Athena was the patron deity of Athens: a simple statement which denotes a complex relationship. In reality, she was more than the patron. In myth, Athena gave her name to the city after being chosen over Poseidon as protector of that land (Apoll. 3.14.1). She was the surrogate mother of the autochthonous child, Erichthonius, from whom the Athenians sprang. In Homer, the name of Athena is synonymous with the rock of the Acropolis and it was upon that same Acropolis that the Athenians built Athena’s great temple, the Parthenon. The Panathenaia, reorganized in 566/5 BC, and the most important Athenian festival in the fifth century, was celebrated in her honor every four years. She appeared on Athenian coins and on art spread throughout the city. As Hegel so eloquently states, she was the city itself—the spirit that infused and informed every aspect of citizen life.

For Hegel, as well as for many other scholars and philosophers, Athena represented moderation, justice and democracy. Unlike emotional and irrational divinities such as Aphrodite, Hera and Ares, Athena has been seen as a figure of reason and enlightenment, and the city she watched over as the seat of civilization. The city was what it was because its goddess was what she was and this was a relationship the Athenians actively fostered in their art.
Athena is understood in most Athenian art as an allegory or representative of Athens. Such an equation of goddess and city is accepted on Athenian monuments, but only in a handful of the Athenian tragedies in which she appears. It is clear that in Aeschylus’ *Eumenides* she is the city and its institutions as much as she is the founder of the Areopagus court. In patriotic plays such as Euripides’ *Ion* and *Suppliant*, she also seems to stand in as a representative of Athens’ interests. She has not been considered as such in other plays, such as Sophocles’ *Ajax*, Euripides’ *Trojan Women*, or *Iphigenia Among the Taurians*. It would appear that she loses her status as allegory or representative of Athens when the play is not specifically about, or set in, Athens or when she is not the serene goddess we and others have come to expect. Athens, however, was not static in the fifth century: its political institutions, physical landscape, military power and international prestige underwent dynamic change. Why should we not expect the figure of Athena to reflect this change? As Athens underwent its transformation, Athena, its goddess and symbol, did so as well. The objective here is to trace this varying picture of Athena and attempt to understand how Athens’ imperial transformations altered the ideals, specifically justice, upon which the democracy rested.

**Tragedy, Civic Identity and the Athenian Empire**

Simon Goldhill’s research on the relationship between Greek tragedy and its performance venue, the Great Dionysia, brought the notion of civic ideology to the fore of tragic scholarship. Since then, numerous studies have been published which attempt to discern how notions of citizen identity were created, supported, and deconstructed in various tragedies written and produced in fifth-century Athens. Two areas of civic identity that have been little explored in tragedy, however, are the impact of the Athenian Empire on Athenian culture and the evolution of political thought and its relationship to identity formation and projection in this very public art form. One aspect of such identity creation and promotion in tragedy that has been entirely ignored is how the patron deity of Athens, Athena, was represented as part of the process. How the Athenians chose to represent her in public contexts was intimately bound up to how they wished to represent their own collective image, including their democracy and the institutions associated with it. My specific interest in this study is what the representations of Athena in tragedies performed at the Great Dionysia can tell us about some ways in which the Athenians conceptualized justice, a fundamental aspect of Athenian democracy and democratic identity. Although these plays are written by indi-
viduals, these playwrights are part of the larger community and subject to the same cultural pressures as other Athenians. Through tragedy we can see both a bit of what the playwrights intended and how their intentions were shaped by their environment.

Scholars since Goldhill have almost all agreed that tragedy played a large role in civic discourse in Athens, serving as a public venue where issues such as the nature of their democracy, justice, war, and class and gender differences could be negotiated.\textsuperscript{10} The use of myths as basic storylines allowed such issues to be played out without being overtly politicized or threatening stasis. Myths were not static but were adapted, altered, written and re-written in order to reflect the shifting sensibilities and needs of the city and her citizens. Part of this shifting involved the way the Athenians identified themselves both as citizens and as hegemons. The Athenians could view debates about their contemporary concerns but filtered through well-known stories which would provide both cultural and temporal distance.

Tragedy was a part of civic, not private, life for the Athenians. Participation in the tragic festivals was a function of citizenship. The plays were written by citizens, paid for by citizens, performed by citizens, watched by citizens and, in the end, voted on by citizens. Concepts such as parrhesia and isonomia applied to the theater as much as to the assembly. The playwrights spoke their piece as if defendants or prosecutors in the courts. The poets’ job was to persuade their jury, the audience, and each had equal standing before the law of the tragic competition. Each citizen in the audience had as much chance as another at being selected by lot as judge for the day. The tragic competitions were as much an expression of Athenian citizenship as were juries and assemblies. In fact, during the performance of some tragedies, the audience was co-opted into the performance to serve as a jury. Also, tragedy was part of a symbolic order in Athenian political life wherein the Athenians manipulated images, history and myth in order to fashion a specific version of their own collective identity.

Because the Great Dionysia was also the venue where allies in the Delian League brought their tribute after 454 BC, it may also be said that the tragedies were not just about the Athenians negotiating their identity among themselves but about projecting an image of Athens to her allies and subjects as well. As Goldhill clearly demonstrated, the ceremonies surrounding the performance of the tragedies were about projecting Athenian power. The Great Dionysia was the glory of Athens and her empire on stage. An Athenian seeing such a display might think of how great his city must be to have gained such wealth. Perhaps he might think how powerful his city must be if others were willing (or compelled) to give this wealth to them. An ally, on the other
hand, might see one of two things in that display: either the glory of his position as a member of the Athenian family or his servitude. Either way, it was Athens’ power being projected out to the audience. The tribute in the orchestra was the fruit of its labors, the payoff for keeping the Persian menace at bay.

Given this close bond between tragedy and civic identity as well as the intimate political bond between the Athenians and their patron Athena, it is important that we consider her appearances in tragedy and how they may be significant in Athenian identity formation. We take such a thing for granted when discussing the Parthenon or the Panathenaia and yet do not apply the same framework to drama. The imperial implications behind tragedy have been largely left unmentioned, though now there is a growing literature in this direction. Because the general scholarly consensus recently has been that the empire was always oppressive, even when scholarship on tragedy does address it, the analysis almost always tends to view tragedy as critical of it. The archê was bad and tragedy is good; therefore, tragedy must question empire. More recently, however, scholars have begun to reexamine the nature of the empire and whether it was as oppressive as has often been believed. Examining further the relationship between tragedy and the archê can help us better see its influence on fifth century culture especially since the relationship is far more nuanced than has widely been appreciated.

To suggest that staging Athena is apolitical is to define political too narrowly. In each of the plays in which Athena appears, justice is a central theme, and justice is a political concept. In addition, to suggest that a historicized, political reading means linking a text directly to specific events is to ignore the continuum of political thought that underscores all those individual events. The political context of a play is never only about a single event (like Ephialtes’ reforms of the Areopagus) but about the climate that makes such an event even possible. In every instance, Athena is represented as an arbiter of justice, though the type of justice she proposes or enforces varies.

In Eumenides and Sophocles’ Ajax Locrus, she is the representative of a type of justice Athens very carefully cultivated as fundamental to their democracy, specifically associated with their court and jury system. We might call this Athena and the justice she affirmed the “official” justice of Athens—it was the image of Athenian democracy and justice which they wanted to promote to others. It is under this heading as well that most of the Euripidean representations fall. In Sophocles’ Ajax, however, we see a darker side of Athena and her justice. Instead of being impartial and part of civic process, she is arbitrary and vengeful. She embraces exactly the type of justice the Athena in Eumenides is sent to disavow and replace. This Athena
and this justice, I argue, reflect the underbelly of Athens’ imperialism. While they claimed their courts as an impartial type of justice to be admired and envied by all, the mechanisms they used to enforce such justice among their allies and subjects belied the very notion of justice as communal and fair, and this undercuts one of the foundations of their democracy as well as the goodwill upon which their early hegemony rested.

Athena in the Empire

Athena was, for the Athenians and others, synonymous with her city and, throughout the fifth century, Athena was positioned as patron deity of the Athenian empire as well. The Athenian archê had its origins in the Delian League, an ostensibly defensive alliance between the Athenians and the islanders of the Aegean against the Persians. Established in 478 BC, in the wake of the Athenian victory at Salamis, the League soon became not just a defensive alliance but also served as a front for the offensive activities of the Athenians against both those Greeks who had “medized” and the Persians themselves. The original divine patron of the Delian League was Apollo. The League treasury was housed in his temple on Delos, and it was there that the Athenians and other members met for their congresses (Thuc. 1.96-7 and 3.11.4). When the tribute was first assessed by Aristeides, one-sixtieth of the phoros, the aparchê, was set aside as a dedication to Apollo. When the League treasury was transferred to Athens in 454 BC, the aparchê was also transferred—to Athena.

It is little observed that with the transfer of the treasury the Delian League gained a new patron. This must have been noted officially. The Delian League also appears to have become a new entity—the Athenian Empire, for there is little doubt that by 454 BC the Delian League had been transformed into the Athenian archê. This is not synonymous with saying that the Delian League had become oppressive. It simply means that the Athenians no longer made a show of being first among equals but, instead, wielded their authority much more openly. As patron of the archê, Athena enjoyed the aparchê, brought to Athens and displayed in the orchestra at the Great Dionysia each year, as well as the dedication of a cow and panoply by allied states at the Panathenaia every fourth year. Some cities were even required to give her grain and other “first fruits.” Athena also appears to have enjoyed the fruits of others’ labor on islands such as Aegina, Samos, Chalcis and Kos. Horoi, boundary stones demarcating cult precincts dedicated to Athena, queen of Athens or Athena Polias, are found on each island. The horoi on Aegina are a most interesting case when considering the transfe-
The boundary stones, dated most probably to the mid 450s, are not the only sacred precincts designated on the island. Also found are horoi dedicated to Apollo and Poseidon, the previous patrons of the Delian League. These were most likely dedicated in the immediate aftermath of Aegina’s forced entry into the Delian League in 457 BC. The stones dedicated to Athena mark additional confiscations of land that accompanied the change in patron. The existence of the horoi allows us to see Athena as more than a patron and patriotic symbol for the city of Athens. She was partner to the Athenians and a representative for them in building and maintaining their archê.

Even before the transfer of the treasury to Athens, the Athenians appear to have begun promoting their patron Athena as a pan-Ionian patron and spreading her influence throughout the Aegean. The process of promoting Athena begins with elaborations upon the role of Athens in the Homeric tales most prominently after 490 BC. Along with this process of enlarging the Athenian presence at Troy came an increase in the production of paintings which associated Athena with the Trojan War heroes (including Ajax). One prominent example is a scene made famous by Exekias of Ajax and Achilles playing draughts (Fig. 1). This scene appears with increasing frequency on Attic and other Greek vases with the insertion of Athena warning them of a coming attack (Fig. 2). Another new scene is of the duel between Ajax and Hector from Book Seven. Athena stands behind Ajax while Apollo stands behind Hector (Fig. 3). Perhaps Athena is meant only to stand as the general spirit of the divinities who fought beside the Greeks but her appearance on vases in scenes she had not earlier inhabited, especially with Ajax, suggests a desire to increase the prominence of their patron deity. Included in this category as well is the dedication of a colossal bronze Trojan horse on the Acropolis. The deeds of Athena at Troy had now become the deeds of all Athenians much like her deeds in the Giantomachy.

The official assimilation of Ajax as an Athenian eponymous ancestor by Cleisthenes also gave the Athenians a greater claim to glory than the barely mentioned exploits of Menestheus and Theseus’ sons. This assimilation seems to have begun in the sixth century and coincided with the conquest of Salamis. His adoption as an eponymous hero in 508 BC made his status as Athenian official and he was hereafter represented as such. Even Menestheus, however, was given greater glory as early as the 470s. An epigram found on the base of a herm in the Agora suggests that, based on Homer’s praise of Menestheus, the Athenians could claim to be both marshals of war and a heroic people. There is a focus as well on the rescue of Aethra by Acamas and Demophon at Troy which coincides with the increase in repre-
sentations of the *Ilioupersis* on Attic vases after the 490s BC. By the time we get to the middle of the fifth century, their deeds receive prominent display most notably on the Parthenon, is the Nekyia painting on the Cnidian Lesche, and on the Stoa Poikile.28

Already by the 470s, then, Athens had begun using the pan-Hellenic myths of Homer to increase its importance in history and to align itself un-\hline
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edibly in the minds of other Greeks with the deeds of Athena and the Athenian (and Salaminian) heroes at Troy. In 454 BC, Athena became the patron of the Delian League and Athens could point to its long association with her, and the military greatness that was connected with her in the great pan-
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Hellenic wars of the past, and justify the dominion they now claimed in the Aegean. The insinuating of Athens into the Homeric stories via Athena and Ajax’s newly emphasized relationship, the spread of Athena’s cult to allied states in the 450s and 440s, the dedications at the Panathenaia and the transfer of the patronage from Apollo to Athena along with the transfer of the treasury served not only to bind Athena and Athens together in the minds of Greeks but also to bind Athena and her worship in their minds with the Athenian *archê*.29 This process continued in Athenian tragedy as shall be ex-
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amined here.

**Approach and Assumptions**

This study is historical and ideological. My primary interest is in understand-
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ing the way the appearances of Athena in tragedies represent more general notions of Athenian identity, specifically with regard the empire and how ruling an empire altered some fundamental democratic ideals. One of the foundations of the Athenian democracy was its jury system, and as Athens emerged after the Persian Wars it was one of the components of the democracy exported to allies. It should be no surprise to find this democratic type of justice represented on Athenian public buildings, on pottery, and on the tragic stage—almost always with Athena (or her proxy Theseus) standing as judge. The connection between these representations and Athenian civic and imperial ideologies is evident. What remains for us is to understand how the Athenian audience conceptualized these connections. In other words, I am concerned with what issues were at stake in the Athenian rise to power and with how the Athenians addressed these issues as playwrights and as audience members. How did they formulate and then debate the questions surrounding the *archê* and their allies? To what extent did the ideological constructs surrounding the performance of the plays inform the Athenians’ understanding of their own position as hegemons? What caused the explo-
sion of public works of art vested in the notion of a particular Athenian identity? And, perhaps most importantly, how does tragedy reflect the process of identity construction and deconstruction?

This is not the first political study of tragedy, but it is one of only a few to look at the political as something both overt and covert, and which sees allegory and ideology both as aspects of a larger system of thought or space where politics and culture interact. Most scholars agree with Susanne Saïd’s assessment of tragic scholarship as a progression from studies on reflections of contemporary events and current politics to looks at committed theater and propaganda to, at last, studies of tragedy and political thought, each succeeding approach an improvement on that last. But political does not necessarily mean committed or propagandizing theater, since ideology often creeps into art and texts unsuspected, and ideology is itself not innocent. Nor does the tendency of scholars to speak now of ideology or political thought render a text incapable of reflecting specific historical events or contexts. The categories of interpretation are not mutually exclusive. A play can simultaneously be allegorical, reflect contemporary events, or support, construct, and undermine ideologies. It is in the nature of art which always has at least two lives: the life intended by its creator and the life it forges all on its own in the world beyond the author’s intent. Our goal is to examine the field within which these ideologies, allegories, intentionalities or incidents are enabled.

In many ways, then, this study of Athena straddles the line between the broadly political and the historical or allegorical. On the one hand, studying the individual portrayals of Athena within the reality of the changing archê commits one to allegory in so far as the goddess is concerned as patron and representative of the city. The ties between Athena and Athens were too strong and too pervasive to be overlooked. While this type of allegorical search within tragedy is defective, it is mostly so because scholars have often sought references to individuals or specific events, and this is sometimes impossible from our distance and with large gaps in our knowledge. As David Rosenbloom suggests, “myth is formed by condensation and dramatization; it encodes more information than a single historical person or circumstance.” We may see influences of individual events, but those individual events also are enabled by the dynamic we seek to examine. The performance of a tragedy, the suppression of a revolt, and the erection of a new temple all happen within the same space, under the same influences and constraints, and they each act upon each other as they are acted upon.

To get at this space, in addition to reading tragedy as a product of its historical circumstances and as, in some ways, a reflection of those circumstances, I am interested in the larger dynamics involved in such an allegorical and historical understanding of tragedy. To my mind, the shift in the repre-
sentations of certain myths and characters on stage signals a shift in the way the Athenians conceived of the very issue of what justice was and how it should be arbitrated. Like Athenian attitudes toward freedom, their notion of justice must also have changed. While submission to the Persians was unthinkable in the 490s and 480s, submission to the Athenians came to be expected in the 430s. There must be a detectable trace of how such a shift in attitudes toward freedom among Greeks occurred and how they used their courts to enforce this new understanding. The same must also be true of justice. Some scholars have sought insight into this issue by examining leadership as a theme in tragedy:

Everyone agrees that “problems of public life” and relations among citizens and between citizens and non-citizens are among the major themes of tragedy...More specifically, tragic poets explored the problems of decision making and leadership, which were crucial for a society of free individuals.

And yet, few consider that one major aspect of this leadership role would have dealt with the negotiation of Athenian identity between being free citizens of their polis and rulers over an archê, or that bound up with that negotiation would have been a reevaluation of the concept of justice, both as part of democratic practice and in dealing with the allies.

Absolutely essential to this study is recognition that the image of the goddess Athena was a fundamental element in the creation and maintenance not only of Athenian civic identity, but also of Athenian imperial identity. Her image was consciously used as a focalizer for Athenian patriotism and identity. Any connection made between the goddess and the city/archê forces us to recognize and consider the way in which her image was utilized by the Athenians in their self-promotion and self-definition. Worship and representation of Athena was a central fact of Athenian life. Promotion of her cult was at the heart of Athenian democratic and imperial practice. Tracing the ways in which she was used in tragedy, within the framework of representation in other public art, and in her promotion in civic and imperial contexts, can only help us understand better the interactions between political, military and cultural life in fifth-century Athens.

In order to do this, I argue from an initial set of three premises. The first premise is that tragedy is a part of civic process. Following the arguments of Paul Cartledge who himself looks to Clifford Geertz, I accept that we can see the larger debates (political and social) of Athenian society playing out on the tragic stage. The role of tragedy, in many ways, is to provide a space where civic relationships can be discussed, but in such a way that they are divorced from the reality of everyday practice. It is a reflective art form that can either force its audience to (re)consider basic assumptions about their
own practices and beliefs or serve to reinforce such assumptions. Tragedy, then, reflects the societal norms of those writing and performing it, but it also allows a space within which to debate those same norms.

The second premise is that “culture” is inherently chauvinistic. The art and literature of a community is in many ways a manifestation of the sense of community and pride in that community. Embedded within any work of art will be the norms and attitudes of the members of the society that produced it. When that work is promoted, performed, or disseminated among those within the community, it fosters chauvinism. When presented to outside communities, it serves to spread and promote those norms as superior and desirable to others. Furthermore, because both imperialism and culture are frequently attached to and promote a patriotic vision of a community, they are also about recreating that community’s identity elsewhere. Tragedy, as a public art form that was closely identified with Athens specifically, and performed not only for Athenians but for allies and other foreigners, served the interests of empire by promoting a certain version of Athenian identity as Athenocentric, pan-Ionian, and pan-Hellenic.

Thirdly, it is absolutely necessary to look at these tragedies not in isolation from each other or from Athenian culture in general, but as a part of an inherently connected system and to think of the playwrights as subject to this system as much or more than they shape it. As Foucault reminds us, nothing is produced in a vacuum. Any study that aims at understanding a system of thought must begin from a basic premise that all events/texts/moments are related. We must study:

Relations between statements (even if the author is unaware of them; even if the statements do not have the same author; even if the authors are unaware of each other’s existence); relations between groups of statements thus established (even if these groups do not concern the same, or even adjacent, fields; even if they do not possess the same formal level; even if they are not the locus of assignable exchanges); relations between statements and groups of statement and events of a quite different kind (technical, economic, social, political).

One goal is to discover the “space in which discursive events are deployed” and so understand both the space and events better and, in the end, to learn to recognize similar dynamics elsewhere.

The Textual Landscape

Our study of Athena in tragedy begins with Aeschylus’ *Eumenides*, in which Athena is explicitly linked to the democratic juries and courts. I argue that the founding of the court of the Areopagus should be understood not only in
light of the reforms of Ephialtes in 462 BC, but also as part of a process of judicial imperialism, in which we see a distinct move on the part of the Athenians to forge a correlation between the type of justice provided by a democratic jury and the polis. This link is promoted not just by situating democracy and the courts as a grant from Athena to the Athenians, but also through spreading the courts to the allies within the Delian League as part of an effort to control the members (and provide them the benefits of Athenian justice).

I then turn to Sophocles’ Ajax Locrus, a fragmentary play, where, I argue, a courtroom drama similar to that staged in Eumenides appears. I read the play in light of other representations of the myth surrounding the lesser Ajax in Athenian public art, specifically on the Stoa Poikile. Here, as in Eumenides, we see myths rewritten to construct a specific relationship between Athena and justice and to situate Athens or those associated with Athens as the ones authorized to dispense such justice.

In a number of plays by Euripides staged between 424 and 410 BC, Athena appears briefly as a dea ex machina and an examination of these plays makes up the subject matter of the next chapter. In many ways, Athena’s cameo appearances in Ion, Suppliants, Iphigenia among the Taurians, Trojan Women and Erechtheus fall into two categories: either they represent Athenian myths and the reaffirmation of Athenian patriotic positions like pan-Ionianism, or they reaffirm mythical alliances established by Athena in earlier plays or public art. Some make direct references either to Athena’s role in Eumenides or to her role as patron of Athens, which is then positioned as progenitor of the Greek race. In each of the plays, there is a pro-Athenian message wrapped in a plea for pan-Hellenism. In each as well, the pronouncements of Athena’s justice are softened either by de-centering the authority of her judgments or by claiming it was Apollo’s will that her autochthonous Athenians should give birth to the other Greek peoples. Athena in each of these plays does not necessarily present a new vision of justice. Instead, these plays serve as a fitting venue for trying to understand how the Athenians later reflected upon the chauvinism of those earlier Athenas on the tragic stage and how such representations were reaffirmed in times of military and civic crisis.

Finally, I turn to Sophocles’ Ajax, one of the more troubling tragedies to have come down to us. No longer is Athena represented as an arbiter of justice associated with the courts, democracy, and equality before the law, but instead with vengeance and the exercise of power. In this chapter, I argue that Ajax calls into question the ideologies upon which Athens built its empire and democracy by showing the incompatibility of the ideals of the de-
mocracy—specifically justice—with the exercise of power. Justice for Ajax is not justice that fits the crime but exceeds the crime. Instead of justice that serves the best interest of the polis community and that reflects the notion of justice as balancing the power of the few with the needs and rights of the many, it is shown to be incompatible with wielding power, since justice as embodied in the courts is meant to mitigate power inequalities, while running an empire insists upon such inequality. Athena herself becomes a symbol of an oppressive type of justice, just as the polis she is identified with finds itself resulting to ever harsher means for controlling its allies. No longer are the democratic courts of Athens dispensers of justice to be envied as represented in Eumenides, but tools for oppression.

The concluding chapter will round out the analysis by thinking about the total picture the study of these tragedies provides. Athena moves from the majestic goddess of the courts and promoter of civic justice to cruel and vengeful. She then moves back again to a goddess of the polis. What we see is that under the influence and pressures of empire, Athena became as corrupted as the institutions she represented. In time of great stress and war, however, Athena becomes once again a patriotic symbol calling Athens and her allies back to the ideals their union was first founded upon. In the end, because the goddess is just, the city she represents must be as well.

Figure 1. Ajax and Achilles playing draughts by Exekias, ca. 530 BC. Museo Gregoriano Etrusco, Vatican Museum, Vatican City. Source: Alinari/Art Resource, NY.

Figure 2. Ajax and Achilles playing draughts while Athena urges them to battle. Ca. 510 BC. London E160, British Museum, London, UK. © Trustees of the British Museum.
NOTES

I use Page’s Oxford edition of Aeschylus with cross-reference to West’s Teubner throughout. For Sophocles’ *Ajax*, I have used the Oxford text of Lloyd-Jones and Wilson. The fragments of *Ajax Locus* are from Halsam’s text in *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* v. 44, with reference to Diggle’s Oxford text. For Euripides, I rely on Diggle’s Oxford texts unless otherwise indicated. Inscriptions are cited according to their source—either *Inscriptiones Graecae* (abbreviated IG) or *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the End of the Fifth Century BC* (abbreviated ML). Translations of ancient texts are my own except where noted.

1 Herodotus tells us that Erechtheus, after ascending the throne of Kekrops, renamed the Kekropidae Athenians in honor of his patron goddess, Athena (8.44).


3 As Guthrie points out, in *Odyssey* 7.80, ἵκετο δ’ εἰς Ἀθήνην καὶ εὐρυάγυιαν Αἴθρην; namely, Athene came to Athene; Guthrie, W.K.C. *The Greeks and Their Gods* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1947), 107. Athene is singular (on analogy with Mykene) because it is the name of the rock. It becomes plural on analogy with the locative Athenai (Mykenai). So the goddess was named like the rock, as Guthrie quotes Cook, “because at the outset she was the rock.”


8 Most studies come in the form of essays in edited volumes. Few book-length studies have appeared. A welcome exception is now Elton Barker, *Entering the Agon: Dissent and Authority from Homer to Tragedy*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 2009. Some

The empire in not mentioned as a political influence though the creation, maintenance, and promotion of such a hegemony is a political enterprise by D.M. Carter, *The Politics of Greek Tragedy*, (Exeter: Bristol Phoenix Press, 2007). In fact, although some scholars suggest that they are reading tragedy historically (especially plays like *Eumenides* and *Trojan Women*), few make reference to the most comprehensive histories of the period, such as Russell Meiggs, *The Athenian Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972) and Charles Fornara and Loren Samons, *Athens from Cleisthenes to Perikles* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991). Instead, we see uncritical use of the histories of Thucydides and Herodotus. It is also surprising how few scholars working within the frame of civic ideology take advantage of the plethora of works on Athenian democracy produced in the last 20-30 years.

Examples of such collections include Barbara Goff, ed. *History, Tragedy, Theory* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1995) and Winkler and Zeitlin.

*Simon Goldhill, “Dionysia,”* 97–129 on Isocrates *de Pace* 82.


Harold Mattingly, *The Athenian Empire Restored* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1996), has been the strongest proponent of this reevaluation but more scholars seem to be moving in this direction. See especially Nikolas Papazarkadas, “Epigraphy and the Athenian Empire: Re-shuffling the Chronological Cards,” in *Interpreting the Athenian Empire*, edited by John Ma, Nikolas Papazarkadas, and Robert Parker (London, Duckworth Press, 2009), 67–88. As Kallet (2009) reminds us, the re-dating of many of the overtly “imperialistic” inscriptions is often an attempt to relieve Pericles of the taint of imperialism and to push contain the oppressive era of the archê to the period of the Peloponnesian War (“Democracy, Empire and Epigraphy in the Twentieth Century,” in Ma et al, 50–56.)
It has always been assumed by scholars that Apollo was patron of the Delian League at its founding. This view has been based primarily on the fact that the League meetings and treasury were based on Delos, an island devoid of people for the most part. Only the shrine to Apollo rested there, thus the treasury would have been under his protection. Also, it seems only logical that there was a precedent for the aparchê that would be awarded Athena after 454 BC. If Apollo had not received a similar tithe, uproar over Athens’ claim would surely have left a trace. The transition seems too smooth to have had such an otherwise overtly imperial act, the taking of the aparchê, not follow a precedent set by putting a portion of the tribute aside for Apollo. It has also been noted that Poseidon was a probable secondary patron, for he was the original patron of the earlier Ionian League (Her. 1.141.4; 1.170.1; 6.7) and as a naval venture the League would have done well to keep the favor of the sea-god (J.P. Barron, “The fifth-century horoi of Aigina,” JHS 72 (1983): 11).

Meiggs, 460.

Meiggs, 292.

The requirement of the cow and panoply was thought to have been part of the allies’ obligation only beginning in the 430s. However, the Clínias decree concerning tribute payment mentions the delivery of these items to the Panathenaia already as early as 447/6 BC (Meiggs, 293). Those allies who were also colonists would have already had this obligation.

Erythrai appears to have been required to send first fruits beginning in 453/2 BC following the suppression of their revolt from the Delian League/Athenian Empire. See chapter 2 for a discussion of the Erythrai decree. The so-called “First Fruits” decree (ML 73) has been recently re-dated to the 430s instead of the orthodox date of 422/1 BC (Papazarkadas, 69).

The horoi each belong to slightly different periods. Those of Samos were perhaps set up on land confiscated after the war in 441/0 BC, though Meiggs and Barron argue for an earlier date. Those of Kos are probably from the 440s. The horoi of Aegina will be discussed below. For discussions of each set of stones, see especially Barron, “Aigina,” 1–11 and “Religious Propaganda of the Delian League,” JHS 84 (1964): 35–48; Thomas Figueira, Athens and Aigina in the Age of Imperial Colonization, (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1991), 115–20; Meiggs, 255–58; Graham Shipley, A History of Samos, 800–188 B.C. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987); Meiggs also notes that there is a possible reference to the establishment of a cult to Athena in Colophon after their revolt was suppressed in 447/6 BC (ML 47). For different datings of these and many other fifth-century Athenian inscriptions, see Mattingly. On the extensive use of religion for political gain by the Athenians during the fifth century see especially, Bernhard Smarczyk, Untersuchungen zur Religionspolitik und politischen Propaganda Athens im Delisch-Attischen Seebund, (Munich: Tuduv, 1990) and Carl Anderson and Keith Dix, “Politics and State Religion in the Delian League: Athena and Apollo and the Eteocarpathian Decree,” ZPE 117 (1997): 129–32, who add the Eteocarpathian decree to those of Samos, Kos and Colophon as being dedicated to Athena Polias; see also Robert Parker “Athenian Religion Abroad” in Ritual, Finance and Politics, eds. Robin Osborne and Hornblower (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994), 339–46.

Anderson and Dix, 129–32.

The same scene appears on many vases after 525 BC including Louvre F290 (*ABV* Louvre 324, 37) and Basel 1921.340 (*ARV* Basel Antikenmuseum 1, 121, PL. (200) 54.6.9). On the popularity of the Athena variant, see Susan Woodford, “Ajax and Achilles Playing a Game on an Olpe in Oxford,” *JHS* 102 (1982): 174-75.

The scene parallels the duel between Memnon and Achilles represented on Boston 97.368, which shows Athena urging Achilles on while Eos urges Memnon. The reverse side shows a similarly designed scene of Diomedes (urged by Athena) killing Aeneas flanked by Aphrodite. The difference, of course, is that Athena is present in the Homeric versions of these scenes while she is not present in the Ajax/Hector duel. She protects Odysseus, Achilles and Diomedes in Homer, not Ajax.


It is also interesting to note that the myth surrounding Theseus’ paternity by Poseidon also increased in popularity as the fifth century wore on. Part of the reason for this may be the emphasis Athenians placed on their navy; see, J.P. Barron “Bakchylides, Theseus and a Woolly Cloak,” *BICS* 27 (1980): 1–8; Deborah Boedeker, “Presenting the Past in Fifth-century Athens,” in Boedeker and Raaflaub, 187; David Castriota, *Myth, Ethos and Actuality: Official Art in Fifth-century BC Athens* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1992), 59–63. The favor and patronage of Poseidon would have been a necessary component of the Empire. Also, even though the Athenians rejected Poseidon’s divine patronage of their city, opting instead for Athena, this does not mean they did not pay heed to him at all. The claim of Theseus’ paternity would have been another way to co-opt divine and heroic glory to Athens and thus support their claims to dominance over the other Greeks, especially the islands.

This is not a novel idea. In fact, Meiggs makes a brief nod in that direction in his discussion of Athens’ cultural growth in the fifth century (290).

See Castriota, 89-95.

D.M. Carter dismisses full-scale allegory as a possible element in tragedy (22), which I agree with for the most part. But a figure like Athena who did function as an allegory in most other forums in Athens could hardly lose that function in only one public medium.


This is the primary argument of Edward Saïd, *Culture and Imperialism* (New York: Knopf, 1993). Also, on culture: typically, the types of public art I refer to in this study are considered “high art” and this is what Saïd seems also to consider “culture.” In the case of Athens, however, the theater as well as the monuments, festivals and other art works referred to here were a part of the fabric of everyday life for the average Athenian much more so than the theater, literature and the arts were for later peoples. In this sense, when I refer to these elements of culture, I consider them part of the totality of a society and culture in a larger sense of the overall interactions and mechanisms for interacting between the members of a given community. These were popular and public arts that we now consider the “pinnacle” of Athenian culture but which to the Athenians were as common and everyday as a football game or romance novel today.