

CARL A. ANDERSON – T. KEITH DIX

POLITICS AND STATE RELIGION IN THE DELIAN LEAGUE: ATHENA AND  
APOLLO IN THE ETEOCARPATHIAN DECREE

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 117 (1997) 129–132

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn



POLITICS AND STATE RELIGION IN THE DELIAN LEAGUE:  
ATHENA AND APOLLO IN THE ETEOCARPATHIAN DECREE

The Eteocarpathanian decree honors the *koinon* of the Eteocarpathians for sending a cypress beam from Apollo's precinct on Carpathos to the temple of Athena Ἀθηνῶν μεδέουσα at Athens (*IG* i<sup>3</sup> 1454, *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 1. 129). The title Athena Ἀθηνῶν μεδέουσα has been identified with Athena Polias of Athens, and its use here seemed to indicate that the decree was related to a group of inscriptions from Samos, Cos, and Colophon, which contain the same epithet of the goddess.<sup>1</sup> The early fourth-century date once generally accepted for the decree, however, appeared to exclude it from this group of inscriptions, which were all dated to the mid-fifth century.<sup>2</sup> Scholars have apparently resolved this problem by a redating of the decree, on the basis of letter-forms, to a period between 445-30 B.C.<sup>3</sup> The purpose of this paper is to reconstruct the likely political and religious circumstances which underlie a fifth-century promulgation of the decree, while confirming identification of Athena Ἀθηνῶν μεδέουσα with Athena Polias at Athens, and to explore the implications of Apollo's presence in the decree for Athenian religious propaganda on Carpathos.<sup>4</sup>

The provisions of the decree itself indicate that there were political difficulties on Carpathos. The decree stipulates: (a) the removal of Athenian troops from the acropolis of the town (18-20), (b) the obligation of the Coans, Cnidians, Rhodians, and other allies to help the *koinon* as they are able (28-33), and (c) the confirmation of *autonomia* for the Eteocarpathians as members of the *symmachia* (11-12).<sup>5</sup> While the precise nature of the problems on the island remains unclear, we may reasonably assume that the Eteocarpathians played some role in the outcome and that as a result their *koinon* was given higher political status within the alliance.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Samos: *SEG* 1, 375-76; 32, 835; J.P. Barron, *JHS* 84 (1964) 35-36 nos. 1 and 4. Cos: Paton-Hicks, *Inscriptions of Cos*, 160 no. 148. Colophon: *IG* i<sup>2</sup> 14/15 (*IG* i<sup>3</sup> 37). Whether the Cos inscription is dated to the 440's (Paton and Hicks, *Inscriptions*, p.160) or ca. 411 (S.M. Sherwin-White, *Ancient Cos* [Göttingen 1978] 38 n. 50), or whether the Colophon decree is dated to the 440s (*SEG* 26.9) or to ca. 427 (*SEG* 34.12, cf. *SEG* 42.9) does not affect our argument. For a list of fifth-century *temene* of Athenian deities in subject cities of the Athenian Empire, see *SEG* 42.84. For recent treatment of Athena Ἀθηνῶν μεδέουσα in Athenian religious and political propaganda among subject states, including brief discussion of the title in the Eteocarpathanian decree, see B. Smarczyk, *Untersuchungen zur Religionspolitik und politischen Propaganda Athens im Delisch-Attischen Seebund* (Cologne 1990) 58-70.

<sup>2</sup> M. Tod dated the Eteocarpathanian decree to the Second Athenian Confederacy, sometime between 394 and 390 B.C. (*Greek Historical Inscriptions*, ii 110, 29-30); he notes, however, that no Carpathians figure in the surviving portions of the list of members of the Second Athenian Confederacy.

<sup>3</sup> For the redating of the Eteocarpathanian inscription to 445-30, see D. Lewis in I.A. Carridice, ed., *Coinage and Administration in the Athenian and Persian Empires* (1987), 58; D. Lewis *IG* i<sup>3</sup> 1454, p. 902; R. Meiggs, *Trees and Timber in the Ancient Mediterranean World* (Oxford 1982), 200-01, 498 n. 36; S.M. Sherwin-White, *Ancient Cos* (Göttingen 1978), 40 n. 63. For a recent discussion of problems associated with dating solely by letter forms, see T.F. Winters, *ZPE* 107 (1995) 282-88.

<sup>4</sup> The primary Athenian strategic interest in the island of Carpathos was probably as a source of timber, which was needed to develop and maintain a strong fleet and to support public building programs at Athens. Meiggs estimates that Athenian consumption of timber increased fourfold in the fifth century (*Trees* [above, n. 3] 193). Archaeological surveys indicate that the group of sites which may have constituted the *koinon* commanded a view of a large natural harbor and lay athwart the main eastern route to the north of the island (R. Simpson and J. Lazenby, *BSA* 57 [1962] 163-65, *BSA* 65 [1970] 69; G. Susini, *AASA* n.s. xxv-xxvi [1963-64] 225-233, especially 231-33).

<sup>5</sup> M. Ostwald argues that *autonomia* first arose at Athens in the time of the Delian league (*Autonomia: Its Genesis and Early History* [Chico, CA, 1982]). As for the political independence of autonomous states, he writes (p. 29): "...we may conclude that a state is *autonomos* when it is left free to exercise on its own the most rudimentary powers necessary for its survival."

<sup>6</sup> The Eteocarpathanian *koinon* first appears on the Athenian Tribute Lists (*ATL* 274) in 434/3 under the rubric πόλεισ ἀὐτὰὶ φόρον ταξάμενα, a phrase which has been interpreted to mean "cities which took the initiative in getting themselves

The decree also stipulates the imposition of a penalty of fifty talents for a group of offenses which include removing the stele, with a tithe of the penalty to be set aside for the “goddess” (τῆς θεοῦ) and the trial to be presided over by the Thesmothetes (20-27). The “goddess” in the context of a trial venue in Athens must be Athena in her role as tutelary goddess of the city, that is, as Athena Polias; and indeed, Athenians regularly refer to their Athena as “the goddess.” The use of the term “the goddess” thus provides an internal piece of evidence, which apparently has gone unnoticed, for the identification of Athena Ἀθηνῶν μεδέουσα with Athena Polias at Athens. The Athenian authors of the decree did not find it necessary to distinguish between “the goddess” who would receive the tithe and the goddess who received the cypress beam, because they understood that Athena Ἀθηνῶν μεδέουσα whom the Eteocarpathians designated as the recipient of the cypress beam was the same goddess as their own Athena Polias.

This identification is further strengthened by the fact that the inscription concerns formal relations between two states, rather than a private donation to a deity, and so the gift must be destined to a major temple rather than any other unknown temple of Athena. A copy of the stone is to stand in the precinct of Apollo, who is presumably chief deity of the Eteocarpathians, and on the Acropolis of the Athenians’ chief deity (34-37).<sup>7</sup> In the third quarter of the fifth century, the cypress could only have been used in the construction of one of two great temples on the Acropolis: the Erechtheion or the Parthenon. The specific destination of the cypress beam in any case does not affect the identification of Athena Ἀθηνῶν μεδέουσα with Athena Polias in Athens, for no separate cult titles existed in the fifth century to distinguish the Athena worshipped in the Parthenon, the Erechtheion, or the archaic temple which lay between them.<sup>8</sup> Athena on the Acropolis, with few exceptions, was Athena Polias.

As noted above, the title Athena Ἀθηνῶν μεδέουσα occurs on a group of inscriptions from Samos, Cos, and Colophon. On Samos the μεδέουσα inscriptions were found in association with ὄροι of Ion and of the eponymoi, both designated as Ἀθήνηθεν. On the basis of this association at Samos, it has been argued that Athenian religious propaganda among the subject allies of the Aegean relied upon the manipulation of genealogical links between the legendary founders of Athens and the legendary founders of the Ionians.<sup>9</sup> The identity of Athena Ἀθηνῶν μεδέουσα in the Eteocarpathian inscription as the Athenian Athena Polias fits and expands this argument to include Carpathos. Athena Ἀθηνῶν μεδέουσα and Apollo on Carpathos are both part of a family tree which joins the Athenians and the Eteocarpathians in a common ancestry.

Apollo’s role as ancestor of the Athenians and Ionians was long established in Athenian cult and thus available for political and religious propaganda; Apollo had been worshipped at Athens since the

---

assessed” (F.A. Lepper, *JHS* 82 [1962] 25-55). Lepper suggested that some allies “volunteered” under this rubric in order to avoid the imposition of harbor masters and the stationing of permanent garrisons with their consequent expense, and to ensure that the tribute fixed in 434 would not be changed. In the case of the Eteocarpathians, we might imagine the gift of the cypress to be associated with an Athenian intervention of 434/3 on the behalf of the *koinon* against other cities on the island, either establishing the *koinon* or ensuring its continuation, or that the Athenians intervened in factional conflict within the *koinon* itself. In any case, the individual Carpathian and perhaps his sons who are honored as benefactors (εὐεργέται, 5-8) in the decree would have been supporters of Athenian interests as would a certain Lindian mentioned at 38-39.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. C.A. Anderson, *AJP* 110 (1989) 11-13. Anderson, following Tod (*Inscriptions* [above, n. 2]), mistakenly dated the Decree to the early fourth century B.C.

<sup>8</sup> We have argued that the Erechtheion is the more likely recipient of the beam (Proceedings of the 98th Annual Meeting of the Archaeological Institute of America, *AJA* 101 [1997] forthcoming); Meiggs argued for the Parthenon as the likely recipient of the cypress (*Trees* [above, n. 3] 196-201). The Athenians did not distinguish between two aspects of Athena on the Acropolis, Athena Polias and Athena Parthenos (J. Herington, *Athena Parthenon and Athena Polias* [Manchester 1955] 8). For discussion of Athena’s specialized worship on the Acropolis in the fifth century, namely as Nike, Hygieia, and Ergane, see B.S. Ridgeway, “Images of Athena on the Acropolis”, in *Goddess and Polis*, ed. by J. Neils (Princeton 1992) 119-41.

<sup>9</sup> For the identification of the title with Athenian religious propaganda among subject states of the Aegean, see Barron (above, n. 1), 35-48; R. Meiggs, *The Athenian Empire* (Oxford 1973) 295-98. The archaeological context of the inscriptions from Cos and Colophon is unknown.

sixth century B.C. as Patroos, ancestor of the Ionians.<sup>10</sup> The importance of Apollo to the Athenian program of religious propaganda in support of the Delian League finds obvious expression in Athenian attention to the cult of Apollo Delios and to the sanctuary of Apollo on Delos. Around 432 the state took over a private cult of Apollo Delios at Phaleron.<sup>11</sup> In 426 the Athenians purified the island of Delos and reinstated penteteric Delian games, then built the Temple of Apollo known as the temple “of the Athenians”. As in the case of Apollo Patroos, Athenian interest in Apollo Delios was already evident in the sixth century. Pisistratus had purified Delos, and Pisistratid patronage was probably responsible for the “Poros Temple” of Apollo, built of Attic poros by Athenian workmen.<sup>12</sup>

The Athenians were able to assert Apollo’s place in their genealogy even beyond the borders of the Ionian world. Pausanias reports that he saw an inscription at Delphi which recorded a statue group by Phidias dedicated by the Athenians from a tithe of the spoils from Marathon (10.10.1). The group depicted Apollo, Athena,<sup>13</sup> Miltiades, seven of the Athenian eponyms (perhaps originally all ten), Theseus, and King Codrus and his son Neleus.<sup>14</sup> In a discussion of this statue group, Barron pointed to the presence of Codrus and Neleus, who are associated with Ionian colonization, as evidence of an Athenian effort to foster Ionian genealogical links with Athens (46-47). In this observation he is surely correct; but there is another genealogical link. Barron characterizes the statues of Athena and Apollo as simply “donor and recipient;” yet Athenian worship of Apollo as Patroos suggests to us an additional and equally important reason for the presence of Apollo. Apollo is joined with the principal goddess of Athens, the hero of Marathon, the legendary forebears of the Athenian tribes, the synoikist of Attica and greatest mythological hero of Athens, and the Athenian forebears of the Ionians, because he too is part of the Athenian family tree. Pausanias points to another link between Apollo and Athens when he reports in the same passage that the heroes become eponyms of the Athenian tribes because of an oracle from Delphi. We can read the entire statue group both as a memorial of the Athenians’ victory over the Persians and as an assertion of the Athenians’ right to lead the Delian league; Apollo becomes a guarantor of that right. Another assertion of a distinctly Athenian connection for Apollo can be found in the prologue of *Eumenides*. There, the Pythia recounts that Apollo left his birthplace on Delos, landed in Attica, and was escorted to Delphi by the children of Hephaestus, that is, the Athenians themselves (*Eum.* 1-14).<sup>15</sup>

<sup>10</sup> C.W. Hedrick, Jr., *AJA* 92 (1988) 185-210; L.R. Farnell, *The Cults of the Greek States*, IV (Oxford 1896-1909), 153-58; R.E. Wycherley, *The Athenian Agora*, III (Princeton 1957) 50-53; H.A. Thompson and R.E. Wycherley, *The Athenian Agora*, XIV (Princeton 1972), 136-39. J. Travlos, *Pictorial Dictionary of Ancient Athens* (New York 1971), 96-99; J.M. Camp, *The Athenian Agora* (London and New York) 159-62. Jacoby suggests that Solon introduced the cult of Apollo Patroos into Athens by the authority of Delphi (*CQ* 38 [1944] 72-73).

<sup>11</sup> H.A. Shapiro has connected several groups of Attic red-figure vase-paintings to the increased importance of the cult of Apollo in Athens from the middle until the end of the fifth century (*Religion and Power in the Ancient Greek World*, Proceedings of the Uppsala Symposium 1993, ed. by P. Hellström and B. Alroth [Uppsala 1996], 101-13).

<sup>12</sup> Thuc. 3.104. D.M. Lewis, *BSA* 55 (1960) 190-94. F. Courby, *Exploration archeologique de Delos XII: Les Temples d'Apollon* (Paris 1931); I. Mylonas Shear, *Hesperia* 32 (1963) 399-408; W.B. Dinsmoor, *The Architecture of Ancient Greece* (New York 1975) 133 and 183-84. The Athenians expelled the Delian inhabitants from Delos in 422 (Thuc. 5.1), but restored them to the island in 421 on orders of Apollo at Delphi (Thuc. 5.32). On the Delian purifications, see S. Hornblower, *HSCP* 94 (1992) 193-96.

<sup>13</sup> For Apollo receiving a wreath from Athena, see a 5th cent. (?) Athenian marble altar (LIMC II. 1 p. 281 and 2 p. 253, Apollo # 786, 2).

<sup>14</sup> The statue group by Phidias presents chronological problems as Phidias was probably only ten years of age in 490, and presumably the spoils would have been used soon after the victory. Pausanias mentions three Hellenistic rulers as part of the statue group; they may have replaced the three missing eponymoi. See J.G. Frazer, *Pausanias' Description of Greece*, V (New York 1965), 265-67; B. Conticello, *Alla Ricerca di Fidia* (Padua 1987), 62-63; U. Kron, *Die Zehn Attischen Phylenheroen* (Berlin 1976), 215-27.

<sup>15</sup> In the fourth century, Demosthenes identifies Apollo Patroos as Apollo Pythios (18, 141). For the relationship between Apollo Patroos and Apollo Pythios at Athens, see Hedrick (above n. 10).

Perhaps the best-known account of Apollo's place in the Athenian family tree is the *Ion* of Euripides. Ion is fathered by Apollo in a cave on the north slope of the Acropolis and is raised as a servant in the temple at Delphi.<sup>16</sup> At the play's conclusion, Athena proclaims to Ion that his four sons are destined to become the eponymoi of Athens and that their "children shall settle the island cities and the coasts of the Cyclades, and thus give strength to the land of Athens, and be called Ionians" (1575-88). Euripides here gives a dramatic aetiology for the legal status of the subject allies after the decree of Thudippus in 425, which made all tribute paying allies Athenian colonists.<sup>17</sup> The inscriptions of Athena Ἀθηνῶν μεδέουσα from Samos, Cos, Colophon and Carpathos, even though they all antedate the Euripidean drama, may be understood in the context of this aetiology.<sup>18</sup>

Apollo on Carpathos was the god in whose sanctuary the cypress tree grew and so at first glance his mention in the decree might seem to be only coincidental. However the decision to cut a tree from Apollo's sanctuary rather than from elsewhere on the island must be deliberate. The centrality of Apollo in the program of Athenian religious propaganda in support of the Delian League allows us to posit a compelling political explanation for the stipulation that the inscription stand specifically in the sanctuary of Apollo. Not only is Apollo the likely patron god of the Eteocarpathians, but from the Athenian perspective he is a central figure in their efforts to establish a common mythology between Athens and the subject states of the Aegean.

The other side of the same coin can be seen in the Eteocarpathian use of the title Athena Ἀθηνῶν μεδέουσα. When the Eteocarpathians send a cypress beam from the sanctuary of their deity, Apollo, to a major temple of their benefactors in Athens, they would recognize Athena Ἀθηνῶν μεδέουσα as the most appropriate title, particularly if they knew Athena Ἀθηνῶν μεδέουσα as an object of cult on Samos, Cos, and Colophon. As subject allies, the Eteocarpathians do not employ the title Athena Polias; they address the aspect of the goddess which reflects her (and their own) interest in the well-being of Athens and her imperial allies. The Eteocarpathian gift for the Athenian temple and their accession to the status of *symmachia* allow the islanders to present themselves as important members of the Delian League. The Athenians simply repeat the Eteocarpathian use of the title for Athena in the decree: they knew that Athena Ἀθηνῶν μεδέουσα was equivalent to their Athena Polias and they saw the suitability of this title for the goddess in an inscription which concerned their relationship with an ally.

Michigan State University  
University of Georgia

Carl A. Anderson  
T. Keith Dix

<sup>16</sup> It is presumed that the cave's connection with Apollo existed before the identification of Apollo as the father of Ion. See E. Simon *Festivals of Attica* (Madison 1983) 74.

<sup>17</sup> *IG* i<sup>2</sup> 63 (*IG* i<sup>3</sup> 71). Cf. Barron (above, n. 1), 48; N. Loraux, *The Children of Athena* (Princeton 1993) 184-236. In a review of the book (*BMCR* 4.6 [1993] 474) C. Dougherty remarks that Loraux "neglects the colonial significance of Delphi and Apollo... it is none other than Apollo, both as patron deity of colonization and in his role as *Patroös*, co-ancestor of Athenians and Ionians, who rapes the autochthonous princess in the play and thereby physically unites Athens' Ionian imperial destiny with its autochthonous one... An Athenian family descended simultaneously from autochthony and Ionia can then rule a land which is both democratic and imperialist."

<sup>18</sup> The *Ion* is thought to have been produced between 413-11 B.C. On the dating see U. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Euripides' Ion* (Berlin 1926), 24; M. Imhof, *Euripides' Ion* (Bern 1966), 59-60; G. Walsh, *Hermes* 106 (1978) 313-15; J. Diggle, *Euripides*, ii (Oxford 1981), 306. On imperialist themes in the tragedy see B. Smarczyk, *Bünderautonomie und athenische Seebundpolitik im Dekeleischen Krieg* (Cologne 1986), 50-52.