

THE ATHENIAN PORTRAYAL OF THE
DISPLACEMENT AND FLIGHT OF PLATAEAN
WAR REFUGEES IN THE FIFTH AND FOURTH
CENTURIES BCE: CITIZENSHIP, INTEGRATION,
ETHNIC IDENTITY*

Mark Marsh-Hunn

Our lives as human beings are shaped by stories: the stories we tell about ourselves, and the stories that are told about us by others. It is by means of stories that our identities are constructed. We adapt, change or embellish these narratives as required to project a certain image of ourselves or reinforce a specific agenda. The narratives we construct, and the manner in which we do so, form a crucial part of our understanding of history: the latter consists, inherently, of narrative. This paper is concerned with the close interplay between historical events, the stories that surround them, and the corresponding effect on collective identity. The study is thus more of a historical than a literary analysis of ancient sources, and yet the two realms are here closely interlinked. I seek to examine closely the way people in Classical Greece constructed stories around historical events, and how these stories were then instrumentalised and exploited.

When the tragic poet Phrynichos staged his play *The Fall of Miletus* in Athens shortly after the capture and sack of the latter city by the Persians toward the end of the Ionian Revolt in the first decade of the fifth century BCE, Herodotus tells us that the Athenian audience in the theatre was grief-stricken and moved to tears. So distressing was the depiction that the Athenians allegedly fined Phrynichos 1,000 *drachmai* and forbade any future staging of the play.¹ As if foreshadowed by the tragedian, Athens itself would be sacked twice by the Persians but a few years later during Xerxes' invasion of Hellas (Hdt. 8.51–5, 140a.2, 142.4; 9.1, 3, 13.1–3). The Athenians were

* I would like to thank, first and foremost, Dr. Rachel Bruzzone for her great support and her valuable comments on this paper. Furthermore, I wish to extend my gratitude to Prof. Hans-Joachim Gehrke for kindly taking time to provide insights and critique. Gratitude also goes to Prof. Astrid Möller, as well as all the other contributors to this volume, all of whom also provided valuable insights. Finally, I would like to thank Clara Hillebrecht and Carolin Gschlecht, who contributed several ideas and arguments to this paper and were kind enough to endure hours of discussions on this topic. All translations in this paper are the author's.

¹ *Μιλήτου ἄλωσις*, Hdt. 6.21.

fortunate enough to have been able to evacuate the bulk of their population before the destruction; yet the trauma of their ruined homes and temples remained ingrained in their consciousness and in the narratives they would later spin.²

The subsequent decades saw the rise of the Delian League and, with it, Athenian imperial aspirations. These ambitions would ultimately culminate in the cataclysmic conflict with Sparta. In this Peloponnesian War, as modern scholarship has named it, the Athenians themselves were guilty of the utter annihilation of a number of *poleis*: Histiaia,³ Torone, Skione, and, most notably, Aigina and Melos.⁴ On the opposing side, the Boeotian city of Plataea, a staunch ally of Athens, was likewise destroyed by the Lacedaemonians and Thebans after a lengthy siege (Thuc. 2.75–8; 3.52–68). Such wholesale destruction of entire communities inevitably led to the mass movement of large numbers of people, not only in the form of slaves, but also as war refugees.⁵ Perhaps the most prominent war refugees in Athens during the Classical period were the Plataeans, evacuated from their city around 430–429 BCE. The sudden influx of a number of refugees into Athens called for various measures to integrate them into Athenian society, and the Plataeans would subsequently become part of that same society for almost a century. Accordingly, the Plataeans added a new dimension to the various historical narratives generated in Athens in the late fifth and fourth centuries: the image of the war refugee and the tragedy of the destruction of an entire *polis*. While Homer had supplied a dramatic depiction of the destruction of Troy in his *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, this story was the stuff of legends; and the fall of Miletus, however distressing it may have been to the Athenian audience, was geographically far removed. Plataea, however, lay at Athens' doorstep, and the presence of the Plataeans served as a constant reminder not only of what would happen if Athens lost the war against Sparta, but likely also of the atrocities the Athenians themselves had committed against other cities.⁶ Phrynichos could be fined, and his play banned; the Plataeans however were ever-present. The Athenians were thus perpetually faced with that timeless

² Steinbock (2013) 323–6.

³ Destroyed, in fact, over a decade before the beginning of the Peloponnesian War.

⁴ Xen. *Hell.* 2.2.3; Thuc. 5.84–116; see Steinbock (2013) 323–6. To this list could be added non-Greek Hykkara, see Thuc. 6.62.3–4. On Thucydides' treatment of the Melos episode and on revulsion against unnecessary violence in ancient Greece, see Panov's contribution to this volume.

⁵ See, e.g., Mantineian and Thasian refugees in Athens in the first quarter of the 4th century, IG II² 33, 5–8: [... εἶ]ναι δὲ [καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις τοῖς φεύγουσι] Θασί[ων ἐπ' ἀ]ττικισμῶι τ[ὴν ἀτέλει]αν καθά[περ Μ]αν[τ]ινε[ῶ]σιν [ἦν'...]. '... that the other refugees from Thasos also [be granted] exemption from taxation due to their partisanship in favour of the Athenians, in the same way as the Mantineians ...' See also the restoration of the Aiginetans, Melians, and Skionians to their cities by Lysander after the end of the Peloponnesian War: Plut. *Lys.* 14.3.

⁶ In this regard, see Steinbock (2013) 123, 126, 323–6.

aspect of war, given face in the shape of the Plataeans, and were forced to grapple with the fear of suffering the same fate, as well as their own feelings of guilt. Psychologically, this struggle ultimately manifested itself in the many narratives the Athenians spun throughout the late fifth and fourth centuries BCE, generating the image of the war refugee and deeply shaping the self-conception the Athenians had of themselves. It is with this issue—the portrayal of war refugees as a consequence of war—that this paper is primarily concerned.

The Plataeans remained as refugees in Athens from *c.* 430 to 338 BCE, and during this time were a part of Athenian society. This period of *c.* 92 years was interrupted by a short-lived colonisation of the town of Skione, recently destroyed by the Athenians (421–404 BCE), as well as a brief restoration to Plataea (*c.* 386–373 BCE), during which at least a portion of the Plataeans left Athens before being forced to return. The Plataeans feature frequently in Athenian public discourse of the fifth and fourth centuries BCE. As far as historical sources are concerned, the Plataeans themselves remain largely mute; almost all sources left to us are Athenian.⁷ Accordingly, this paper attempts to analyse the various ways in which the Plataeans and their lot as war refugees feature in Athenian public discourse, and what impact this had on their cohesion and identity as a group. In the first part of the paper, I attempt to analyse the legal status of the Plataeans during their exile in Athens. Secondly, I examine the role played by the Plataeans in Athenian contemporary narratives, especially with regard to their role as staunch allies of Athens and as victims of war. In particular, I lay emphasis on the evolution of the Athenian portrayal of the Plataeans as war refugees, and how these portrayals are used to further political agendas or to discriminate against other groups, as well as serving to alleviate the Athenians' feelings of guilt. In the third and final section, I draw conclusions regarding the construction, maintenance, and evolution of Plataean group identity, especially to what extent the Athenian portrayals and treatment of the Plataeans shaped and influenced it.

The story of the Plataeans as refugees in Athens begins thus: in 431, after having decided to hold the city against Theban aggression and having somewhat impetuously executed the 180-odd Theban prisoners captured during the latter city's abortive attempt to take Plataea in a *coup de main*, the Plataeans prepared for a siege (Thuc. 2.2–6). In a rather unceremonious and sober manner, Thucydides writes: 'After this, the Athenians marched to Plataea, brought food, established a garrison, and took away the weakest amongst the men along with the women and children'.⁸ In his dramatic

⁷ This need not mean that the Plataeans did not have their own narratives, and possibly their own dedicated historians; for a discussion in this regard see below.

⁸ Thuc. 2.6.4: καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι στρατεύσαντες ἐς Πλάταιαν σῆτόν τε ἐσήγαγον καὶ φρουροὺς ἐγκατέλιπον, τῶν τε ἀνθρώπων τοὺς ἀχραιοτάτους ξὺν γυναιξὶ καὶ παισὶν ἐξεκόμισαν.

description of the siege of Plataea (Thuc. 2.71–78) he later adds that 400 Plataean warriors remained behind as a garrison, together with some 80 Athenians and 110 women to prepare food, emphasising again that the rest of the populace had earlier been evacuated to Athens (Thuc. 2.78.3). In their report on the extensive ÖAI archaeological survey of Plataea published in 2013, Konecny et al. tentatively estimate the population of Plataea at the start of the fifth century, both citizen and slave, as being around 5,000–6,000 people, or possibly slightly more.⁹ Deducting the five hundred or so warriors and women left behind to hold the city as well as adjusting for the loss of territory to Thebes in the second half of the fifth century,¹⁰ the number of Plataean refugees entering Athens in 429 can plausibly be estimated at around 4,000–5,000.

In his portrayal, Thucydides is clearly sympathetic toward the Plataeans. His extremely detailed description of the defence of Plataia, as well as the dramatic escape of some 212 of the defenders on a stormy night in 428 BCE,¹¹ show a degree of admiration. However, Thucydides does not shy away from pointing out that, in this war, the Plataeans were the first to commit an atrocity. In his description of the Theban night attack on Plataea in 431 BCE, he mentions that the Theban attackers attempted to win the Plataeans over by persuasion (albeit with a degree of coercion), deciding to refrain from using violence in order to eliminate the political opposition within the town. When the Plataeans successfully surrounded, attacked, and killed a number of the Thebans and captured some 180 of them, they subsequently executed all of the latter.¹² As we shall see, Thucydides' inclusion of this detail will be relevant when analysing later portrayals of the Plataeans' lot.

1. Legal Status

In order to understand the narratives surrounding the Plataeans, as well as their image amongst the Athenians, it is first necessary to take a close look at the legal status the refugees were granted upon entering Athenian society. Most probably shortly after the escape of the 212 Plataean (and possibly some Athenian) warriors from Plataea, the Plataeans were granted Athenian

⁹ Konecny et al. (2013) 26–7.

¹⁰ Especially the smaller settlements of Hysiai, Erythrai, Skaphai, and others, which may have formed a *sympoliteia* under Plataean hegemony; see Bruce (1968) 190–5; Konecny–Aravantinos–Marchese (2013) 26–9.

¹¹ Thuc. 3.20–4; see Hammond (1992) 146.

¹² Thuc. 2.5; for a detailed discussion see Pelling (2000) 62–4. See also Mackil (2013a) 39–40. See also Panov's comments on this episode in his contribution to this volume.

citizenship *en masse* around 427 BCE.¹³ The decree recording the naturalisation is preserved in the fourth-century court speech *Against Neaira*:

Decree regarding the Plataeans: On the motion of Hippokrates [it is thus decreed] that the Plataeans are to be Athenians from this day hence, and are to enjoy all the civil rights which the Athenians themselves enjoy; that they may have a share in everything, both in the religious and in the civil context, except for such priesthoods or religious rites which are the prerogative of specific families. They are also excluded from the office of the nine archons. Their offspring, however, are not. The Plataeans are to be distributed amongst the demes and tribes. After this distribution, no Plataean shall be eligible for Athenian citizenship without the express consent of the Athenian people.¹⁴

¹³ There has been much discussion in regard to the exact date of the naturalisation. Based largely on Thucydides' reference to the Plataeans as 'allies and citizens' of Athens (both the Plataeans and Thebans do this in the Plataean Debate: see Thuc. 3.55.3: *ξυμμάχους καὶ πολιτείας*; 3.63.2: *Ἀθηναίων ξύμμαχοι καὶ πολῖται*), some authors have argued that the naturalisation must have occurred at some point during the fifth or even at the end of the sixth century BCE: see, for instance, Christ (2012) 145 n. 54. Hammond (1992) 146 has argued that the naturalisation must have happened at some point during the siege of Plataea. This, however, makes no sense: how could the besieged Plataeans have got wind of the naturalisation, consequently referring to themselves as Athenian citizens in the debate with the Thebans? Pelling (2000) 76–7 has argued for a naturalisation at some point in the fifth century, since he does not think it likely that the otherwise so meticulous Thucydides would make such a glaring mistake. This ultimately speculative assumption presupposes a large degree of faith in Thucydides. Perhaps Thucydides did indeed make a mistake here; I would however argue that he purposefully projected the later naturalisation into the past, using it in the Plataean Debate in order to provide arguments for both the Plataeans (3.55.3) as well as the Thebans (3.63.2). Since he subsequently mentions the Plataeans only three times, and only briefly (4.67; 5.32; 7.57), it is most likely that he moved the naturalisation to the debate for narrative reasons. The naturalisation can therefore be most plausibly dated to 427 BCE, after the survivors of the siege reached Athens. The idea may however have been floated at an earlier date, and indeed the whole issue may have been more of a lengthy process, discussed in the popular assembly and finally ratified after the destruction of Plataea.

¹⁴ [Dem.] 59.104: *Ψήφισμα περὶ Πλαταιέων*[.] *Ἰπποκράτης εἶπεν, Πλαταιέας εἶναι Ἀθηναίους ἀπὸ τῆσδε τῆς ἡμέρας, ἐπιτίμους καθάπερ οἱ ἄλλοι Ἀθηναῖοι, καὶ μετεῖναι αὐτοῖς ὧν περ Ἀθηναῖοι μέτεστι πάντων, καὶ ἱερῶν καὶ δόσιων, πλὴν εἴ τις ἱερωσύνη ἢ τελετὴ ἐστὶν ἐκ γένους, μηδὲ τῶν ἐννέα ἀρχόντων, τοῖς δ' ἐκ τούτων. κατανεῖμαι δὲ τοὺς Πλαταιέας εἰς τοὺς δῆμους καὶ τὰς φυλάς. ἐπειδὴν δὲ νεμηθῶσι, μὴ ἐξέστω ἔτι Ἀθηναίῳ μηδενὶ γίγνεσθαι Πλαταιέων, μὴ εὐρομένῳ παρὰ τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Ἀθηναίων.*

The granting of citizenship almost certainly only applied to Plataean men of age, and excludes women and children. Kapparis (1995) 373 (see below) has argued that the women and children also received citizenship; however, he provides no evidence for this claim. It is far safer to assume that citizenship was only extended to the men of age, and possibly even only to the select few who escaped from the siege of Plataea.

πλὴν εἴ τις ἱερωσύνη ἢ τελετὴ ἐστὶν ἐκ γένους: the hereditary priesthoods almost certainly refer to the old Athenian *genē*, groups of families who by tradition officiated various major *polis* cults; see e.g. the Kerykes, Philleidai, and Eumolpidai (priesthood of Demeter und Kore in Eleusis: see Andron of Halicarnassus, *FGHist* 10 F 13; *SEG* XVII 2; *IG* I² 845; *IG* II² 204,

The orator, Apollodorus, then goes on to add some details:

And [the lawmaker] does not allow anyone to become Athenian at a later point in time, unless he becomes such now and with the approval of the court; in this way, no great multitude of people may claim Athenian citizenship by falsely claiming to be Plataeans. Furthermore, in the Plataean Decree he included a clause in regard [to the Plataeans], in the interest of the city and the Gods: that they not be allowed to be chosen by lot to hold the offices of archon or the priesthoods; their offspring, however, are to have this right, so long as they were born of mothers of Athenian descent who were wedded according to the law.¹⁵

The naturalisation is unrepeatable; in this way no one could, at a later point in time, falsely claim to be a Plataean and thus be entitled to citizenship. The Athenians were famously protective of their citizenship and sought to limit the scope for fraud. The Plataeans are here barred from *all* priesthoods; and Plataean offspring may hold the aforementioned offices only if their mothers are citizens of Athenian descent.

Both the authenticity of the decree as well as the apparent contradictions between it and Apollodorus' subsequent details have been extensively debated by scholarship, most notably by Konstantinos Kapparis and, more recently, Mirko Canevaro.¹⁶ This discussion is beyond the scope of this article; however, they come to the following relevant conclusions.

While Canevaro makes a very convincing case that the decree is a later post-Classical insertion¹⁷ and is thus not authentic, the overall content of the decree can broadly be considered accurate.¹⁸ However, Canevaro points out that Apollodorus' added details are probably a more accurate reflection of the status the Plataeans enjoyed. For instance, the hereditary priesthoods are

3639.3–4); the Eteoboutadai (priesthood of Athena Polias and Poseidon Erechtheus on the acropolis: see Aeschin. 2.147; Apollod. *Bibl.* 3.15; Plut. *Mor.* 841B, 843E–F); and the Bouzygai (priesthood of Zeus Teleios and Zeus at the Palladion: see *IG I* 71, 273, 294; *IG II²* 1096, 2884, 3177, 5055, 5075). In this regard see also Blok (2009) 162–4.

κατανεῖμαι δὲ τοὺς Πλαταιέας εἰς τοὺς δήμους καὶ τὰς φυλάς: The distribution amongst the demes and tribes is further confirmed in *Lys.* 23.2; see below.

¹⁵ [Dem.] 59.106: *καὶ ὕστερον οὐκ ἐᾷ γίνεσθαι Ἀθηναῖον ἐξεῖναι, ὃς ἂν μὴ νῦν γένηται καὶ δοκιμασθῆ ἔν τῷ δικαστηρίῳ, τοῦ μὴ πολλοὺς φάσκοντας Πλαταιέας εἶναι κατασκευάζειν αὐτοῖς πολιτείαν. ἔπειτα καὶ τὸν νόμον διωρίσατο ἐν τῷ ψηφίσματι πρὸς αὐτοὺς εὐθέως ὑπέρ τε τῆς πόλεως καὶ τῶν θεῶν, καὶ μὴ ἐξεῖναι αὐτῶν μηδενὶ τῶν ἐννέα ἀρχόντων λαχεῖν μηδὲ ἱερωσύνης μηδεμιᾶς, τοῖς δ' ἐκ τούτων, ἂν ᾧσιν ἐξ ἀστῆς γυναικὸς καὶ ἐγγυητῆς κατὰ τὸν νόμον.*

¹⁶ Kapparis (1995) 359–78; Canevaro (2010) 337–69.

¹⁷ Canevaro (2010) 362, 365, 367.

¹⁸ Blok (2009) 166; Blok (2009) 166 n. 106 has pointed out that the language and terminology used in the decree match those used in other surviving late 5th-century decrees, suggesting that while it may be a later insertion, the information and wording contained within it may have been drawn from an earlier, late 5th-century document.

exclusive by definition, so it makes far more sense if the Plataeans were in fact barred from *all* priesthoods and the archonships altogether.¹⁹ In this speech, Apollodorus charges an Athenian citizen, Stephanos, with having falsely passed off his lover, Neaira, as an Athenian citizen. Even more outrageously, he is accused of having married off Neaira's daughter, Phano—according to his argument, likewise not a citizen—to the Athenian *archon basileus* ([Dem.] 59.72–3). One might therefore suspect that Apollodorus is here consciously and deliberately misrepresenting the legal position to reinforce his argument: it was in his interest to emphasise that only Athenian citizens whose parents were also citizens were eligible for the priesthoods—regardless of whether these were hereditary or, as in the case of the *basileus*, drawn by lot.²⁰ Josine Blok has, however, argued convincingly that the Athenians went to great lengths to retain the customary requirements for the eligibility for the priesthoods and archonships, namely being a citizen born from Athenian citizen parents into an *oikos*. The most important point can thus be identified as the regulation of marriage and the rights of the offspring. Eligibility for the priesthoods would therefore, naturally, not apply to the Plataeans, but could apply to their offspring, *if* they married an Athenian citizen woman.²¹ On the one hand, this created an incentive to marry into the Athenian citizen body. On the other, one might speculate as to how many Plataeans would have had any hope of actually marrying an Athenian citizen woman. The number of unmarried Plataean citizen men of age was likely rather small, perhaps as few as a couple hundred or so,²² especially after the loss of some 200 at the end of the siege of Plataea. Additionally, there was no incentive on the Athenians' side to marry a Plataean, especially considering the fact that the Plataeans, having lost their city, appear initially to have been extremely poor. This is borne out by the fact that they fought as light-armed troops, not as hoplites, in the Athenian attack on Nisaia during the Peloponnesian War.²³ Many of the Plataean men of age would already have been married and had children, and epigraphical evidence hints that some Plataeans married *metoikoi*, implying that at least some of them were *metoikoi* also.²⁴ The Athenians were

¹⁹ Canevaro (2010) 361–2, 368–9.

²⁰ On the exclusivity of Athenian citizenship and its close association with eligibility for the priesthoods, see Roy (2014) 244.

²¹ Blok (2009) 167.

²² See Kears (2013) 166–7.

²³ Thuc. 4.67.2–5: Πλαταιῆς τε ψιλοί. See also the Plataeans in Isocrates' *Plataikos* complaining about their poverty (14.48); see below for a more detailed discussion.

²⁴ For the epigraphical evidence see *Ag.* XVII 648 (dated to the 4th c. BCE): Σίμη Θεώνος Πλαταιική Εὐκτέμων Καλλιμάχου Σινοπέ[υς]. 'Sime, daughter of Theon the Plataean, [and] Euktemon, son of Kallimachos of Sinope'. If Sime were the daughter of a citizen, it would make little sense for her to marry a *metoikos* or *xenos*, as Euktemon's *ethnikon* Sinopeus makes clear. She must have held *metoikos* status. This reasonably contradicts Kapparis' somewhat

clearly very protective of their citizenship and went to great lengths to bar foreigners from entering the most sacred offices. It is very reasonable to assume that, initially, only very few Plataeans would have been available and had the means to marry into Athenian families,²⁵ thereby severely restricting the number of new citizens of Plataean descent. Additionally, by opening the offices only for second-generation Plataeans born from an Athenian mother, a sufficient level of integration into the host society would have been guaranteed. Within a few decades, however, at least some Plataeans appear to have achieved some level of financial prosperity: by the early fourth century, some apparently owned slaves,²⁶ and some may also have run cheese-stalls in the *agora*.²⁷ There is subsequently epigraphical evidence for intermarriage with Athenian citizens, which appeared to have continued up until the first century BCE, thereby forming close family ties between the Plataeans and Athenians.²⁸ Indeed, the horrendous losses of Athenian citizens due to the Peloponnesian War as well as the plague may have caused the Athenians to reconsider, at least temporarily, their expectations of a respectable marriage. This may ultimately have contributed to marriages between Athenian citizen women and Plataeans.

Kapparis adds the interesting if somewhat speculative notion that the naturalisation of the Plataeans by the Athenians first and foremost happened for practical reasons: it was the easiest way to integrate the sudden influx of a comparatively large number of people into Athens without alienating them by classing them as *metoikoi*, which could have led to social strife.²⁹ For the Plataeans, who had lost everything due to their loyalty to Athens, this would have been degrading, and the payment of the *metoikoi* tax difficult. Additionally, it may have proved difficult to find so many Athenian citizens to serve as *prostatai* for a large number of new *metoikoi* at such short notice. Indeed, in 427 BCE the Athenians were facing a series of crises, including the renewed bout of the plague as well as the situation at Mytilene, and may have wanted to deal with the Plataean issue as swiftly and efficiently as possible. Most importantly, however, the naturalisation of the Plataeans may have served an additional, more psychological function. The Athenian image among its allies and tribute cities may well have suffered due to the Athenian handling of the revolts of Poteidaia and Mytilene, and the naturalisation of the Plataeans served to present the Athenians as loyal

speculative argument ((1992) 373) that Plataean women and children also received a form of citizenship.

²⁵ Hammond (1992) 147; see also Lape (2010) 254.

²⁶ ‘Middle-class’ citizens and *metoikoi* would have been able to own slaves: see Schumacher (2001) 92–4; Andraeu and Descat (2011) 44–6, 68–9; Hunt (2018) 51–4; Weber (1981) 156–8; for a particularly enlightening discussion see Fisher (2001) 34–57.

²⁷ Lys. 23.6–10; for a more in-depth-discussion on this, see below.

²⁸ e.g., *IG II²* 10087, 10088/9, 10094/5, 10097–102; *SEG XVII* 97.

²⁹ Kapparis (1995) 360–1, 376–8.

protectors of their allies. More significantly, by granting the Plataeans citizenship, the Athenians could allow themselves to feel absolved of guilt. The heavy toll of the plague, as well as the costly and lengthy sieges of Poteidaia and Mytilene, had distracted Athenian attention from the siege of Plataea, and the Athenians' utter failure to provide their loyal Boeotian ally with help may have influenced their decision to naturalise the refugees.³⁰

With regard to the legal status of the Plataeans, the picture presented by the sources is, however, somewhat vague. In his meticulous analysis of *metoikoi* identity in Athens, Matthew Kears points out how ambiguous the status of the Plataeans appears to have been in practice.³¹ The line between Plataeans with citizen and those with *metoikos* status appears to have been blurred to such an extent that even those with Athenian citizenship were still referred to as 'Plataeans', and not by their *demotikon*,³² and citizenship, at any rate, appears to have been difficult to prove.³³ Both Kears and Kapparis make the argument that the Plataeans could thus choose their own level of integration, and that many may indeed have rejected Athenian citizenship

³⁰ Athenian feelings of guilt in this regard are echoed most clearly, and bitterly, by Thucydides; see below for more detailed discussion.

³¹ Kears (2013) 84, 95, 168–71, 204. See also Loraux (1981) 32–3.

³² See, for instance, *SEG XVII 97: Φίλων Ἐλαιεύς. Χρυσάλλης Γρύλλου Πλαταιέως*. 'Philon from Elaious [and] Chrysallis, daughter of Gryllos the Plataean'. Gryllos is clearly referred to as a Plataean; yet he must have been a naturalised Athenian citizen who had wedded an Athenian citizen woman, as his daughter, Chrysallis, wedded the Athenian citizen Philon from the *demos* of Elaious, implying she was a citizen also. Pausanias (1.29.11–2) mentions a grave stele in the Kerameikos listing the fallen of the Sicilian Expedition of 415–413 BCE; he says that 'of the warriors are inscribed the Plataeans together with the citizens' (*γεγραμμένοι δέ εἰσιν [...] τῶν στρατιωτῶν ὁμοῦ τοῖς ἀστοῖς Πλαταιεῖς*). It seems strange that the Athenians would have listed the Plataeans together with, and yet grouped separately from, the Athenian citizens; this further implies the ambiguous status the Plataeans must have held. Other examples of naturalised Plataeans being referred to as 'Plataeans' may be found in *Lys.* 23.1–2, 5–6, 8, 12–13 and possibly also *Aeschin.* 3.162. See also Hammond (1992) 143, 146. Just how blurred the status probably was in practice is implied by a problematic passage in *Lys.* 3.33: Theodotos, a Plataean youth (*Lys.* 3.5: *Θεοδότου, Πλαταιῶκοῦ μαιρακίου*), is to be tortured in order to provide a testimony to the court. Torture of a citizen to obtain a testimony was illegal; Theodotos must therefore have been a *metoikos*. It is quite likely, however, that Lysias is here deliberately using the potentially ambiguous status of the Plataeans in favour of his own argument. In this regard see Kears (2013) 168–9.

³³ Though the Athenians kept lists of their citizens at the level of the *demos*, there appears to have existed no central register. Citizenship appeared to have been based largely upon the consensus of the fellow demesmen, and needed to be reemphasised and reconfirmed regularly, for instance by the means of *dokimasia*; in this regard see Lape (2010) 186–7, 194, 196.

due to their identity as citizens of Plataea and their hope—at least initially—of soon being able to return.³⁴

To summarise: the decree awarding citizenship to the Plataeans was influenced in its inception by two important factors. On the one hand, it was clearly a pragmatic solution to the pressing problem of integrating a large number of newcomers swiftly in a time of crisis, while at the same time safeguarding both the exclusive Athenian citizenship as a whole and the sacred priesthods and the archonship in particular.³⁵ On the other hand, by granting the Plataeans citizenship, the Athenians also had opportunity not only to publicly demonstrate their generosity at a time when Athens' image was tarnished by its mistreatment of its subject cities, but also to salve their own bad conscience at having failed such a loyal ally.

As staunch and long-standing allies of Athens, the Plataeans quite obviously enjoyed a very favourable reputation, which would have contributed to the decision. The decree, however, in practice extended full rights on par with Athenian citizenship only to second-generation children born from marriage between a naturalised Plataean and an Athenian citizen woman. The first-generation naturalised Plataeans thus appear to have had a sort of second-rate citizenship status, while the rest—quite likely a large number including women as well as children not yet of age—almost certainly became *metoikoi*, possibly receiving *ateleia*.³⁶ The second-rate status, together with the granting of citizenship only to a select number of Plataeans, may have been one of the factors which contributed to the maintenance of their cohesion and identity as a separate group within Athenian society. This issue is covered in more detail below, but let us first examine the Athenian portrayal of the Plataeans in Athenian public discourse throughout their exile.

2. The Plataeans in Athenian Contemporary Narratives

Let us now turn to the realm of narrative: the stories told about the Plataeans, both by themselves as well as their Athenian hosts. One aspect common to all contemporary Athenian depictions of the Plataeans—be they histories, court speeches or comedies—is the extremely positive image enjoyed by them in Athens. This is probably largely due to Plataea's long history of alliance with Athens beginning in the late sixth century, and also to Plataean

³⁴ Kapparis (1995) 367–8, 376–7; Kears (2013) 169, 171–2. This hope may have been regularly fed afresh by their colonisation of Skione, 421–404 BCE, and their brief restoration to Plataea, 386–373 BCE.

³⁵ On this matter see Canevaro (2010) 364–5.

³⁶ The Athenians routinely granted *ateleia* to refugee populations in Athens: see, e.g., the Thasians and Mantineians in *IG II²* 33, 5–8. See also Gauthier (1972) 364, who refers to an 'isopolitie exceptionnelle' granted to all the Plataeans collectively, equating it to a 'droit de cité (avec certaines restrictions)'.

loyalty toward Athens: they were the only other Greek *polis* joining the Athenians at Marathon against the Persians,³⁷ as well as losing their city to the Thebans in 427 BCE. Plataea's prominent role during the Persian Wars, along with its function as serving as a place of collective memory for all the Greeks and guardian of the graves of those who had fallen in the defence of Greece, likely reinforced this image.³⁸ Aside from this generally positive depiction, however, the Athenians had a habit of portraying the Plataeans as victims. The destruction of Plataea at the hands of the Thebans as well as Athenian generosity in accepting the Plataean refugees and granting them citizenship feature prominently in several contemporary texts. In nigh all cases, the lot of the Plataeans is used by the author to generate emotions of compassion as well as outrage, most often with an agenda aiming to discriminate against or discredit a third party or present the Athenians themselves in a particularly positive light.

Let us begin with Thucydides. In his famous Plataean Debate, Thucydides has those Plataeans who had remained behind to defend the city—who ultimately surrendered to the besieging Lacedaemonians—debate their antagonists, the Thebans, in an attempt to save themselves from execution. The Plataean arguments, based largely on appeals to past glories earned during the wars against Persia, ultimately fail to impress the Lacedaemonians, and after hearing the Thebans, the Plataeans are executed, the captured women enslaved, and the city razed shortly thereafter.³⁹ Rachel Bruzzone has convincingly shown that Thucydides here uses his portrayal of the atrocity committed against the Plataeans as an example of how the past can be ignored in favour of expediency.⁴⁰ Implicitly, Thucydides thereby criticises the Lacedaemonians and Thebans for their actions while at the same time adding to the drama of his narrative of the Peloponnesian War.⁴¹ The arguments which Thucydides puts into the mouths of the Plataeans betray a very strong use of what Hans-Joachim Gehrke has termed 'intentional history': the historical narratives that are crucial to the self-conception of a group.⁴² There is a strong case to be made

³⁷ Hdt. 6.108, 111.1–2. See Christ (2012) 146–7; Hammond (1992) 144.

³⁸ Bruzzone (2015) 290, 293, 295–6; Kalliontzis (2014) 342–4; Steinbock (2013) 121–2, 127–30; Pelling (2000) 61; Cogan (1981) 15; Macleod (1977) 229, 231, 241. On the sacrosanctity of Plataea declared by Pausanias after the Battle of Plataea, see Thuc. 2.71.2–3; Hammond (1992) 145–6. For an in-depth examination of remembrance in regard to the Battle of Plataea see Jung (2006) 225–95.

³⁹ Thuc. 3.52–68. For the weakness of the Plataean arguments see Cogan (1981) 15; Macleod (1977) 229, 231.

⁴⁰ Bruzzone (2015) 289–300; see also MacLeod (1977) 241.

⁴¹ See Pelling (2000) 68.

⁴² Gehrke (2007) 93–4; id. (2010) 15–16.

that these arguments actually reflect Plataean self-perception,⁴³ as I discuss below. It is however equally likely, and indeed probable, that Thucydides echoed Athenian opinions on the matter. Perhaps the most interesting point, however, is that Thucydides appears implicitly to criticise the Athenians themselves. Though they had no direct part in the destruction of Plataea, it was their very inaction which doomed their loyal allies. Thucydides never openly states this; however, he does end his description of the destruction of Plataea with a particularly bitter note: ‘And thus ended the business at Plataea in the ninety-third year after they had become allies of Athens’.⁴⁴ By emphasising the length of the alliance, the author points out the enduring loyalty the Plataeans had exhibited as well as the trust they had placed in Athens, while at the same time demonstrating the Athenians’ failure to live up to that very trust.⁴⁵ Thucydides briefly touches upon this again in his Book 5; he describes how the Athenians, after having destroyed the city of Skione in the Chalkidike, killing the men of age and enslaving the women and children, gave the land thus acquired to the Plataeans to colonise.⁴⁶ Though Thucydides does not go into any detail, there are nonetheless glaring similarities to the destruction of Plataea. The Athenians committed the very same crime against the Skionaian which the Thebans and Lacedaemonians had committed against the Plataeans, only to then give the destroyed city to the latter; this bitter irony would not have escaped his audience. It is quite likely that the Athenians were actually attempting to make good their earlier failure to help the Plataeans by giving them new land to settle, something which his mostly Athenian audience would have been aware of and which is echoed more directly by Diodorus: ‘[A]nd [the Athenians] gave the island to the Plataeans to live in, as it was on account of the Athenians that they had

⁴³ Thucydides quite likely had opportunity to interview Plataean refugees, either before, after, or indeed during his exile (by visiting Skione in the Chalkidike, where at least some Plataeans had by then been settled); in this regard see Hornblower (2007) 143.

⁴⁴ Thuc. 3.68.5: *καὶ τὰ μὲν κατὰ Πλάταιαν ἔτει τρίτῳ καὶ ἐνενηκοστῷ ἐπειδὴ Ἀθηναίων σύμμαχοι ἐγένοντο οὕτως ἐτελεύτησεν*. In this regard see Hornblower (2007) 143.

⁴⁵ Badian (1989) 97 makes the valuable observation that the evacuation of the bulk of the population of Plataea to Athens effectively turned them into hostages, forcing the Plataeans to hold out and not give in to Theban and Lacedaemonian demands, while at the same time making a formal promise for aid which they never provided: see Thuc. 2.73. Conceivably the Athenians, originally at least, may have had somewhat darker motives for the evacuation of the Plataean population to Athens, thereby precluding a Plataean capitulation to the Thebans and forcing them to hold on. Hornblower (2007) 141–4 and West (2003) 442 argue that sending military aid to the besieged Plataeans would have been a significant challenge for the Athenians and might, at any rate, not have made much strategic sense. Indeed, Hornblower notes that the Athenians may even have had some religious or political reservations which contributed to their not lending more aid to their ally. This, however, in no way rules out that the Athenians may have subsequently felt guilt at not having provided help, especially after the horrible fate of those Plataeans who surrendered.

⁴⁶ Thuc. 5.32.1; compare D.S. 12.76.3; Arr. *Anab.* 1.9.5. See Christ (2012) 154; Konecny–Aravantinos–Marchese (2013) 31.

been originally driven from their homeland'.⁴⁷ Though subtle, in his description of this episode Thucydides not only levels criticism at the Athenians for the crimes they had committed, but also indirectly points out their concomitant feelings of guilt. The execution of the Plataeans by the Lacedaemonians and Thebans may have drawn significant contemporary attention and indeed condemnation;⁴⁸ as such, the Athenians may have been forced to reflect upon their role in the whole affair. It is these feelings of guilt, together with the practical question of integrating a large number of refugees, which best explain the ease and swiftness with which the Athenians granted the Plataeans citizenship. Additionally, when taken into consideration, this guilt puts the later Athenian narratives surrounding the Plataeans into a somewhat different and interesting perspective.

Thucydides mentions the Plataeans only three times after his Plataean Debate (Thuc. 4.67; 5.32; 7.57). In his description of the Athenian *strategos* Demosthenes' attack on Nisaia in 424 BCE, the author has a unit of Plataean light-armed warriors accompany the general. The Plataeans heroically storm the gates, holding them until Athenian reinforcements arrive (4.67.2–5). This further hints at Thucydides' admiration of the Plataeans and, by implication, the positive image they enjoyed in Athens. This sentiment is also echoed in a passage in the contemporary comedy *Frogs* by Aristophanes, performed in 405 BCE: 'For it is disgraceful that those who have taken part in but one naval engagement should now be Plataeans and thus masters instead of slaves'.⁴⁹ Here, the *choros* laments that slaves serving on Athenian warships in but a single naval battle now demand the same rights as those awarded to the Plataeans—implying that the Plataeans were far more deserving of the exclusive Athenian citizenship and enjoyed a positive image, especially when compared to other social and ethnic minority groups.⁵⁰ Due to the horrendous losses of skilled rowers during the Sicilian Expedition 415–413 BCE, it appears the Athenians in the subsequent 'Dekeleian' war made increased and extensive use of slaves and *metoikoi* to fill the rowing banks on the warships in exchange for freedom (in the case of the slaves) and possibly also naturalisation. It is in this context that this passage needs to be read.⁵¹ It

⁴⁷ D.S. 12.76.3: τὴν δὲ νῆσον οἰκεῖν παρέδοσαν τοῖς Πλαταιεῶσιν, ἐκπεπτωκόσι δι' ἐκείνους ἐκ τῆς πατρίδος.

⁴⁸ See Xen. *Hell.* 6.3.5; Isoc. 12.92–4, 14.62; Dem. 16.25; see also later sources such as Plut. *Arist.* 21.5. See Panov's point in his contribution to this volume that ancient sensibilities may have been forerunners of our own, for which the condemnation of the atrocity against the Plataeans serves as an example.

⁴⁹ Ar. *Ran.* 686–94, at 693–4: καὶ γὰρ αἰσχρόν ἐστι τοὺς μὲν ναυμαχῆσαντας μίαν καὶ Πλαταιᾶς εὐθὺς εἶναι κἀντὶ δούλων δεσπότης.

⁵⁰ See Kears (2013) 174–6.

⁵¹ For ancient sources indicating this, see Hellanikos of Lesbos, *FGrHist* 323a F 25; Xen. *Hell.* 1.6.24; D.S. 13.97.1. See also Hammond (1992) 147–50, in which the author makes the rather unconvincing and speculative suggestion that the citizenship in question is, in fact, not the Athenian, but rather the *Plataean*—and that the Athenians accordingly granted the

makes clear that the Athenians were perfectly capable of discrimination against minority groups, even when they needed them, yet that the unique circumstances under which the Plataeans came to Athens as refugees ensured a favourable opinion toward them on the part of their hosts.

At this point, it is worth drawing a comparison between Thucydides' account and a later one, written several decades after the events. In the mid-fourth century BCE, an orator—probably Apollodorus—wrote the court speech *Against Neaira*. In it, he dwells extensively not only on the topic of the naturalisation of the Plataeans mentioned above, but also on the siege of Plataea and how the Plataeans came to Athens. As in the passage in Aristophanes' *Frogs*, the Plataeans are used to discriminate against a third party—in this case the aforementioned supposed courtesan, Neaira, accused of having been fraudulently passed off as a citizen woman.⁵² The orator goes into great detail in describing the siege of Plataea and the escape of a part of the garrison. He apparently used Thucydides' account as one of his sources;⁵³ however, the two authors also differ on a variety of points, the most prominent being these:⁵⁴ in Apollodorus, the attack is instigated by the Lacedaemonians ([Dem.] 59.98), whereas in Thucydides it is the Thebans. The Plataeans who let the initial group of Theban warriors into the city were bribed and not oligarchs trying to overthrow the democracy as portrayed in Thucydides ([Dem.] 59.99; Thuc. 2.2.2). In Apollodorus, the Theban army withdraws from Plataea when they see the Athenian army approaching, and not because the Plataeans threaten to execute their Theban prisoners ([Dem.] 59.100; Thuc. 2.5.5–6, 6.4). Apollodorus has two thirds of the entire Peloponnesian levy, in addition to all the Boeotians and some Thessalian tribes,⁵⁵ besiege Plataea, whereas Thucydides mentions these in the broader context of the war, not in regard to the siege ([Dem.] 59.101; Thuc. 2.9.2, 10.2). When making the break-out attempt, Apollodorus has the Plataeans draw straws, whereas Thucydides mentions that half of them remained

slaves Plataean citizenship. His argument relies on the assumption that the term Πλαταιᾶς is to be taken strictly as referring to citizens of Plataea. He also assumes that this arrangement of granting Athenian slaves Plataean citizenship goes back all the way to the battle of Marathon, where slaves and Plataeans were allegedly interred together. I find this unconvincing. As pointed out above, the term 'Plataean' could be applied rather loosely to any person belonging to the Plataean community, regardless of whether they were Athenian citizen or *metoikos*, and regardless of whether they were born in Plataea or were second- or third-generation exiles in Athens. It makes most sense to interpret Aristophanes' Πλαταιᾶς as a reference to those Plataeans who had received Athenian citizenship; this also best fits the context of the speech made by the *choros*.

⁵² See Steinbock (2013) 126.

⁵³ Kears (2013) 167 n. 62; Pelling (2000) 62–4; Trevett (1990) 407, 411.

⁵⁴ Pelling (2000) 62–4; Trevett (1990) 412–4.

⁵⁵ Trevett (1990) 416 has argued convincingly that the portrayal of the Thessalian tribes as allies of Sparta is, in fact, a reflection of the political situation of the early fourth century, falsely projected to an earlier date.

behind because they were terrified;⁵⁶ and Apollodorus subsequently has Plataea fall heroically when the besieging army storms it, while Thucydides says the garrison surrendered due to starvation ([Dem.] 59.103; Thuc. 3.52–68). Apollodorus also claims the siege lasted ten years, which is clearly incorrect,⁵⁷ and omits the Theban attempt to bring Plataea into the Boeotian *koinon* peacefully, and that the Plataeans initially agreed to it (Thuc. 2.2.4, 3.1); nor does he mention the Plataean pledge not to execute their Theban prisoners (Thuc. 2.5). Additionally, while he does mention—in passing—that the women and children were enslaved,⁵⁸ ‘all save those who, when they beheld the advancing Lacedaemonians, slipped away to Athens’, he in the very next sentence emphasises how the Plataeans had lost all of their possessions, their wives, and their children, thereby possibly also implying that only those 212 who fled received citizenship, focusing on the heroism and suffering of a small portion of the Plataean population while ignoring the rest.⁵⁹ Compare this to Thucydides, who says that the entire population was evacuated save the garrison that was left behind.⁶⁰ In regard to the Persian Wars, Apollodorus also has the Plataeans fighting and dying together with the Lacedaemonians at Thermopylae, mentioning that they were the only Boeotians to stand against the Persians when this clearly contradicts the account of Herodotus, who does not mention the Plataeans at that battle, but instead has Thebans and Thespians fighting there;⁶¹ and he has them serving on the ships at Salamis, which also contradicts Herodotus and Thucydides, who mention them at Artemision only (Hdt. 8.1.1, 44.1; Thuc. 3.54.4).

This detailed comparison makes evident a key difference between the two variants of the narrative. Apollodorus paints a picture of a brave and noble people, having endured immense pain and suffering while at the same time heroically fighting not only for their own independence, but for the freedom

⁵⁶ [Dem.] 59.103; Thuc. 3.20.2. In this regard, Gomme (1956) 283–4 points out that Apollodorus’ version here is more believable than Thucydides’; it seems far more likely that the Plataeans consciously decided to send half their force to Athens in order to make the food supplies last longer. This, indeed, implies that those remaining behind did so out of dedication and bravery, which is more consistent with their later defiance during the Plataean Debate than if they had remained behind out of terror.

⁵⁷ [Dem.] 59.102; see Trevett (1990) 414–15.

⁵⁸ [Dem.] 59.103. Thucydides (3.68.3), by contrast, mentions only women, not children. It is entirely plausible that children were born during the siege of Plataea; five hundred men sharing a limited amount of space with a mere hundred women for some two years may well have produced offspring.

⁵⁹ [Dem.] 59.103–4. ὅσοι μὴ αἰσθόμενοι ἐπιόντας τοὺς Λακεδαιμονίους ὑπεξήλθον Ἀθήναζε.

⁶⁰ It must be pointed out, though, that even Thucydides in his more nuanced version of the story does draw a disproportionate amount of attention to the select few Plataeans who remained behind to hold the city, be they those who fled or those who were eventually executed.

⁶¹ [Dem.] 59. 95; Hdt. 7.202, 222; see Steinbock (2013) 134–40; Trevett (1990) 408–9.

of all the Greeks, all the while loyally standing as allies of Athens. He also downplays or ignores the atrocities and alleged oathbreaking committed by the Plataeans. This, of course, serves his purpose: to present a positive picture to contrast the negative one he paints of Neaira.⁶²

An evolution of the image of the Plataeans, as well as the corresponding narrative, is apparent. When Thucydides wrote his story, the lot of the Plataeans was largely overshadowed by the Athenians' own suffering in the course of the war and the plague, and the political turmoil directly following the end of the war, and may not have attracted quite as much attention. Additionally, while Thucydides clearly has a favourable opinion of the Plataeans, he does point out their flaws, especially the massacre of the Theban prisoners as well as the breach of their alleged oath to spare them. As pointed out by Stephanie West and Simon Hornblower, this issue was clearly uncomfortable to Thucydides himself.⁶³ He makes the unusual choice to imply that there are conflicting versions of the story, the Thebans' claiming that the Plataeans had sworn an oath to spare the prisoners, something the Plataeans themselves subsequently denied.⁶⁴ The image Thucydides paints is thus nuanced. By contrast, the alleged Plataean oathbreaking as well as their execution of the Theban prisoners is downplayed or ignored outright by later authors. By the time Apollodorus told the story of the Plataeans, the narrative had been modified and dramatised, and was frequently used to discriminate against others or to further one's political agenda. The latter usage is nowhere more apparent than in Isocrates' *Plataikos* and *Panathenaikos*.

Much like his contemporary Apollodorus, Isocrates tells a story of Plataean heroism, loyalty, dedication, and suffering. Isocrates' political agenda is decidedly anti-Theban at a time when there was much debate in Athens on whether to side with Sparta against Thebes, with whom Athens was at the time allied.⁶⁵ The subjugations of Plataea and Thespiiai by Thebes were major factors and often debated.⁶⁶ In his *Plataikos*, Isocrates has the Plataeans make an emotional plea to the Athenians, repeatedly emphasising the many hardships they had suffered at the hands of the Thebans (Isoc. 14.1–2, 4, 7, 22). They also mention the misery of exile, complaining about the difficulty of making a living, adequately caring for their elderly or properly educating their children (Isoc. 14.48). They then go on to remind the Athenians that, by right of intermarriage, they are now bound to the Athenians by blood (Isoc. 14.51–2), before emphasising their role as the sole

⁶² [Dem.] 59.107; see Steinbock (2013) 126; Trevett (1990) 407–8.

⁶³ Hornblower (2007) 138–9, 144; West (2003) 438–9.

⁶⁴ Thuc. 2.4–2.6. In this regard see Hornblower (2007) 144–5; Pelling (2000) 62–4; see also Mackil (2013a) 39–40.

⁶⁵ See Steinbock (2013) 121–2, 123–6.

⁶⁶ Dem. 16.4; see Steinbock (2013) 125–6.

Boeotians to have stood with Athens in the wars against the Persians.⁶⁷ Like Apollodorus, in his *Panathenaikos*, Isocrates focuses on those few Plataeans who fled from the siege, and does not even mention the thousands of women, children, and elderly who were also evacuated according to Thucydides: ‘[...T]he Lacedaemonians, showing favour to the Thebans, after besieging them slew them all, save those who were able to escape’.⁶⁸ To this portrayal, full of pathos, the author adds praise of the Athenians for having so generously accepted the Plataeans and given them citizenship (Isoc. 12.94; 14.1, 51–2). It is interesting to note how far the narrative has developed from Thucydides’ comparatively sober description. The focus lies, more and more, on the outrageous suffering and injustice done to the Plataeans. In this case, the emphasis placed on the repeated atrocities committed by the Thebans against their neighbour served Isocrates’ anti-Theban agenda. In addition, it becomes evident that, as time passes, the number of the Plataeans also seems to diminish in the narrative, as the Plataean population which was evacuated is ignored in favour of the heroic few who fled from the siege—thereby increasing the pathos and drama of the narrative.

The portrayals in both Apollodorus and in Isocrates match the Athenian mentality at the time, which envisioned the Athenians as humble protectors of their allies from enemy aggression, as well as kind and generous hosts to oppressed peoples.⁶⁹ Much time had passed since the glorious days of Athens’ hegemony, as well as the many atrocities committed by them: the Athenians could now allow themselves to indulge in tales of Athenian generosity toward loyal allies at a time when Athens was struggling to maintain its dominant place in Greece in the face of Spartan and, later, increasing Macedonian aggression.⁷⁰ The presence of the Plataean refugees over many decades constantly reminded the Athenians of their past transgressions as well as their failure to help their allies; however it also provided the Athenians with opportunities to construct an identity which envisioned them as generous and kind toward their allies—with the Plataeans, who had become an integral part of Athenian society, ironically serving as living proof thereof.

⁶⁷ Isoc. 14.57; see also Isoc. 12.93. This statement is inaccurate, as Thespiiai (Hdt. 7.202) and possibly Haliartos (Paus. 9.32.4) also appear to have opposed the Persians.

⁶⁸ Isoc. 12.93: [...] Λακεδαιμόνιοι, χαριζόμενοι Θηβαίοις, ἐκπολιορκήσαντες ἅπαντας ἀπέκτειναν πλὴν τῶν ἀποδρᾶναι δυνηθέντων.

⁶⁹ For further examples of Athenian self-perception as being generous and kind toward the oppressed, see also Xen. *Hell.* 6.5.45; Isoc. 4.52; 12.241; 15.300; Aeschin. 3.134; Dem. 20.3, 64, 109; 25.89; Lycurg. 85; Lys. 2.20–3; Plut. *Pel.* 6.3; *Cim.* 10.5; *Demetr.* 22.1; this view apparently also extended into the stories the Athenians told of their city’s mythistorical past, see Hdt. 9.27.2; Soph. *OC* 260–2, 566–9, 1124–7; Eur. *Supp.* 1176–9; *Herac.* 304–33; Isoc. 4.54–6; 12.168–71; Lys. 2.7–16; and was sometimes indeed judged detrimental to the city’s interests: see Pl. *Menex.* 244e; Andoc. 3.28. For discussions on the Athenian claim to kindness and generosity see de Romilly (1979) 97–112; in oratory see Christ (2013); and for the limits of Athenian altruism, see Christ (2012).

⁷⁰ See Pelling (2000) 67.

Thus, what may have begun as a psychological mechanism for coping with guilt was ultimately exploited in a wholly different manner, starkly shaping and being shaped by the narratives the Athenians told about themselves.

One particularly interesting case of an evolving narrative is the story of the battle of Marathon. Herodotus tells us that the only Greek allies to come to the Athenians' aid at that battle were the Plataeans, who arrived with their entire levy.⁷¹ As a sign of immense gratitude, from that year onward the Athenians, whenever they celebrated the Panathenaia every four years, had their herald pray for good fortune for the Athenians and Plataeans together (Hdt. 6.111.2). Nonetheless, within just a few decades, in a classic case of intentional history, the Athenians had spun a new narrative: that they had faced the might of Darius' army entirely on their own, effectively writing the Plataeans out of the tale, thereby emphasising the image of Athenian exceptionalism.⁷² The reason for this lies, undoubtedly, in the biased nature of the sources in question, in which Athenian exceptionalism is pushed for political reasons; over time, however, this tendency appears to have become widespread in Athenian society. Accordingly, Marathon features neither in Thucydides' Plataean Debate, nor in Isocrates' *Plataikos*, in which one might expect them. However, there is evidence of an alternative narrative which existed alongside this one, in which the Plataean role at Marathon is remembered. This is most markedly exemplified in Apollodorus: in *Against Neaira*, he begins his story of Plataean noble deeds with the battle of Marathon, also mentioning a painting depicting the battle in the *Stoa Poikile* which supposedly also pictured some Plataean warriors, identifiable by their Boeotian helmets.⁷³ Despite the passage of one-and-a-half centuries, the Plataean role at Marathon had not entirely been forgotten, and it is reasonable to assume that the Plataeans had their own historical narratives, which they brought with them to Athens and which influenced those told by the Athenians. This is hinted at in the fact that the Plataeans apparently celebrated the memory of Arimnestos, who commanded their forces at both Marathon and Plataea during the Persian Wars; in later times, Pausanias records that the Plataeans had set up a statue of the man in the temple of

⁷¹ Hdt. 6.108.1: ἐπῆλθον βοηθέοντες Πλαταιέες πανδημί.

⁷² See, e.g., Lys. 2.20; Plat. *Menex.* 240c; Dem. 60.10; Thuc. 1.73.4; this indeed already occurs in a speech given by the Athenians in Hdt. 9.27.5, contradicting (intentionally or not) the author's earlier depiction of the battle. See also Christ (2012) 146–7; Steinbock (2013) 141–2. Jung (2006) 160–3 also points out how the battles of Plataea and Thermopylae were marginalised in Athenian narratives in favour of Marathon and Salamis, in which the Athenians featured most prominently. Indeed, by the late fifth and early fourth century BCE many Athenians were unable to even distinguish between the two Persian invasions of 490 and 480 BCE; see, e.g., Andoc. 1.108.

⁷³ [Dem.] 59.94; see Steinbock (2013) 127–30, 134–40, Trevett (1990) 408–9. The helmet may possibly be the one mentioned by Xenophon in Xen. *Hipp.* 12.3.

Athena Areia in their city.⁷⁴ Jeremy Trevett has made the valuable point that the narrative peddled by Apollodoros may have been extensively influenced by popular tradition and, possibly, by the works of other historians now lost to us. It is tempting—if somewhat speculative—to associate the enigmatic contemporary historian Daimachos of Plataea, of whose works only fragments remain, with these narratives.⁷⁵ Public discourse, here, is characterised by the heavy use of arguments taken from collective social memory of both the Athenians as well as the Plataeans;⁷⁶ when formulated as intentional history, these arguments serve the purpose of forming and legitimising group identity. As John Gillis put it: ‘The core meaning of any individual or group identity, namely, a sense of sameness over time and space, is sustained by remembering; and what is remembered is defined by the assumed identity’.⁷⁷ The fact that Apollodoros apparently felt confident enough to go against the prevailing Athenian narrative which emphasised their exceptionalism implies that the Plataean version of the story was known and taken seriously. The long history of alliance between the two cities, as well as the tragedy which had befallen the Plataeans not least due to Athenian inaction, was a strong enough factor to make the Athenians take a humble step back and question their established tales of heroism. That the Athenians were, by implication, prepared to accommodate the Plataeans not just as refugees, but also in their stories so crucial to their *polis* identity, is a stark indicator of how disproportionately influential the presence of the small Plataean community was in shaping Athenian society.

The Athenian portrayal of the Plataeans thus served multiple functions. Aside from using the example of the Plataeans to discriminate against other groups, the Athenian portrayal of the Plataeans also appears to have served as a collective psychological coping mechanism as well as a catalyst in the evolution in Athenian collective identity. The ongoing presence of Plataean refugees in Athens served as a perpetual reminder not only of Theban and Lacedaemonian atrocities, but also of which lot could befall Athens herself were she to fall to the enemy. Perhaps more uncomfortably, it also reminded

⁷⁴ Paus. 9.4.2; see Hdt. 9.72.2; Plut. *Arist.* 11.5–6. In this regard, see the interesting point made by Yates (2019) 170–80, that the Plataean historical narratives hinted at in the temple emphasise civil strife between fellow Greeks rather than the conflict with the barbarian ‘other’, thus differing from Athenian narratives which favoured the latter focus.

⁷⁵ See Daimachos, *FGrHist*, no. 65; Trevett (1990) 411, 415–7. See Thuc. 3.20.1, in which the author mentions Eupompidas, son of Daimachos, as one of the commanders of the Plataeans who broke out of the siege and fled to Athens. Given Greek naming conventions of naming children after their grandparents, it is entirely plausible that Eupompidas may have had a son named Daimachos, and to associate this son with Daimachos of Plataea. This would have made Daimachos an extremely valuable source of information. Trevett, however, fails to consider the possibility that Thucydides may also have used Daimachos as a source.

⁷⁶ Steinbock (2013) 121–2, 123–5, 127–30.

⁷⁷ Gillis (1994) 3.

them of the many atrocities the Athenians themselves had committed against other cities as mentioned above, as well as their failure to help a loyal ally.⁷⁸ In the words of Christopher Pelling: ‘No wonder [Plataea’s] destruction lived on in the Athenian memory, a scar in the popular historical consciousness, a perpetual reproach to Thebes and Sparta and an emblem of the horrors of war’.⁷⁹ After Thucydides’ subtle—or perhaps not-so-subtle—criticism of Athenian foreign policy and the crimes they had committed, in the fourth century Athenian authors would increasingly focus their criticism on the Thebans and Lacedaemonians, thereby glossing over their own city’s crimes. Emphasising the gross injustice committed against the Plataeans by others likely helped downplay their own failures. Psychologically speaking, by emphasising Athens’ generosity toward the deserving Plataeans in their narratives, the Athenians could thus allow themselves to alleviate their own bad conscience.

3. Plataean Refugee Community Collective Identities: Construction and Maintenance

We have seen how the ambiguous legal status of the Plataeans in Athens as well as the various narratives in which they featured influenced both their own and Athenian identity and contributed to Plataean group cohesion. For the Plataeans, there must have been considerable tension between the desire and need to assimilate on the one hand, and to maintain distinct Plataean and Boeotian identities on the other.⁸⁰ In the final portion of this paper, I will accordingly attempt to draw some conclusions with regard to Plataean group identity during their exile in Athens, and how their lot as refugees shaped it.

The Decree of Naturalisation presented in Apollodorus makes clear that, even in the case of the Plataeans, the Athenians were reluctant to yield too much control over their citizenship and their city’s institutions. Indeed, Apollodorus himself, son of a freedman and a naturalised citizen, probably felt the stigma surrounding naturalised citizens who overreached in regard to taking part in the city’s political life.⁸¹ This likely strengthened Plataean group cohesion. There are strong indications that the Plataeans actively

⁷⁸ Steinbock (2013) 123, 126, 323–6. There has long been speculation that Euripides’ *Trojan Women* was written as a reaction to Athens’ brutal subjugation of Melos in 416 BCE. On this matter see Panov’s comments in his contribution to this volume.

⁷⁹ Pelling (2000) 61.

⁸⁰ Kears (2013) 171–2.

⁸¹ E.g., Dem. 50.26; see Lape (2010) 216–8. It needs to be pointed out, however, that there is no evidence in the ancient sources implying that the Plataeans suffered from stigmatisation at the hands of their host society. Nonetheless, the sources mention no Plataeans in prominent political offices during their exile in Athens, implying that they may have been *de facto* marginalised despite the positive image they enjoyed.

maintained a distinct community within Athenian society which likely transcended the *metoikos*/citizen divide, to encompass all the Plataeans—which is perhaps one of the reasons why the Athenians always called them ‘Plataeans’, regardless of whether they were Athenian citizens or not.⁸² The method by which the Plataeans expressed their group identity was by means of various public statements—*acts of identity*—which stressed their group cohesion, their status in Athenian society, and their identity as ethnic Boeotians.

The earliest indicator for the maintenance of a group identity comes from a group of grave *stelai* from the Kerameikos, found in a common context, identified as Plataean and dated to the late 5th c. BCE.⁸³ The *stelai* feature a number of names, some of which are clearly Boeotian in form,⁸⁴ while others are apparently uncommon in Attika yet common in Boeotia.⁸⁵ As is common in Boeotian grave inscriptions throughout the Classical period, only the personal name of the buried person is inscribed,⁸⁶ which differs from the Athenian practice that was coming into increased use during this time, in which often not only the name, but also the *patronymikon* and sometimes the *demotikon* are inscribed. All but one of the names are written in the Boeotian alphabet and carved somewhat roughly into the rock.⁸⁷ Most interestingly, one *stèle* contains the fragmentary name of a woman, [...]ΣΤΡΑΤΕ, written in the Attic dialect and alphabet.⁸⁸ It is tempting to identify this woman as an Athenian citizen woman who had married a Plataean. The fact that she was buried along with the Plataeans, yet that differing alphabets were used, suggests that the Plataeans made a specific point of setting up their own grave *stelai* and using their own alphabet and burial practices to reinforce their identity as a distinct group.⁸⁹ The grouping of the graves thus emphasised their own *polis* identity, while the use of the Boeotian alphabet clearly identified them as belonging to the Boeotian *ethnos*. At the same time, the

⁸² Hammond (1992) 143, 146.

⁸³ *IG I³* 1363a–h; see Blok (2009) 167 n. 109; Lewis–Jeffery (1993) 857–8.

⁸⁴ *IG I³* 1363a (Thoga), d (Theomnastos and Nikostrata), f (Pherenika). These names feature the Boeotian long A instead of Attic H.

⁸⁵ *IG I³* 1363b (Dorkion and Kallis), c (Konto); see Blok (2009) 167 n. 109.

⁸⁶ See, e.g., the magnificent late 5th-century grave *stelai* of Mnason, Rhynchon, and Saugenes (*SEG II* 187 (a–b), 189). For further examples from the fifth century see, e.g., *SEG II* 193–5, 200, 201, 203, 205, 212, 216–20, 222, 223. For examples from the fourth century, which prove that this practice continued in Boeotia throughout the Classical period, see, e.g., *SEG II* 204, 206, 207, 210, 211, 221. For a rare exception listing the deceased’s place of origin see, e.g., *SEG II* 209.

⁸⁷ See Hondius (1925) 126–30. The poor quality of the inscriptions, incidentally, could serve as evidence for the financial destitution the Plataeans initially faced.

⁸⁸ *IG I³* 1363h; see Hondius (1925) 126–30.

⁸⁹ Regarding the use of dialects and writing systems as markers of ethnic identity, see Hall (1997) 143, 146–7, 153, 179.

stelai indicate that some Plataeans wedded Athenian, others Plataean women,⁹⁰ possibly confirming that some Plataeans likely held *metoikos* status, yet that they apparently placed emphasis on maintaining group cohesion despite the disparity in legal status, accordingly burying their dead together. This prioritisation of the group over the actual difference in terms of legal/social status further hints at the somewhat ambiguous status of the Plataeans.

That the Plataeans made efforts to be seen as a distinct, cohesive group is also evident from the textual sources. In the aforementioned passage from Thucydides describing the attack on Nisaia, the author specifically mentions the Plataeans as a distinct military unit of light-armed troops, fighting alongside Athenian light-armed *peripoloi* (Thuc. 4.67.2–5). This implies that both the Plataeans themselves as well as the Athenians saw the Plataeans as a distinct group, regardless of their legal status.⁹¹ This is further confirmed in a speech by Lysias, dated to the early 4th century. In *Against Pankleon*, Lysias charges a man named Pankleon with posing as an Athenian citizen of Plataean descent. The orator first disproves Pankleon's claim as being registered in the *demos* of Dekeleia by having the accuser interview the Dekeleians in the city (Lys. 23.2–4). He then also disproves the man's Plataean descent, interestingly, by first having the accuser speak to the eldest of the Plataeans, Euthykritos, then to all the Plataeans he knows personally, asking whether they know the man (Lys. 23.5–6). After confirming that they

⁹⁰ Later *stelai* from the fourth century further confirm this: see *IG II²* 10096: Plangon and her father Tolmides, both Plataeans, were buried together; and *SEG XVII* 97: Chrysallis the Plataean wedded an Athenian citizen from Elaious. Apparently, some Plataean women also wedded *metoikoi* (or *xenoi*) not of Plataean descent, see *Ag. XVII* 648: Sime the Plataean wedded a man from Sinope.

⁹¹ In this regard, see the intriguing case of an unpublished inscription from Plataea listing those men who had fallen in a campaign at Olynthos in the Chalkidike. Yannis Kalliontzis rediscovered the *stèle* originally found in 1924 and wrote a paper (2014) in which he analyses it. The *stèle* merely states 'In Olynthos', then listing the names of the fallen, with no *patronymika*. The names are in themselves intriguing, with three (Asopon, Asopillos, and Asopolaos) incorporating the name of the river Asopos, closely associated with Plataea. Most interestingly, the name Asopolaos is otherwise only known from Thucydides' Plataean Debate (Kalliontzis (2014) 337–8; see Thuc. 3.52.5). The *stèle* is dated to the 1st c. BCE; however, it is clearly a copy of a list referring to a campaign at some point in the 4th c. (Kalliontzis (2014) 338–40). There is a remote chance that the men fell in an otherwise unknown battle against the Olynthians during the Plataeans' colonisation of Skione in the late 5th c. BCE. More probably, however, the men were in fact part of an Athenian force sent to support Olynthos against the king of Macedon in the mid-4th c. BCE. Either way, the fallen must almost certainly originally have been listed on a *stèle* in Athens, now lost, and then copied by the Plataeans after their return to Plataea. This implies that they were probably listed separately, much in the manner Pausanias (1.29.11–2) describes for a different *stèle* listing the dead of the Sicilian Expedition. Whether the Plataeans in this campaign were fielded as a separate unit, or whether merely their dead were listed separately, it appears that both the Plataeans and the Athenians clearly thought of them as a distinct group within Athenian society.

do not, the Plataeans finally advise the accuser to ‘go to the fresh cheese’ at the market on the last day of the month, since on that day the Plataeans always congregated there; there he would receive ‘the most accurate information’.⁹²

Multiple points are of note here. Firstly, this interesting passage provides us with an example of the practical application of the rules laid down in the Plataean Decree later mentioned in Apollodorus’ *Against Neaira*. The fact that Pankleon claimed to have been registered in the *demos* of Dekeleia confirms that the Plataeans were distributed amongst the demes and tribes. That he was able to successfully pose as an Athenian citizen of Plataean descent at least for a time (assuming he actually was a fraud) implies that even the strict rules laid down in the decree could, and were, exploited, confirming that the Athenian reservations in this regard were not unfounded.

Secondly, the fact that the accuser first asks the eldest of the Plataeans, then goes to their regular meeting-place, implies that they maintained a tight community bound by social networks in which they kept track of each other and knew exactly who was a member of their group and who was not. Additionally, the accuser is claimed to have known a number of Plataeans personally, suggesting that they were likely a relatively prominent, visible and well-integrated group within Athenian society.

Thirdly, the fact that the Plataeans congregate at a specific public place at regular intervals is telling. While Lysias does not go on to say why they do this, and it is impossible to know with any degree of certainty the exact intention behind this regular meeting, we can make some reasonable assumptions. This little Plataean ‘ritual’ likely served the purpose of networking and keeping track of the members of their group, as well as providing social support and an opportunity to discuss issues concerning the group, regardless of their legal status within Athenian society.⁹³ Constituting an *act of identity*, it probably also strengthened group cohesion and helped maintain their group identity. However, the fact that the Plataeans decided to meet at a public place likely to be frequented by Athenian citizens⁹⁴ betrays a second important function: intended or not, it served a public statement to the Athenians as a cohesive group on a regular basis. This would not only provide a small measure of political and social leverage but, perhaps more importantly, would also reaffirm their privileged status: by

⁹² Lys. 23.6: ἀκριβέστατα ἂν ἔφασάν με πυθέσθαι ἐλθόντα εἰς τὸν χλωρὸν τυρὸν τῆ ἔνῃ καὶ νέῃ: ταύτῃ γὰρ τῆ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ μηνὸς ἐκάστου ἐκέλευε συλλέγεσθαι τοὺς Πλαταιέας. Lysias is here likely referring to the fresh-cheese corner in the market in the *agora*.

⁹³ Kears (2013) 95. For the relevance of networking in the maintenance of group identity, see Collar (2014) 97–9, 104; Haarmann (2014) 20.

⁹⁴ See Xen. *Oec.* 8.22–3, in which Xenophon presents the market as a well-ordered place in which the customer always knows exactly where to find what he is seeking. This may have contributed to the Plataean decision to choose the market as their regular meeting place, knowing that it would be frequented by the Athenians also.

appearing as a cohesive group, the Plataeans would regularly signal publicly who belonged to their group, and who therefore was a Plataean. This was particularly important in a society in which proof of citizenship rested largely on popular consensus and providing witnesses,⁹⁵ and would therefore serve the function of protecting their citizen status as well as their positive image enjoyed in Athens, in addition to regularly reminding the Athenians of the same. Even those Plataeans who merely held *metoikos* status would profit by these regular meetings: if they were in need of a citizen spokesman—for instance, in regard to legal issues—they could ask fellow Plataeans who had full Athenian citizenship for help. Additionally, by thus drawing a line between themselves and the other *metoikoi* in the city, they could assert their privileged status. That the line between Athenian citizens and *metoikoi* amongst the Plataeans *de facto* appears to have been blurred may in fact have been a significant advantage.

Fourthly, the location is suspect. The fresh-cheese corner of the market was a suitably public place in order to make public statements. But why the cheese? Admittedly, we are now moving into the realm of speculation. I nonetheless posit the following hypothesis: Boeotia was famous for its green pastures which allowed for extensive animal husbandry, and the Parasopia—where Plataea was located—was particularly fertile.⁹⁶ Indeed, the name ‘Boeotia’ contains the same stem as *βοῦς*, ‘ox’ or ‘bull’.⁹⁷ Boeotia, ‘the land of cattle’, accordingly appears to have been famous for its cheese,⁹⁸ and it is plausible to assume that some Plataeans had taken up their native craft and set up cheese stalls in the market. Economic advantages aside, this not only provided the Plataeans with a place to congregate, but it also affirmed and reinforced their identity as Boeotians. Quite possibly, making and selling Boeotian cheese may also have been a conscious effort on the

⁹⁵ Lape (2010) 187–8, 194, 196, 198.

⁹⁶ See Konecny–Aravantinos–Marchese (2013) 23, 26.

⁹⁷ In this regard see Paus. 10.15.1: After the victory over the Persians before the gates of their city in 479 BCE, the Plataeans apparently dedicated an ox of bronze at the sanctuary in Delphoi. See also McInerney (2010) 147–8, 182, 218: it appears that both the Athenians as well as the Plataeans grazed their cows on the Kithairon mountain range; the alliance between the two would have significantly facilitated this. See also a coin find from Plataea (a *chalkous*?) dated to the 4th c. BCE depicting the face of Hera (the protector of the city) on the obverse, and an ox or bull on the reverse: Imhoof-Blumer (1871) 375–6. The bull could represent Boeotia. See also a comparable bronze coin find depicting the nymph Plataea on the obverse and a bull on the reverse, Millingen (1831) 58.

⁹⁸ See for instance Ar. *Eq.* 475–80:

Κλέων: ἐγὼ μὲν οὖν αὐτίκα μάλ' ἐς βουλὴν ἰὼν [...] ἐρῶ, [...] τὰκ Βοιωτῶν ταῦτα
συντυρούμενα.

Ἄλλαντοπώλης: πῶς οὖν ὁ τυρὸς ἐν Βοιωτοῖς ὄνιος;

Kleon: ‘I shall swiftly hurry to the Council [...] and tell them everything [...], all the Boeotian things you are cheeseing together’.

Sausage vendor: ‘How much then does cheese cost in Boeotia?’

part of the Plataeans to keep their native traditions alive and therefore reinforce group cohesion and identity. Despite their centuries-long conflict with Thebes, the Plataeans apparently cherished their identity as Boeotians, and their being part of the Boeotian *ethnos* was never questioned, neither by the Athenians, nor by themselves, nor by the other Boeotians.⁹⁹ The Thebans, who apparently equated the membership of the Boeotian *ethnos* to membership in the Boeotian *koinon*, in Thucydides' Plataean Debate use the Plataeans' own Boeotian identity as an argument against them: they argue that the Plataeans had 'betrayed their Boeotian heritage' when they had scorned membership in the *koinon* and had instead allied themselves with Athens.¹⁰⁰ Indeed, it appears that the Plataean quarrel was with Thebes in particular, not with the Boeotian *koinon*. In times when Theban hegemony over the *koinon* was reduced, the Plataeans were happy enough to join it; this may in fact have happened during their short-lived return to Plataea, c. 386–373 BCE.¹⁰¹ This is evidenced by the fact that, during this period, the Plataeans minted a number of coins, many of which depicted the characteristic shield of the *koinon*—a strong indicator of their continued identification as Boeotians.¹⁰²

Nonetheless, over time the Plataeans appear to have integrated into Athenian society fairly well. An indicator for this may be found in Plataean grave *stelai* during the fourth century BCE. The Plataeans appear to have adopted the Attic alphabet as well as Attic dialectal elements;¹⁰³ also, where

⁹⁹ Indeed, the point made by Yates (2019) 170–80, that Plataean historical narratives seem to have focused on civil strife rather than the conflict with the Persians, is interesting in this regard. The fact that most Boeotian cities had medised, and that the Plataeans had faced their fellow Boeotians on the battlefield, may have been a deeply distressing experience which engraved itself in the Plataean psyche in the subsequent decades. This may reinforce the idea that the Plataeans perceived themselves as part of the Boeotian *ethnos*.

¹⁰⁰ Thuc. 3.61.2: *παραβαίνοντες τὰ πάτρια*. See also the Theban coup attempt described in Thuc. 2.2.4, during which the Thebans attempt to win the Plataeans over by appealing to their common descent and kinship (*τὰ πάτρια τῶν πάντων Βοιωτῶν*). In this regard see Mackil (2013a) 39–41; ead. (2013b) 307–9; ead. (2014) 273–4. Apparently, the ethnic argument only worked to a limited degree: see Mackil (2014) 280–1.

¹⁰¹ They may have also done so for a time during the *Pentekontaëtia*, see Mackil (2013a) 336–7; 336 n. 39; and perhaps even 338 BCE, after their restoration with the help of the king of Macedon.

¹⁰² Head (1884) 58; Hoover (2014) 377–8; Kraay (1976) 112. In regard to the usage of the 'Boeotian' shield as a symbol of the *koinon* see Buck (1972) 97–8; Mackil (2013b) 309; Kraay (1976) 108–9.

¹⁰³ See, e.g., *IG* II² 351: *Εὔδημος*; *Ag.* XVII 648: *Σίμη*; *IG* II² 10090: *Ἐπιχαρίδης*; and *IG* II² 10096: *Τολμίδης*. All these names feature the Attic H instead of the Boeotian long A. For corresponding Boeotian variants of these names cf. *SEG* III 333, 361, 370; *SEG* XXIII 271; *SEG* XXXII 493; *SEG* XXXVII 385; *SEG* XL 488; *IG* VII 505, 1740, 2117, 2424, 2466, 3067, 3089, 3153, 3180, 3204, 3293, 3349, 3386; *SIG³* 519; *AD* 2 (1916) 269; *Klio* 6 (1906) 45; *BCH* 23 (1899) 195–6; *BCH* 26 (1902) 296; *BCH* 60 (1936) 177; *BCH* 70 (1946) 477, 479. Whether we

the Plataean grave inscriptions from the late fifth century BCE only listed the name of the deceased, the fourth-century BCE inscriptions now followed the increasingly established Athenian practice of listing name along with *patronymikon* and *demotikon*.¹⁰⁴ Of particular interest is the curious practice of listing not the *demos* in which the Plataean was registered, but instead using the *ethnikon* *plataieus*¹⁰⁵ or *plataiikos/plataiike*.¹⁰⁶ It must be noted that the *ethnikon* is applied to all Plataeans, regardless of whether they held Athenian citizen status or were *metoikoi*.¹⁰⁷ One may therefore conclude that, while there appears to have been a certain level of acculturation, the Plataeans nonetheless sought to emphasise their heritage and identity.

At this point, a brief comparison between the aforementioned early grave *stelai* from the late fifth century BCE and the later ones from the fourth century BCE can provide interesting insights, especially when taking into account the Plataean practice of meeting regularly at the fresh cheese stalls in the *agora*. In his seminal work *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries*, Fredrik Barth emphasises that the cultural markers which are used to draw boundaries between ethnic groups may shift and change over time, the boundary itself remaining stable despite these changes.¹⁰⁸ I suggest that it is this very dynamic described by Barth which may be observed in the case of the Plataean identities during their exile in Athens. This is most evident in the burial practices as evidenced by the grave *stelai*. Initially, shortly after their arrival in Athens in the late fifth century BCE, the Plataeans used the Boeotian alphabet and the Boeotian practice of inscribing merely the name of the deceased on the grave *stela*; this would have sufficed to mark them out as distinct from the Athenians. However, as time passed and the Plataeans became acculturated into Athenian society, they gradually adopted the Attic alphabet, Attic dialectal elements, as well as Attic burial practices. As their own alphabet and dialect fell into disuse as boundary markers, the Plataeans created new markers by explicitly adding the *ethnikon* denoting their heritage,

can assume an Attic H or a Boeotian long A for the Plataean Tolmides/Tolmidas mentioned in Thuc. 3.20.1 remains unclear due to the genitive.

¹⁰⁴ See e.g. *Ag.* XVII 647, 648; *IG* II² 10090, 10096; *SEG* XVII 97. Cf., however, the exception of the aforementioned casualty list analysed by Kalliontzis (see above, n. 91) which, if dated to the mid-4th c. BCE, clearly deviates from this practice. However, Athenian casualty lists usually only listed the name of the deceased under a heading indicating the tribe he belonged to, which could explain why the Plataean list contained the names only.

¹⁰⁵ See, e.g., Hondius (1925) 128; *SEG* XVII 97; *SEG* XXXVII 171; *IG* II² 10090, 10096.

¹⁰⁶ See, e.g. *Ag.* XVII 647, 648; *IG* II² 10096.

¹⁰⁷ For an example of Plataeans who were clearly *metoikoi* see *Ag.* XVII 648 (see above, nn. 24 and 90).

¹⁰⁸ Barth (1969) 14–15. Cf. Hall (1997) 20–6, 32: Supplementing Barth's theory, Hall argues that *indicia* of ethnicity are used to mark the boundaries between groups. These *indicia* may vary from group to group and over time, and may take many different shapes and forms, language and dialect being one of these; *indicia* are, however, not constitutive to the group itself, and serve merely to differentiate the group from other groups.

thereby re-drawing and re-emphasising the boundary between them and the Athenians. They supplemented this marking of the boundary by creating new traditions which had hitherto not been necessary by meeting at the fresh-cheese stalls in the *agora* on a regular basis. This meeting not only allowed them to demonstrate clearly to the Athenians who belonged to their group and who did not, but also explicitly linked them with a cultural marker associated with Boeotia: cheese. In this manner, as they integrated into Athenian society and their own dialect and alphabet fell from use, the Plataeans sought new ways to draw a clear boundary between themselves and their hosts, despite and perhaps in conjunction with increasing integration and acculturation. We can thus here observe a constant and dynamic negotiation and renegotiation of ethnic boundaries.

Integration into Athenian society is also attested by many inscriptions indicating intermarriage.¹⁰⁹ Exogamy is one of the swiftest ways to breach the barrier between one group and another,¹¹⁰ and the Plataeans appear to have been no exception. Boundaries between groups are not hard, and individuals may be members of multiple groups at the same time, thereby maintaining multiple or hybrid identities.¹¹¹ This can be beneficial, since it allows the individual to be part of multiple social fields, thereby increasing his possibilities to prosper.¹¹² Nowhere is this made clearer than in a fragment by Herakleides Kritikos, writing in the third century BCE, many decades after the Plataeans had returned to Plataea from their exile in Athens: ‘The citizens [of Plataea] have only this to say: that they are Athenian colonists, and that at this place the famous battle between Hellenes and Persians took place. They are Athenian Boeotians’.¹¹³

Conclusion

In this paper, I have presented a case study of collective construction of narrative, using the case of the Plataean refugee community in Athens in the fifth and fourth centuries BCE. I have demonstrated how collective narratives were constructed and exploited by Plataeans and Athenians alike, and how these were in turn used to construct group identity, demonstrating the close link between the stories people tell and their identity. I have presented the case of the Plataean refugees as an example of the depiction of the

¹⁰⁹ See, e.g., *SEG* XVII 97; *IG* II² 10091. These apparently continued well into the 1st century BCE, as attested by *IG* II² 10095, 10097.

¹¹⁰ Reger (2014) 120–1; Hall (1997) 28.

¹¹¹ Wimmer (2008) 976; Gruen (2013) 20; see also Hutnyk (2005) 81.

¹¹² Reger (2014) 121–3.

¹¹³ Herakleides Kritikos, *FGrHist* 369A F 1.11: οἱ δὲ πολῖται οὐδὲν ἕτερον ἔχουσι λέγειν ἢ ὅτι Ἀθηναίων εἰσὶν ἀποικοὶ καὶ ὅτι τῶν Ἑλλήνων καὶ Περσῶν παρ’ αὐτοῖς ἡ μάχη ἐγένετο. Εἰσὶ δὲ Ἀθηναῖοι Βοιωτοί. See also Mackil (2014) 273–4.

consequences of war in ancient Greek sources, as well as providing a case study for the handling of a refugee crisis and the integration of foreigners into a host community in an ancient Greek context. The story of the Plataeans offers a unique insight into ancient Athenian societal mechanics, as well as embodying one of those timeless aspects of war: the destruction of entire communities and the flight of the survivors to a safer haven. I have argued that the legal status of Plataean war refugees, as well as the various narratives they featured in, starkly shaped Plataean group identity in this period, while at the same time allowing their Athenian hosts to manufacture a narrative casting themselves as saviours.

The ambiguous second-rate citizen status afforded by the Athenians after the destruction of Plataea was enjoyed by only a portion of the first-generation exiles. While a generous gesture on the part of the Athenians, it significantly limited the number of Plataeans who would be able to produce offspring with an Athenian citizen wife, who would be born enjoying full Athenian citizen rights. The majority of Plataeans remained *metoikoi*, and the sources make apparent that the Plataeans went to great lengths to maintain a group identity and cohesion, likely in order to provide financial and social assistance to the majority who were not naturalised.

The portrayal of the Plataeans in the Athenian sources indicates that the glorious and tragic history of Plataea—most notably its loyalty to Athens, its prominence in the wars against the Persians as well as its perceived injustices suffered at the hands of the Thebans—were crucial factors in the construction and maintenance of Plataean identity. These narratives were reinforced and embellished by the Athenians, who used them to discriminate against other groups, and quite probably to alleviate the Athenians' own guilty conscience in regard to atrocities committed against other cities by focusing on the generous benefactions granted to the deserving and loyal Plataeans. The favourable and positive Athenian presentation of the Plataeans in their narratives indicates that the generosity shown by the former to the latter may well have begun as a psychological coping mechanism designed to absolve the Athenians of their guilt of not having helped their loyal ally in time of need. In time, however, this image was increasingly exploited by the Athenians to construct for themselves a new identity casting themselves as benefactors and protectors of the oppressed, with the Plataeans serving as proof thereof. In this way, the Athenians further contributed to the maintenance of a Plataean group identity constructed around the city's past. The narratives evolved over time, increasing in pathos and glorifying Plataea's past in what can be termed 'intentional history'. Despite the Plataeans having been written out of Athens' narrative of the battle of Marathon, Apollodorus' mention of the Plataeans at that battle and the painting thereof in the *Stoa Poikile* support the notion that the Plataeans may have maintained their own narratives alongside the Athenian ones, perhaps with their own dedicated historians, and in turn influenced the evolution of the stories being told.

The Plataeans accordingly walked a thin line between assimilation and maintaining their own identity. The use of the Boeotian dialect and alphabet and the running of cheese stalls are indications that the Plataeans made an effort to stress their Plataean and Boeotian, as distinct from Athenian, identities. When the dialect and alphabet fell into disuse, the Plataeans sought alternative methods to mark the ethnic boundary between themselves and the Athenians by using *ethnika* to identify themselves as Plataeans. Additionally, they regularly made public appearances as a cohesive group, be it as warriors on the battlefield or at the cheese corner in the market, thereby emphasising the boundary between them and the rest of Athenian society and regularly reaffirming their status as Plataeans. At the same time, the positive image enjoyed by the Plataeans in Athens as well as the opportunity for some of them to marry into the Athenian citizen body contributed to their integration into the host society and to their increasingly adopting an additional, Athenian identity, to the degree that, even a century after returning to Plataea, they identified as both Athenians and Boeotians.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Andreau, J. and R. Descat (2011) *The Slave in Greece and Rome* (Madison); trans. by M. Leopold of *Esclave en Grèce et à Rome* (Paris, 2006).
- Badian, E. (1989) 'Plataea between Athens and Sparta: in Search of Lost History', in H. Beister and J. Buckler, edd., *Boiotika: Vorträge vom 5. Internationalen Bötien-Kolloquium zu Ehren von Professor Dr. Siegfried Lauffer* (Munich) 95–112; repr. in E. Badian, *From Plataea to Potidaea: Studies in the History and Historiography of the Pentecontaetia* (Baltimore and London, 1993) 109–23.
- Barth, F. (1969) 'Introduction', in F. Barth (ed.), *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: the Social Organisation of Culture Difference* (Bergen, et al.) 9–38.
- Blok, J. (2009) 'Perikles' Citizenship Law: A New Perspective', *Historia* 58: 141–70.
- Bruce, I. A. F. (1968) 'Plataea and the Fifth-Century Boeotian Confederacy', *Phoenix* 22: 190–9.
- Bruzzone, R. (2015) 'Killing the Past in Thucydides' Plataean Debate', *CPh* 110: 289–300.
- Buck, R. J. (1972) 'The Formation of the Boeotian League', *CPh* 67.2: 94–101.
- Canevaro, M. (2010) 'The Decree Awarding Citizenship to the Plataeans ([Dem.] 59.194)', *GRBS* 50: 337–69.
- Christ, M. R. (2012) *The Limits of Altruism in Democratic Athens* (New York and Cambridge).
- (2013) 'Demosthenes on *Philanthrōpia* as a Democratic Virtue', *CPh* 108: 202–22.
- Cogan, M. (1981) 'Mytilene, Plataea and Corcyra: Ideology and Policy in Thucydides, Book Three', *Phoenix* 35: 1–21.
- Collar, A. C. F. (2014) 'Networks and Ethnogenesis', in McInerney (2014) 97–111.
- Fisher, N. R. E. (2001) *Slavery in Classical Greece*² (London).
- Gauthier, P. (1972) *Symbola: les étrangers et la justice dans les cités grecques* (Nancy).
- Gehrke, H. J. (2007) 'Marathon: A European Charter Myth?', *Palamedes* 2: 93–108.
- (2010) 'Greek Representations of the Past', in N. Luraghi, H.-J. Gehrke, and L. Foxhall, edd., *Intentional History: Spinning Time in Ancient Greece* (Stuttgart) 15–34.
- Gillis, J. R. (1994) 'Memory and Identity: the History of a Relationship', in id., ed., *Commemorations: the Politics of National Identity* (Princeton and Chichester) 3–24.
- Gomme, A. W. (1956) *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides: The Ten Years' War, Vol. 2, Books II–III* (Oxford).
- Gruen, E. (2013) 'Did Ancient Identity Depend on Ethnicity? A Preliminary Probe', *Phoenix* 67: 1–22.

- Haarmann, H. (2014) 'Ethnicity and Language in the Ancient Mediterranean', in McInerney (2014) 17–33.
- Hammond, N. G. L. (1992) 'Plataea's Relations with Thebes, Sparta and Athens', *JHS* 112: 143–50.
- Hall, J. M. (1997) *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity* (Cambridge).
- Head, B. V. (1884) *Catalogue of Greek Coins: Central Greece (Locris, Phocis, Boeotia and Euboea)* (London).
- Hondius, J. J. E. (1925) *Novae Inscriptiones Atticae* (Leiden).
- Hoover, O. D. (2014) *Handbook of Coins of Northern and Central Greece: Achaia, Phthiotis, Ainis, Magnesia, Malis, Oita, Perrhaibia, Thessaly, Akarnania, Aitolia, Lokris, Phokis, Boeotia, Euboea, Attica, Megaris, and Corinthia: Sixth to First Centuries BC* (Lancaster and London).
- Hornblower, S. (2007) 'Thucydides and Plataean Perjury', in A. H. Sommerstein and J. Fletcher, edd., *Horkos: the Oath in Greek Society* (Bristol) 138–47.
- Hunt, P. (2018) *Ancient Greek and Roman Slavery* (Malden, Mass.).
- Hutnyk, J. (2005) 'Hybridity', *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 28: 79–102.
- Imhoof-Blumer, F. (1871) 'Zur Münzkunde und Palaeographie Boiotiens', *NZ* 3: 321–87.
- Jung, M. (2006) *Marathon und Plataea: Zwei Perserschlachten als 'lieux de mémoire' im antiken Griechenland* (Göttingen).
- Kapparis, K. (1995) 'The Athenian Decree for the Naturalisation of the Plataeans', *GRBS* 36: 359–78.
- Kalliontzis, Y. (2014) 'Digging in Storerooms for Inscriptions: an Unpublished Casualty List from Plataia in the Museum of Thebes and the Memory of War in Boeotia', in N. Papazarkadas, ed., *The Epigraphy and History of Boeotia: New Finds, New Prospects* (Leiden) 332–72.
- Kears, M. J. (2013) 'Metics and Identity in Democratic Athens' (diss., University of Birmingham).
- Konecny, A., V. Aravantinos, and R. Marchese (2013) *Plataia: Archäologie und Geschichte einer boiotischen Polis* (Vienna).
- Kraay, C. M. (1976) *Archaic and Classical Greek Coins* (London).
- Lape, S. (2010) *Race and Citizen Identity in the Classical Athenian Democracy* (New York and Cambridge).
- Lewis, D. and L. H. Jeffery, edd. (1993) *Inscriptiones Atticae Euclidis Anno Anteriores. Fasciculus II: Dedications, Catalogi, Termini, Tituli Sepulcrales, Varia Tituli Attici Extra Atticam Reperti Addenda (IG I³)* (Berlin and New York).
- Loroux, N. (1981) *L'invention d'Athènes: histoire de l'oraison funèbre dans la 'cité classique'* (Paris).
- Mackil, E. (2013a) *Creating a Common Polity: Religion, Economy, and Politics in the Making of a Greek Koinon* (Berkeley and London).
- (2013b) 'The Greek Koinon', in P. F. Bang and W. Scheidel, edd., *The Oxford Handbook of the State in the Ancient Near East and Mediterranean* (New York and Oxford) 304–23.
- (2014) 'Ethnos and Koinon', in McInerney (2014) 270–84.

- Macleod, C. (1977) 'Thucydides' Plataean Debate', *GRBS* 18: 227–46; repr. in id., *Collected Essays* (Oxford, 1983) 140–58.
- McInerney, J. (2010) *The Cattle of the Sun: Cows and Culture in the World of the Ancient Greeks* (Princeton).
- , ed. (2014) *A Companion to Greek and Roman Ethnicity* (Chichester).
- Millingen, J. (1831) *Ancient Coins of Greek Cities and Kings: from Various Collections Principally in Great Britain* (London).
- Pelling, C. (2000) *Literary Texts and the Greek Historian* (London and New York).
- Reger, G. (2014) 'Ethnic Identities, Borderlands and Hybridity', in McInerney (2014) 112–26.
- de Romilly, J. (1979) *La douceur dans la pensée grecque* (Paris).
- Roy, J. (2014) 'Autochthony in Ancient Greece', in McInerney (2014) 241–55.
- Schumacher, L. (2001) *Sklaverei in der Antike: Alltag und Schicksal der Unfreien* (Munich).
- Steinbock, B. (2013) *Social Memory in Athenian Public Discourse: Uses and Meanings of the Past* (Ann Arbor).
- Trevett, J. (1990) 'History in [Demosthenes] 59', *CQ* 40: 407–20.
- Weber, C. W. (1981) *Sklaverei im Altertum: Leben im Schatten der Säulen* (Düsseldorf).
- West, S. (2003) 'ΟΡΚΟΥ ΠΑΙΣ ΕΣΤΙΝ ΑΝΩΝΥΜΟΣ: the Aftermath of Plataean Perjury', *CQ* 53: 438–47.
- Wimmer, A. (2008) 'The Making and Unmaking of Ethnic Boundaries: a Multilevel Process Theory', *American Journal of Sociology* 113: 970–1022.
- Yates, D. C. (2019) *States of Memory: the Polis, Panhellenism, and the Persian War* (New York and Oxford).