdt.* viii 1.1). One wonders whether such Plataeans were the ex-slave Plataeans, and if so they might be these 400. At any rate casualties of ten men would be compatible with an approximate 2% of 400 ex-slave Plataeans fighting at the Battle of Marathon.

#### **The Portland Vase revisited\***

D. E. L. Haynes' 1964 booklet *The Portland Vase* and Bernard Ashmole's article of 1967 ushered in a spate of renewed speculations concerning the scenes depicted on the Portland Vase (FIG 1).<sup>1</sup> Despite the considerable literature since then, I venture to propose a new interpretation of part of the vase. First of all, it should be said that I accept the view of Ashmole (and others) against Haynes (and others) that the vase depicts two separate scenes and not one continuous one. I also accept (with many others) Ashmole's interpretation of the first scene as the love or marriage of Peleus and Thetis; the two lovers are figures A and C, Thetis being marked out as a sea-goddess by the sea snake in her lap, with Eros (B) and Zeus or Poseidon (D) looking on. In the case of figure D, I prefer Zeus to Poseidon, for two reasons: the marriage of Peleus and Thetis, we are told

\* My thanks to Robin Osborne and to the referee and editor of *JHS* for helpful criticism.

<sup>1</sup> D. E. L. Haynes, *The Portland Vase* (London 1964; new edition 1975); B. Ashmole, *JHS* lxxxvii (1967) 1-17; D. E. L. Haynes, *JHS* lxxxviii (1968) 58-72; C. W. Clairmont, *AJA* lxxii (1968) 280-1; E. L. Brown, *AJA* lxxiv (1970) 189 and *AJA* lxxvi (1972) 379-91; E. B. Harrison in *Essays in Memoriam Otto Brendel* (Mainz 1976) 131-42; J. G. F. Hind, *JHS* xlcv (1979) 20-5; J. D. Smart, *JHS* civ (1984) 186; K.-H. Hunger, *Des Geheimnis der Portlandvase* (Munich 1988). E. Simon, *Augustus: Kunst und Leben in Rom um die Zeitwende* (Munich 1986) 163-5 gives much the same version as her previous *Die Portlandvase* (Mainz 1953). Another recent interpretation linking the Vase with Latin poetry is Kenneth Painter, 'The Portland Vase' in *Roman glass: two centuries of art and invention*, ed. Martine Newby and Kenneth Painter (London 1991) 33-45. This includes a valuable table listing all known interpretations of the iconography.