Transactions of the American Philological Association 129 (1999) 319–332

Archaeology and the Athenian Empire

Robin Osborne
Corpus Christi College, Oxford University

Athenian imperialism in the fifth century directly or indirectly affected all cities of mainland Greece and the Aegean.[1] The empire meant more military activity and demands for tribute in money and offerings of other sorts (cows, full sets of armour from allies; it also changed the possibilities for exchange of goods in both positive (e.g., no pirates) and negative ways (the *Hellespontophylakes* we hear of in the Methone decree, and the general assertion of the Corinthians in Thucydides 1.120). Given all this, we should expect to see the consequences of Athenian imperialism in the archaeological record. Can we?[2]

In the 1961 *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* John Cook noted a contrast between the archaeological wealth of sixth-century Ionia and the shortage of archaeological remains to be dated to the fifth century; he suggested that this was a product of impoverishment because of the Ionians paying tribute both to Athens and to Persia under the Athenian empire.[3] He briefly repeated this thesis in his *Greeks in Ionia and the East*: "[I]n the era of the Athenian league Ionic city life was at its lowest ebb. Archaeologically, it is virtually non-existent: no substantial new buildings seem to have been erected, Ionic art was at an end, and the sites of the eastern Aegean cities show scarcely any sign of urban habitation in this period."[4] In reviewing Cook's book, Boardman devoted a single sentence to this thesis: "Cook suggests that there was no substantial new building in Ionia under the Athenian League (p. 122), but there seems to be evidence for new temples or serious reconstruction in Chios, Samos, and at Didyma."[5]

[1]I am grateful to Helene Foley for the invitation to give a version of this paper as part of the Presidential Panel at the 1998 meeting of the APA and in celebration of the 100th anniversary of the AIA, and I am grateful to my fellow panelists and to audiences in Oxford, Swansea, St. Andrews and Leicester for comments and criticisms.

[2]Past considerations of this question have largely focused on two areas, Athenian art and the impoverishment of Ionian allies. I discuss the latter in Osborne 1994 and Osborne 1998. Here I concentrate on the material effects of empire and the issue of impoverishment.

[3]Cook 1961.

[4]Cook 1962: 122.

[5]Boardman 1964: 83.

If Boardman's sentence suggests serious archaeological doubts about the basis of Cook's thesis, no one has picked that message up.[6] The poverty of fifth-century Ionia, which the supposedly low levels of tribute paid by Ionian cities have been used to support, has become a "fact." Pritchett in 1971 referred to "the economic eclipse of Ionia in the fifth century."[7] In 1972, Meiggs was doubtful about how far archaeology could be relied upon, denied that Ionian cities were paying both ways, and put more emphasis on the Ionian Revolt as a cause; but he too subscribed to the decline-of-Ionia thesis.[8] By 1975 Amit was talking of "the harsh fact of the Ionian decline," with an interesting use of the definite article.[9] Balcer's fantasies regarding Ionian social structure were based on accepting wholesale Cook's claims about a split between town and countryside; so he wrote in 1984: "The long-term depopulation of the Ionians, and specifically the gentry, the burden of tribute to the Athenians, and the Ionian failure in economic competition accentuated by the emergence of Athens as the dominant imperial and commercial power marked the Ionian decline to a low provincial status." In 1985 he suggested that the Athenians did not care about the development of countryside or city in Ionia.[10]

Since 1985 increased scepticism has been visible. Shipley has pointed out a) that on Samos "the town and the Heraion were at a relative standstill ever since Polykrates fell"; b) that there was indeed building in the town of Samos and, to a limited extent, at the Heraion during the fifth century; and c) that there is no widespread reduction in Ionian tribute and that the relatively small sums paid may have other explanations—though the other explanation he offers (small population) would not be inconsistent with the decline-of-Ionia thesis.[11] The attack on drawing conclusions from tribute has been taken further by Kallet-Marx in her *Money, expense and naval power*; she repeatedly stresses that tribute was not the only form of imperial revenue.[12] But neither of these critiques amount to an adequate discussion of Cook's thesis. The issues that demand attention seem to me to be: first, whether Cook's archaeological observations are correct; second, how whatever archaeology reveals in this case

[6]Even Simon Hornblower, who in vol. 1 of his Thucydides commentary (1991: 415) refers readers to Boardman's review ("[Cook's] general point may be right (though see Boardman's brief reply at *CR* 14 (1964) 83)," is prepared to state that "mid-fifth-century Ionia was not flourishing" (531).

[7]Pritchett 1971: 62–65.

[8]Meiggs 1972: 270–71.

[9]Amit 1975: 43.

[10]Balcer 1984: 414ff.; 1985: 40.

[11]Shipley 1987: 146–48.

[12]Kallet-Marx 1993:140–43.

is to be interpreted; third, whether, more generally, archaeology can measure prosperity; and fourth, whether archaeologically we are, or should expect to be, able to see the Athenian empire.

Was Cook correct about the archaeological evidence?

Meiggs remarked in 1972 that "it is too early to look for firm conclusions from archaeology. Excavation has barely tapped the surface of the Ionian cities."[13] Despite a quarter of a century's work since then, some of which has been published, that statement remains very largely true. To record that nothing is known from sites which have never been investigated is positively misleading: archaeological silences constitute evidence only if they are revealed by investigation and are not themselves merely the product of a lack of archaeological investigation.

It is clear that there was some building in Ionia and that talk of de-urbanisation is exaggerated. Shipley's attack on Cook gathers as evidence of Samian activity in the fifth *and* fourth centuries two small temples at the Heraion, and, in Samos town, a pottery shop, a monument to the Persian Wars, a temple of Poseidon, and the Sacred Way. Miletos has its Hippodamian plan as evidence for considerable urban redevelopment, following the sack of 494 B.C.E., and a number of buildings in the harbour area in use in the Hellenistic period can be shown to be classical (if not definitely fifth-century) in origin. The temple of Athena, which aligns with the Hippodamian plan, belongs to the first half of the fifth century.[14] On Khios, Boardman excavated a fifth-century temple building by the harbour at Emborio (also fifth-century rural buildings at Pindakas and a new village at Delphinion, but those are not so directly relevant). Mytilene had fifth-century walls.[15] Aiolian Larisa saw a house enlarged c. 450 to give it a peristyle plan. Pergamon (not itself listed as tributary, but its harbour town of Elaia did pay) has a fifth-century phase to its walls, and the earliest buildings of its upper agora are perhaps also fifth-century.[16]

What is lacking here, of course, is any equivalent of the great sixth-century temples of Samos or Ephesos or Didyma, or indeed even of the less ambitious temples, both Ionic and Doric, found in the sixth-century Aegean. A weak version of Cook's archaeological claim must be allowed to stand—particularly since monumental temples are not things that, in general, have to await intensive archaeology for their discovery.

[13]Meiggs 1972: 270–71.
[14]Akurgal 1978: 209–10.
[15]*Archaiologikon Deltion* 17.2 (1961–62): 261–62.
[16]Larisa: Akurgal 1978: 111–13; Pergamon: *IM* 42 (1992): 163–234 and 241.

How is the failure to build to be interpreted?

But was Cook right to see the absence of fifth-century monumental architecture in Ionia as a sign of impoverishment? To answer this question we need to consider both the relationship between building and wealth and how the record of Ionia compares with that of other Greek cities inside, and indeed outside, the Athenian empire.

Thucydides (1.10.2) famously observed, *à propos* of Sparta and Athens, that there was no direct correlation between buildings and power. Between buildings and wealth, on the other hand, there is a necessary relationship; but although the decision to build demonstrates the availability of resources (of manpower as much as of money), few cities can have built just because they could afford to do so.

In the sixth century, temple building in Ionia had not been universal. Colossal temples are limited to Samos, Ephesos and Didyma; otherwise only the temple of Apollo Napaios on Lesbos comes into the monumental class of temples with stylobates over 20 m. wide.[17] More modest (or else indeterminate) temples are known from Khios (Emborio and Kato Phana), Myous, Mytilene and Phokaia. Even at cities which in the fifth century pay substantial sums of tribute to Athens, there is often no record of substantial temple building in the archaic period—cities such as Klazomenai, Lebedos, Kolophon, Teos, Kyme. That there is no record does not mean that there was no building, but it is not obvious that the absence of evidence of fifth-century building at sites where there is no evidence of sixth-century building should be explained in terms of factors peculiar to the fifth century.

Why had Samos, Ephesos and Miletos built in the sixth century? These cities are close together in the same region, and legend told how, in the second generation after the settlement of men from Epidaurus on Samos, Ephesians had expelled them, accusing them of conspiring with the Carians (Paus. 7.4.2–3), while in the Lelantine war Samos helped Khalkis and Miletos helped Eretria and Miletos and Samos clashed during the rule of Polykrates too (Hdt. 3.39). "Peer-polity interaction" clearly has something to contribute to explaining what is going on. Being at a point of rich cultural contact with non-Greek civilisations may be important too.[18]

Miletos, Ephesos and Samos were rich, but so were other Ionian cities. At the battle of Lade Miletos provided eighty ships, Samos sixty, but Khios one

[17]See Osborne 1996b: 263–64.

[18]Snodgrass 1986 for the former; Osborne 1996b: 264–66 for the latter.

hundred. Yet Khios built nothing in the sixth century comparable to those colossal temples. Her buildings fall much more within the tradition to which the archaic temples on Naxos or Paros belong. The Khians competed in a different world; we might also note that they did not organise settlements in the frenetic way the Milesians did—nor even to the same extent as the Samians.

It is not hard to see why peer-polity interaction might be less of a spur to building in the fifth century. The Athenian empire moved the focus of activity away from this tiny quarter of Ionia, and the Athenians, rather than the Milesians or Ephesians, became the people against whom to measure up. Competing with Athenians, however, was primarily a political matter: independence, not cultural superiority, had to be the first issue. As importantly, these cities now had their temples. Round one of the competition was over and some special motivation would be required to start round two. On the mainland, Athens' insertion of herself into a new Ionian world already provided a motivation for the Ur-Parthenon (and would go on to produce the Temple of the Athenians on Delos); the Persian sack of Athens added further reason for building, and Olympia's monumentalisation established the scale. On top of that, the complexity of relations within a large territory meant that one Attic sanctuary could not be brought up to international specifications without the same being done to all; hence the rash of building at Rhamnous, Loutsa, Brauron, Thorikos, Sounion, Vouliagmeni and Eleusis (at least).[19]

Comparing fifth-century building in Ionia with fifth-century building in Athens reveals clearly enough that the Ionian cities were not imperial powers, but it does little else. If buildings are to say anything more subtle than that about the Athenian Empire, we need a different set of comparanda. It is appropriate to begin within the Athenian empire. How does the archaeological record for Ionia compare with that for other parts of the Empire?

Building that can certainly be dated to the fifth century is pretty hard to come by anywhere in and around the Aegean. Marcus Lodwick, indeed, in his recent thesis, adopts a Cook-style explanation for this:

> In contrast to the building activity on Delos in the Classical fifth century, stand the architectural fortunes of the other Cycladic islands on which there are no known monumental buildings in this period. Unless there is a major discrepancy in the archaeological record, this is most likely due to the drain in local resources caused by the forced membership of the Delian League to which substantial tribute in ships or money had to be paid. In the case of Paros, the terms must have been

[19]Boersma 1970 is still the most convenient collection of evidence.

> so harsh as to cause the island's wealth to come to a temporary end, as amply demonstrated by the termination of the island's once busy architectural activity. Likewise, the Athenian 'cleruchy' or garrison colony on Naxos perhaps further discouraged local displays of wealth. Delos was now the sole focus of new monumental architectural activity of the Cyclades; this was almost certainly not fortuitous.[20]

Of the Cycladic facts there can be no doubt. On Lodwick's account Delos finished the Prytaneion c. 500–450 (*GD* 22); built a court wall and stoa to the Archagesion c. 480–70 (*GD* 74) and the so-called Thesmophorion (perhaps the Hestiatorion of the Keans) in 480–450 (*GD* 48), along with no fewer than four Treasury buildings (*GD* 17–20); began the Great Temple to Apollo and got it to frieze level (it was completed only at the end of the fourth and in the early third century) c. 475–450 (*GD* 13); and at the same time carried out Stage II of the Propylaia (*GD* 5); probably started late in the century on the North Building or Graphe (*GD* 35) and the temple of Artemis Lochia (*GD* 108); and saw the Athenians build their own temple c. 425–417 (*GD* 12). Elsewhere in the Cyclades, nothing. In the fourth century, excluding Delos, there is, by contrast, a late-fourth-century gymnasium at Amorgos; a fourth- or third-century temple at Anaphe; a late fourth-century (?) stoa at Palaiopolis on Andros; an early fourth-century peristyle building, temples of Apollo Pythios and at Marmara (both 400–350), a tholos (350–300), an Asklepieion (C4) and an Archilocheion (325–300) on Paros; and on Tenos between 320 and 280 Building B, a fountain-exedra, Hestiatorion Q and a Temple of Poseidon (E1).[21] But no fourth-century monumental architecture is known on Kea, Naxos or Thera—which must weaken the impact of Lodwick's remarks about the Naxian kleroukhy.

Much of the Delian building can plausibly be directly connected with the Athenian empire. The four treasuries are surely linked to Delos becoming the place for the treasury of the League itself, and I find it attractive to see the Great Temple as begun and financed with the share that Delian Apollo putatively took of the tribute while the Treasury was at Delos, and then broken off when the Treasury was removed to Athens and that share went to Athena.[22]

[20]Lodwick 1996: 214–15. In the follow passage I use *GD* to refer to P. Bruneau and J. Ducat *Guide de Délos*, 3rd ed. (Paris, 1991).

[21]Amorgos: *Ergon* 1986, 1987; Andros: *Archaiologike Ephemeris* 1964: 2–4; Paros: *Archäologische Anzeiger* 1982: 245–90, 621–83; Tenos: Etienne and Braun 1986.

[22]Lodwick (1996: 214) prefers to see that temple as "commissioned by the Athenians"—despite his drawing attention to the fact that, unlike the Temple of the Athenians, it employed "typically Cycladic techniques and proportions."

Looking at the rest of the Aegean shows that the Cyclades are no more special than Ionia. A temple of Apollo Eretimios near Tholós on Rhodes with an associated theatre may belong to the end of the fifth century (or to the beginning of the fourth).[23] On Karpathos there are defensive walls that might date to the fifth century (or might not). Only for Thasos, where there have been extensive careful excavations, is there much to catalogue. Lodwick, who for architectural reasons looks at Thasos as well as the Cyclades, catalogues as "monumental" only the addition of a Doric colonnade to the North building at Aliki. But on a less restrictive definition of "monumental" rather more can be reported—all conveniently summed up by Grandjean ten years ago.[24] And it is worth reporting it, since non-monumental as well as monumental building costs money, and it may not be money alone that determines whether to build monumentally.

The fuller Thasian picture looks like this. A new amphora warehouse was constructed by the Gate of Zeus c. 475–450 and another building there late in the century; there is an early fifth-century building and a metalworking workshop near the Gate of Herakles. The Artemision was extended. There are signs that building extended into the plain during the century but also involved in-fill within previously built-up area—e.g., "sondage Platis." Near the Agora a sanctuary of Soteira was constructed, and the theatre existed by the end of the century. This compares with, in the late sixth or early fifth century, the construction of the city walls, the construction of the terrace for the Evraiocastro sanctuary, the building of a *leskhe* at the Heraklion, the extension of the sanctuary of Athena Polioukhos, the building of the harbour mole and the construction of the passage of the theoroi.[25]

There clearly is a contrast between the amount of construction in the quarter century or so before the Persian wars and that in the seventy-five years afterwards. But what are we to make of this contrast? Grandjean himself is clear that we should not make too much: "La prise de Thasos par les Athéniens en 463 ne paraît pas avoir affecté les différentes composantes de la ville; seul le rempart a été touché, et encore son démantèlement n'a-t-il pas été complet.... L'appauvrissement de la cité est perceptible au travers des listes de tributs, on ne relève rien de tel dans l'habitat de cette époque.... La ville, qui avait connu un essor architectural considérable au début du v^e^ siècle a dû vivre sur cette

[23]Jacopi 1933.
[24]Grandjean 1988.
[25]For the last see *BCH* 117 (1993): 652.

lancée tout au long de ce siècle, en ajoutant même quelques créations nouvelles."[26] Good sense, or special pleading?

To answer that question we need to look outside the Athenian empire. How much building did any city other than Athens do in the fifth century? If we restrict ourselves to temples, the Peloponnese can boast not only the temple of Zeus at Olympia, the new Heraion at Argos (which followed destruction of the earlier temple by fire), and the temple of Apollo at Bassai, but also quite large temples at such unsung places as Asea and Alipheira (temple of Athena). Sicily continues to show extravagant temple building down to c. 450 (temples of Victory at Himera, of Athena at Syracuse, A, O, M and ER at Selinous, Hera Lakinia at Akragas) but after that only Agrigento keeps up the momentum with temples of Concord (450–425), Hephaistos (425–406) and temple L (second half of the fifth century), apart from the propylon to the Demeter Malophoros sanctuary at Selinous and the Doric temple at Segesta, for the construction of which special factors may be operative. The temple of Poseidon at Paestum dates to c. 460 and the temple of Hera at Croton to a similar period; the Doric temple at Caulonia is the only Italian mainland temple from the second half of the century. No other place in the Greek world builds any temple on any scale between 480 and 400.

At Delphi there were monuments to the victory in the Persian Wars and to the Athenian monument to victory at Eurymedon, a fifth-century phase to the altar of Apollo (for which Hdt. 2.135, giving no indication of date, is our main evidence, and which was a Khian dedication), a mid-century Corcyrean base (following an early century Corcyrean bull), the treasury of Brasidas and the Akanthians (again on literary evidence, Plut. *Lys.* 1.1–3, *SIG*^{3} 79),[27] the Athenian stoa, the Knidian Leskhe (dated by Polygnotos' paintings) and a Trojan Horse dedicated by Argos c. 414. In this meagre haul, monuments are as likely to be erected by Ionians as by anyone else.

A similar dearth of non-Athenian building is apparent if we turn to stoas.[28] There are plenty of Athenian stoas: we have just met the Athenian stoa at Delphi; in Athens itself there are the Stoa Poikile, probably the Stoa of the Herms, the stoa of the sanctuary of Artemis Brauronia on the Akropolis, the Stoa of Zeus, South Stoa I, a stoa in the Peiraieus, the west stoa at the Asklepieion. In Attica there is the pi-stoa at Brauron. Elsewhere there is the South Stoa at the Argive Heraion of 450–40, a stoa at the sanctuary of

[26]Grandjean 1988: 476.
[27]See Hornblower 1996:11–12.
[28]See Coulton 1974: 39–46.

Poseidon at Kalaureia, and two stoas at Elis (all apparently of the last third of the century), the North Stoa II at Corinth, and the West Stoa and East Hall at Olynthos (all of uncertain fifth-century date), and the Theban stoa built from the spoils of Delion, known only from Diodoros 12.70.5. Coulton indeed notes this Athenian dominance and puts it down to the Athenian empire: "The economic history of Greece in the fourth century," he writes, "means that the distribution of stoas is very different from that in the fifth century. The contribution of Athens is not of major significance, for she no longer had the resources of her empire to finance building."[29]

Coulton's emphasis on economic history points to one Thucydidean conclusion which this survey of fifth-century building would seem to encourage: building does not straightforwardly—does not at all, perhaps—reveal the political history of Greece. One could not predict whether or not a city belonged to the Athenian empire by whether or not it engaged in monumental building. The pattern of building within the Athenian empire is not markedly different from the pattern of building outside it. True, the Peloponnese can boast a small but significant crop of fifth-century temples, and that crop would compare relatively well with the crop of sixth-century temples there, but these conspicuously concentrate in cities (Asea, Alipheira, Phigaleia) which, as far as the literary record is concerned, entirely lack a fifth-century political history. These are cities of the lowest rank, whose peers are strictly their neighbours, and they are cities whose resources are in general agricultural, supplemented perhaps from the war booty of returning mercenaries.

But if the pattern of building in the fifth century does not reflect the major movements of political history, does it better reflect the economic history of Greece? The activity of Alipheira and Asea again argues against this, and alongside this can be laid the literary evidence for prosperity in cities which did not build in the fifth century. Indeed literary evidence suggests that Ionia itself was prosperous: Thucydides 8.40.2 remarks that Khios had more slaves than any other city except Sparta.[30] This is hardly a sign of poverty—Andrewes observes in his commentary that "Chios was a rich and extensive island, but the absolute number of its slaves cannot have been greater than that of Attica. Thucydides presumably had in mind the proportion of slave to free, the density of the slave population."[31] Thucydides remarks at 8.24.4 about the "eudaimonia" of Khios, and in the context (it is coupled with *sophrosune* and a

[29]Coulton 1974: 46.
[30]Compare 8.15.2 with Robert, *BCH* 59 (1935): 453–59 for their military use.
[31]*HCT* V.86–87.

rank order in which they are second to Sparta) this is clearly in part a political comment, but it must also suggest material prosperity. More generally the implication of the Persian King's eagerness to collect arrears from Ionia (Th. 8.5), whatever those arrears were, implies that the amounts that could be pressed from the area were not insignificant.

In sum, Cook was right that there is less building in fifth-century than sixth-century Ionia, though there was more fifth-century activity there than he chose to acknowledge; but this is part of a wider pattern where, from Sicily to Asia Minor, Athens itself is the only serious exception to the rule that cities that had built monumentally in the century before the Persian wars build little in the years after. Cook was therefore premature, at least, in concluding that the dearth of building indicated an economic decline in Ionia that demanded an explanation in peculiarly Ionian terms. While we must allow at least a minimal correlation between possessing surplus funds and building, lack of building cannot be taken as a sign of lack of prosperity and the pattern of fifth-century building seems at least insufficiently explained in economic terms. Both sixth- and fifth-century patterns of building make more sense in terms of competition within and between communities, of neighbourly rivalry and "peer-polity interaction," than in terms of economic boom and slump.

Can archaeology measure prosperity?

The poor, individually and even collectively, are very hard to find in literary and epigraphic sources, both because those sources are dominated by activities that presuppose wealth and because we have no criterion for poverty in the way that we have criteria for wealth. Poverty does not show up archaeologically: failure to build in stone, failure to use high-class pottery, failure to put valuable objects into graves or offering trenches—none of these demonstrate poverty. Those of us who work on the eighth and seventh century in Attica have had to come to terms with this invisibility, not least as a result of Ian Morris's work, but it is a hard lesson to learn.[32] In the excitement of finding that there was much more material in the Greek countryside in the late fifth and especially the fourth century than there was in the sixth, it was tempting to see this fact as a measure of prosperity. But careful work on the uncertain nature and size of these rural establishments leads to the conclusion that the mass of evidence was generated by a small percentage of the population, and I remain more attracted by the view that what we see is politically induced social choices rather than major economic revolutions *à la* van Andel and Runnels.[33] And it

[32]Morris 1987; Osborne 1989.
[33]Osborne 1987, 1996a; van Andel and Runnels 1987.

might be worse than that: though I am sceptical about some of the procedures they employ in their calculations, Bintliff and Snodgrass point to a real problem with finding archaeological remains in Boiotia to match the known population levels, and the total invisibility of the poor is a real possibility.[34]

Measuring prosperity is not the same thing as saying something about the economy. I am a firm believer in the possibility of revealing something about the economy from archaeology, but more its nature and structure than absolute levels of productivity, etc. We are more likely to be able to see archaeologically whether the Athenian empire had an impact on the structure of the economy than on prosperity, but it will be small finds, and perhaps site distribution, that show that effect, rather than monumental buildings or their absence. Currently we do not have enough careful excavations to be able to compare, for example, the distribution of types of pottery within and outside the empire. To study distribution one must have good cemetery excavations, and from the empire we have virtually nothing of that sort beyond the Rheneia purification trench. One indication of this is that works by or near the Phiale Painter are recorded from Amyklai, Knossos, Corfu, Thebes, Oropos, Corinth, and the Near East as well as from Sicily and Italy; but from within the empire there is just one piece from Eretria and four from Rheneia and Delos.[35] Eretria and the island of Khalki off Rhodes (with one piece each) are the only imperial provenances recorded for the Eretria Painter's work, which otherwise is found in Spain, France, and the Black Sea as well as Italy and Athens.[36] With data so lacking analysis of patterns is futile.

Is there an archaeology of the Athenian Empire?

Cook drew attention to a pattern that indeed deserved attention but jumped to the wrong conclusion. But if archaeology cannot tell us how impoverished the Ionians were, what can it tell us about the empire?

Monumental building is a way of forging an identity. Buildings, political or civic buildings but above all religious buildings with their associated rituals, form a focus for community endeavour and expression. Temples show off cult, they show that a community cares about its gods, and they imply that those gods are worth caring about. The Athenian building programme went hand in hand with the enhancement of cult in other ways—linking tribute payment to the Dionysia and making settlements abroad bring phalloi to parade, presumably on that occasion, enhancing the Panathenaia by ordering allies to

[34]Bintliff and Snodgrass 1985.
[35]Oakley 1990.
[36]Lezzi-Hafter 1988.

come along with a cow and a full set of armour. Similarly the re-invention of tradition on Delos, when the festival of the Delia is started up again on a grand scale after the Athenian purification of the island, goes with the Athenian construction of a temple there. Athens was claiming that her own deities (and at Eleusis as well as on the Acropolis, see *ML* 73) and the Delian deities whose affairs she conveniently controlled (all the Delian amphiktions were Athenians, nonsensical though that was in terms of the point of having amphiktions running the sanctuary) deserved international attention.

What, by contrast, the absence of development of cult centres elsewhere in the Empire shows is the failure of allies to promote their own sanctuaries and festivals in the face of this. Despite having the makings of cult centres with more than just a local pull, sanctuaries like the Heraion on Samos or the sanctuary of Artemis at Ephesos seem, to judge from the archaeology, to have done nothing to promote themselves. It is not simply that they do nothing innovative in cult terms; they seem not even to reinforce in any material way their traditional cult activities, as one might expect them to if they were actively resisting outside pressure. This inactivity contrasts with the acute awareness of the possible politics of cult that is shown both by the Herodotean story of Telesarkhos' decisive opposition to Maiandrios' request to exchange a political for a cultic role following the death of Polykrates (Hdt. 3.142–43) and by the Samian foundation of games in honour of Lysander in the early fourth century.

There is no evidence which would suggest that Athens prevented or repressed cult activity among her allies (even if nothing suggests that she encouraged it), and only in the cases of Delian Apollo and perhaps Theban Amphiaraos is there evidence of Athens stealing the limelight.[37] The decision not to build, or rather the failure to make the decision *to* build, has to have been more or less freely taken by Athens' allies; it was exactly the same decision as was taken by the great majority of Greek cities outside the Athenian empire too. It was a decision which suggests little desire to reconfigure existing patterns of cult activity or existing local and city identities. It was a decision, further, which suggests that the allies were not so unhappy about what Athens was doing that they felt impelled to adopt countervailing measures. Ionian enthusiasm to establish what we know as the Delian League, attested in some of our literary sources, can be understood in terms of the positive desire to assert a Greek identity; it was the political version of what massive temple building had done in the sixth century. Their choice of Delos as the centre not only drew on traditional ties celebrated in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, it also made the

[37]For Amphiaraos see Parker 1996.

Ionians look *west*, and that was a advantage to be put alongside the disadvantages when Athens set up practical and cultic means of putting herself at the centre of the League.

For Cook and his followers, lack of archaeological evidence of fifth-century activity in Ionia and elsewhere in the Athenian empire is evidence of oppression. That interpretation is, I have tried to show, revealed as essentially baseless by comparison with the behaviour of cities outside the empire. It is hard enough to explain why people do things, harder still to explain why they fail to do things. But if we start from observations about the role of building, when it does occur, in peer-polity interaction, it may not be fanciful to interpret lack of building in a similar way. If we do so, it seems more reasonable to see the (lack of) archaeological evidence as revealing Athenian popularity rather than Athenian oppression, more reasonable to think that in the great debate over the popularity of the Athenian empire the evidence supports Geoffrey de Ste Croix rather than Thucydides.[38]

Works Cited

Akurgal, E. 1978. *Ancient civilisations and ruins of Turkey*. 4th ed. Istanbul.

Amit, M. 1975. "The disintegration of the Athenian Empire in Asia Minor." *Scripta Classica Israelica* 2: 38–72.

Balcer, J. M. 1984. *Sparda by the bitter sea. Imperial interaction in Western Anatolia*. Chico.

———. 1985. "Fifth-century Ionia: a frontier revisited." *REA* 87: 31–42.

Bintliff, J. L., and A. M. Snodgrass. 1985. "The Cambridge/Bradford Boeotian Expedition: the first four years." *Journal of Field Archaeology* 12: 123–61.

Boardman, J. 1964. Review of Cook 1962 in *CR* 14: 82–83.

Boersma, J. S. 1970. *Athenian Building Policy from 561/0 to 405/4 B.C.E.* Groningen.

Bommelaer, J.-F. 1991. *Guide de Delphes. Le Site*. Paris.

Bruneau, P. and Ducat, J. 1983. *Guide de Délos*. 3rd ed. Paris.

Cook, J. M. 1961. "The problem of classical Ionia." *PCPhS* 7: 9–18.

———. 1962. *The Greeks in Ionia and the East*. London.

Coulton, J. J. 1974. *The architectural development of the Greek stoa*. Oxford.

Étienne, R. and J. P. Braun. 1986. *Ténos I: le sanctuaire de Poseidon et d'Amphitrite*. Paris.

Gomme, A. W., A. Andrewes, and K. J. Dover. 1981. *A historical commentary on Thucydides*. Vol. V. Oxford.

Grandjean, Y. 1988. *Recherches sur l'habitat Thasien à l'époque grecque. Ét. Thas.* XII. Paris.

Hornblower, S. 1991. *A commentary on Thucydides*. Vol. I. Oxford.

———. 1996. *A commentary on Thucydides*. Vol. II. Oxford.

Jacopi, G. 1933. "Il tempio e il teatro d'Apollo Eretimio." *Clara Rhodos* 2: 77–116.

Kallet-Marx, L. 1993. *Money, expense, and naval power in Thucydides'* History. Berkeley.

Lezzi-Hafter, A. 1988. *Der Eretria-maler und sein Kreis*. Mainz.

[38]Ste Croix 1954/5.

Lodwick M. V. 1996. *The monumental architecture of the Cyclades in the Classical and Hellenistic periods*. D. Phil. thesis. Oxford.
Meiggs, R. 1972. *The Athenian Empire*. Oxford.
Morris, I. M. 1987. *Burial and ancient society*. Cambridge.
Oakley, J. 1990. *The Phiale Painter*. Mainz.
Osborne, R. G. 1987. *Classical landscape with figures: the ancient Greek city and its countryside*. London.
Osborne, R. G. 1989. "A crisis in archaeological history? The seventh century in Attica." *Annual of the British School at Athens* 84: 297–322.
———. 1994. "Democracy and Imperialism in the Panathenaic Procession: The Parthenon Frieze in its Context." In W. Coulson *et al.*, eds., *The archaeology of Athens and Attica under the Democracy*. Oxford: 143–50.
———. 1996a. "*Classical landscape* revisited." *Topoi* 6: 49–64.
———. 1996b. *Greece in the Making 1200–479 B.C.E.* London.
———. 1998. *Archaic and Classical Greek Art.* Oxford.
Parker, R. C. T. 1996. *Athenian Religion: a history*. Oxford.
Pritchett, W. K. 1975. *The Greek State at War.* Vol. I. Berkeley.
Shipley, G. 1987. *A history of Samos 800–188 B.C.E.* Oxford.
Snodgrass, A. M. 1986. "Interaction by design: the Greek city-state." In C. Renfrew and J. Cherry, eds., *Peer polity interactions and the development of sociocultural complexity*. Cambridge. 47–58.
de Ste Croix, G. E. M. 1954/5. "The character of the Athenian Empire." *Historia* 3: 1–41.
van Andel, Tj., and C. Runnels. 1987. *Beyond the Acropolis. A rural Greek past.* Stanford.