SEPARATING FACT FROM FICTION IN THE IONIAN MIGRATION

ABSTRACT

The Ionian cities of Asia Minor have been the subject of much discussion, particularly in regard to their foundation. Traditional accounts of this foundation posit a large-scale migration from the Greek mainland led by Athenian colonists. This article reviews the historical, archaeological, and linguistic evidence for the origins of the Ionian cities, and offers a new analysis of the substantial body of later literary material written in Greek and Latin. This new analysis of the literary material brings the origin of the cities into sharper focus in terms of both the complex patterns of mobility and local settlement that contributed to their physical origins, and the equally complex sociopolitical concerns that shaped the origins of their Ionian identity.

In the 2008 volume of this journal, Brian Rose and Holt Parker published a pair of articles on the Aiolian Migration in which they reconsidered the evidence for a mass migration from mainland Greece to the northeastern Aegean during the Early Iron Age.¹ This article seeks to follow Rose and Parker's lead, examining the evidence for settlement in Ionia, the area immediately to the south of Aiolia. Specifically, I offer a reassessment of the evidence surrounding the Ionian Migration, a large-scale migration from mainland Greece to Ionia thought to have occurred roughly around the same time the Aiolian Migration, during the 12th, 11th, and 10th centuries B.C.

Such a reassessment is now timely, given the significant advances in knowledge of recent decades. Most obviously, archaeological and epigraphic discoveries in Ionia have greatly changed our perspective, and several excellent surveys of this material are already available.² Less well

1. This article owes much to the work of Rose (2008) and Parker (2008), and I am grateful to both Brian Rose and Jeremy McNerney for the opportunity to present some of these ideas in the Gold Medal Award Session honoring Rose at the 146th Annual Meeting

of the Archaeological Institute of America in 2015. I would also like to thank Susan Lupack and the anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments. I am extremely grateful to Olivier Mariaud, Antonis Kostonas, Jana Mokrišová, and Stephen Colvin

for their insight and helpful suggestions on earlier drafts of this article. Any errors of fact or judgment are solely my own.

2. See Lemos 2007; Herda 2009; Greaves 2010; Mariaud, forthcoming.

material in general.⁴ In this article, I will reexamine the literary sources in the light of these new developments, setting the literary material within a comprehensive overview of other forms of evidence in order to shed new light on the origins of the Ionian cities.

The cities of Ionia lie along the central western seaboard of Anatolia and its adjacent islands, clustered around the mouths of the Hermos, the Kayster, and the Maeander Rivers (the modern Gediz, Küçük Menderes, and Büyük Menderes Rivers; see Fig. 1). These cities were a vital part of the ancient Greek world, and yet they were also fully integrated within the Anatolian sphere. This article will focus on the 13 cities that were members of the Ionian League, an exclusive political and religious association established sometime in the Geometric–Archaic periods and which lasted until at least the 2nd or 3rd century A.D.⁵ The 12 original cities of the League, listed north–south, were: Phokaia, Klazomenai, Erythrai, Chios, Teos, Lebedos, Kolophon, Ephesos, Samos, Priene, Myous, and Miletos. By the end of the Archaic period, these cities were joined by Smyrna, which originally was an Aiolian city. Unless specified otherwise, the term “Ionian” in this article is used narrowly, referring to these 13 members of the Ionian League, as opposed to either the geographical region of Ionia or the wider Ionian *ethnos*. I have chosen to focus on these 13 cities because the members of the League shared a particularly strong collective identity, which was actively celebrated through their League membership. One important aspect of this identity was negotiated through the idea of common origins. Various stories were told in antiquity about Ionian origins, the best known of which is the myth of the Ionian Migration.

The story of the Ionian Migration describes a large-scale population movement from mainland Greece, which was predominantly composed of and led by Athenians. These colonists are said to have crossed the Aegean during the Early Iron Age and settled in the region that later became known as Ionia, founding cities on the coast and nearby islands. Perhaps the fullest version of the story can be found in the writings of the 2nd-century A.D. writer Pausanias (7.2.1–4):

ἔτεσι δὲ οὐ πολλοῖς ὕστερον Μέδων καὶ Νειλεὺς πρεσβύτατοι τῶν Κόδρου παίδων ἐστασίασαν ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀρχῆς, καὶ οὐκ ἔφασκεν ὁ Νειλεὺς ἀνέξεσθαι βασιλευόμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ Μέδοντος, ὅτι ὁ Μέδων τὸν ἕτερον ἦν τῶν ποδῶν χωλός. δόξαν δὲ σφισιν ἀνενεγκεῖν ἐς τὸ χρηστήριον τὸ ἐν Δελφοῖς, δίδωσι Μέδοντι ἢ Πυθία βασιλείαν τὴν Ἀθηναίων. οὕτω δὲ ὁ Νειλεὺς καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ τῶν Κόδρου παίδων ἐς ἀποικίαν ἀπεστάλησαν, ἀγαγόντες μὲν καὶ αὐτῶν Ἀθηναίων τὸν βουλόμενον, τὸ δὲ πλεῖστόν σφισιν ἦσαν τοῦ στρατεύματος οἱ Ἰῶνες. . . . ὥς δὲ ταῖς ναυσὶν ἐς τὴν Ἀσίαν κατήραν, ἐπ’ ἄλλην ἐτρέποντο ἄλλοι τῶν ἐπὶ θαλάσῃ πόλεων.

Not many years later Medon and Neileus, the oldest of the sons of Kodros, quarrelled about the kingship, as Neileus did not agree that Medon should be elevated to rule over him, because Medon was lame in one foot. They referred the matter to the Delphic oracle, and the Pythia gave kingship over the Athenians to Medon. And

4. Newly discovered texts in recent decades include new fragments of Sappho (Obbink 2014) and Simonides (Boedeker and Sider 2001), which change our understanding of inter-regional interaction and historiography in the Archaic period, respectively. One example of a new critical study is the commentary on Lycophron (Hornblower 2015), which sheds new light on important passages concerning the foundation of Miletos in particular. New theoretical and methodological approaches include the post-colonial turn, intertextuality, and reception studies; see, e.g., Cameron 1989.

5. For the Ionian League, see Crielaard 2009, pp. 65–66; Mac Sweeney 2013, pp. 173–187. It is significant that certain cities were never admitted to the Ionian League despite both belonging to the Ionian *ethnos* and being located in the region of Ionia, e.g., Magnesia on the Maeander.

so Neileus and the rest of the sons of Kodros were sent off to live abroad, taking with them any Athenian who wished to go, and the majority of them on the expedition were Ionians. . . . When they arrived at Asia by ship, each turned their steps to different cities on the sea.

Versions of this story, or references to it, appear in many literary sources from the Classical period onward. The Ionian Migration is also the standard narrative of Ionian origins in modern scholarship, and its historicity was accepted for much of the 19th and 20th centuries. The modern popularity of the story must be understood in the context of broader trends in archaeology; migration was long the standard explanation offered for cultural change, and it remained so until major shifts in interpretive approaches during the late 20th century.⁶ Although doubt was cast on the veracity of the Ionian Migration story as early as 1906,⁷ it was not until the late 20th century that the principle of the migration was more widely challenged. This was due to new theoretical movements in archaeology, new approaches to the later phenomenon of Greek colonization, and, most importantly of all, new archaeological evidence from Ionia.⁸ Opinions still diverge over the historicity of the Ionian Migration, with some scholars maintaining the essential accuracy of the story, and others rejecting it completely.⁹

Although it is not often acknowledged, the disagreement fundamentally stems from differing approaches to the literary evidence. Supporters of the Ionian Migration argue that this evidence is reliable, claiming that texts document stories preserved in the oral tradition, which themselves began as faithful accounts of historical events. In contrast, detractors of the Ionian Migration argue that the literary evidence does not reflect historical truth, asserting that since both oral and literary traditions make innovative and strategic use of existing stories, the sheer extent of the exaggerations, inventions, and omissions in the stories over time would render them historically inaccurate. For example, it has been pointed out that the story of foundation from Athens may have served a political purpose in the context of Athenian imperial ambitions during the 5th century, and may have been exaggerated or even invented to serve this purpose.¹⁰ It is assumed—on both sides of the debate—that the central concept of the Ionian Migration derives from literary sources. While archaeological and linguistic evidence is often used to argue either for or against the historicity of the Ionian Migration, the basic hypothesis of the migration itself is presumed to come from texts.¹¹

Despite the centrality of the literary material to the Ionian Migration debate, there has been little critical examination of this material in recent literature, and none that integrates a detailed analysis of the texts with recent information from archaeological, epigraphic, and visual sources. In this article, I will attempt precisely this. Before turning to the literary sources however, I will first offer a survey of the other historical, archaeological, and linguistic evidence surrounding the origins of the Ionian cities.

6. For an overview of archaeological approaches to the concept of migration, see Lightfoot 2008; van Dommelen 2014.

7. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1906. There was also some disagreement at this time among scholars who did believe in the historicity of the Ionian Migration. While most placed it in the Early Iron Age (e.g., Beloch 1913, p. 399; Caspari 1915, p. 179), others claimed it occurred during the Late Bronze Age (e.g., Meyer 1901, p. 392).

8. For new theoretical movements, see Jones 1997; Johnson 2010, pp. 102–215; Hodder 2012. For new approaches to Greek colonization, see Osborne 1998; Antonaccio 2009; Tsatsikhladze and Hargrave 2011. For new archaeological evidence, see sections on the archaeology of Ionia, pp. 387–397, below.

9. For general acceptance of the story, see Cook 1962, p. 24; Herda 2013, p. 426. For wholesale rejection of the story, see Cobet 2007; Greaves 2010, pp. 222–224. For the historiography of modern scholarship surrounding the Ionian Migration, see Vaessen 2014, pp. 43–78.

10. This has been widely argued, including by Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1906, pp. 54, 70–71; Sakellariou 1958; Hall 1997, pp. 55–56; Lemos 2007, p. 714, with references.

11. E.g. Crielaard 2009, p. 51; Greaves 2010, p. 10; Herda 2013, p. 427, n.19.

HISTORICAL SOURCES FOR IONIA AND THE IONIANS

There are a range of early written sources that offer evidence either for the region of Ionia or for the Ionians as a group. Some of these belong to the periods immediately preceding the supposed date of the Ionian Migration (i.e., the Late Bronze Age [LBA], before ca. 1200 B.C.), and others belong to the periods that follow (i.e., the Geometric and Archaic periods, ca. 900–500 B.C.).¹² Unfortunately, no textual evidence survives for the intervening Early Iron Age (EIA; ca. 1200–900 B.C.), the time during which the Ionian cities are thought to have been founded. The sources treated in this section are considered separately from literary accounts of Ionian foundations (which will be discussed in detail below), partly because they are earlier in date, but also because they do not directly address the question of the origins of the Ionian cities.

It seems that there was a good deal of continuity in the terms used to designate the region from the Late Bronze Age until the 6th century B.C. For the Late Bronze Age, our fullest evidence comes from the Hittite texts, which use a range of toponyms for the region. Several documents refer to the *Arzawa* lands, apparently designating the central portion of western Anatolia (more or less the areas covered by the later regions of Lydia, Aiolia, Ionia, and Karia).¹³ The *Arzawa* lands comprised several independent principalities: *Mira-Kurwaliya*, *Hapalla*, and the *Seha River Land*, and most importantly, *Arzawa* itself.¹⁴ The term *Arzawa* in the broad sense overlapped somewhat with another term, that of *Assurwa*.¹⁵ The *Assurwa* lands included those of *Arzawa*, but they also seem to have incorporated the areas directly to the north, including the later regions of Mysia and the Troad. A form of the name *Assurwa*—*Aswiai*—can also be found in Linear B tablets from Pylos, Knossos, and Mycenae.¹⁶ The term is used as an ethnic identifier, and occurs alongside ethnics that can be located in the eastern Aegean and Anatolia.¹⁷ Less directly helpful is the related term found in contemporary Egyptian inscriptions: *Isy*. In one inscription this is paired with Keftiu (Crete), implying an Aegean location.¹⁸ On balance, the associated terms *Assurwa*–*Aswiai*–*Isy* seem to refer to the northern and central parts of western Anatolia, and they are the likely forerunners of the later Greek word *Asia* (Ἀσία).

12. The Geometric and Archaic periods are roughly contemporary with what is sometimes called the Middle Iron Age in Anatolian and Near Eastern archaeology.

13. Garstang and Gurney 1959, pp. 75–109; Heinhold-Krahmer 1977; Hawkins 1998, 2009.

14. These separate kingdoms were at times united in a confederacy against the Hittites, and their collective leader was involved in high-level interregional

diplomacy. Two letters from the Amarna archive appear to be from the King of *Arzawa*: EA 31 and EA 32, and they are unusual in that they were written in Hittite rather than Akkadian, but their contents are typical of Amarna diplomatic correspondence, dealing with dynastic marriages, dowries, and an exchange of ambassadors.

15. Bossert 1946; Güterbock 1986, p. 40; Bryce 2009, p. 83.

16. Morris 2001.

17. These ethnics include designations for people from the later Ionian settlements of Miletos (*Milatiai*) and Chios (*Kswiai*), as well as nearby Knidos (*Knidiai*), Lemnos (*Lamniai*), and Halikarnassos (*Dzephurrai*). For the eastern Aegean ethnics in Linear B, see Shelmerdine 1998, p. 295; Niko-loudis 2008; Olsen 2014, pp. 95, 106–107.

18. Cline 1997, pp. 193–196.

Indeed, when the term “Asia” first appears in Greek literary texts in the 8th century, it seems to refer exclusively to western Anatolia. Its first occurrence is in Homer’s description of “Asian meadows on both banks of the Kayster River” (Ἀσίῳ ἐν λειμῶνι Καῦστρίου ἀμφὶ ῥέεθρα, *Il.* 2.461). In this context, the “Asian meadows” are clearly located in the area that the Hittites would have considered to be *Assuwa*. The term appears again in Hesiod (*Theog.* 360) as the name of a river nymph, but a reference to the geographical location of the river in question is not provided. It is used as a western Anatolian toponym again in a fragment from the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women* (fr. 180 M–W; *POxy* XXVIII 2503.3–4), stating the birth of Dardanos was located in “wheat-bearing Asia” (πυ]ροφόρου Ἀσίας) by the “eddyng River Hermos” (μη]λοβότους Ἑρμῶν). Similarly, a fragment from the 7th-century poet Archilochos describes the Lydian king Gyges as “ruling over sheep-rearing Asia” (ὁ δ’ Ἀσίας καρτερὸς μηλοτρόφου, fr. 227 West). Around the same time, the poet Mimnermos of Kolophon also referred to his home region on the Anatolian coast as Asia (fr. 9 West). It therefore appears that until the 7th century, the central portion of western Anatolia was not referred to as “Ionia,” but rather as “Asia.” It was only later, during the course of the 6th century, that the name “Asia” came to designate an entire continent.¹⁹

Just as references to the region make no use of the word “Ionia,” references to Ionia and Ionians offer no clear link to the region.²⁰ Indeed, the earliest uses of the term make no clear geographical connection whatsoever. These come from the Late Bronze Age, on two Linear B tablets from Knossos that use the ethnic term *Ijawone* to refer to specific detachments of soldiers.²¹ Around the same time, the word *Ijaunia* appears in a list of subdued countries from the mortuary temple of Amenophis III in Egyptian Thebes.²² It is unclear whether the list is ordered by geographical location, but if this were the case, *Ijaunia* would be located in central Greece. The toponym *Yman* in Ugaritic texts may also potentially be related to these terms, although the only location given refers in a generic way to islands and the sea.²³ The Late Bronze Age terms *Ijawone*–*Ijaunia*–*Yman* cannot therefore be linked to any specific location, and it is possible that these words had different geographic connotations in Knossos, Egypt, and Ugarit.

The Greek word for the Ionians appears for the first time in Homer, where a corps of “Ionians with long tunics” (Ἰάονες ἐλκεχίτωνες, *Il.* 13.685)

19. While it is the received opinion that 6th-century geographers used the term “Asia” (e.g., Munn 2006, pp. 179–188), I would like to highlight that the evidence for this comes only from the reports of later sources. It is the 2nd-century A.D. writer Athenaios who first tells us that one of the sections in the *Periegesis* of Hekataios was entitled “Asia” (*FGrH* 1 T15b), and most of the surviving fragments of this section have been preserved for us in the writings of the 6th-century A.D. Stephanos of Byzantion. Perhaps the earliest (although

indirect) attribution can be found in Herodotos’s critique of maps that portray Europe and Asia as being of equal size (*Hdt.* 4.36). It seems likely that Herodotos was referring to the maps of Hekataios and Anaximander. If we follow received opinion, however, and postulate a change in the use of the term “Asia” in the 6th century, this change in meaning can be paralleled by a similar shift in the terms “Europe” and “Hellas.” Both these terms appear to have initially designated relatively limited geographical areas in the central Greek

mainland, but both gained a broader meaning at a similar time. For the changing use of the term “Hellas,” see Hall 2002, pp. 129–134; for the original use of the term “Europe,” see Tozer 1971, p. xii (and *Hymn. Hom. Ap.* 251).

20. For discussion of the early use of the term “Ionia,” see Hall 2002, pp. 70–71; Crielaard 2009, pp. 41–44.

21. Chadwick et al. 1986, tablets KN XD 146 (p. 67) and KN B 164 (p. 81).

22. Haider 2008.

23. Dietrich and Loretz 1998.

is listed alongside units of men from Boiotia, Lokri, and Epeios. This strongly implies a mainland Greek location. Roughly contemporary is the use of the term *Iamanaja* in several Neo-Assyrian texts.²⁴ The word is used to refer to raiders who regularly attacked the Phoenician and Cilician coasts, eventually incurring punitive campaigns by Assyrian kings in the late 8th and early 7th centuries.²⁵ In these texts, the Ionians are said to live “in the midst of the sea” somewhere in the west, and it is generally thought that the term was used as a broad category for Greek communities.²⁶ When the related term *Yamanaya* appears slightly later in Neo-Babylonian texts, it is used to designate a group of specialized craftspeople working at the palace in Babylon, while *Yawan* describes the origin of certain consignments of imported textiles and metals.²⁷ In neither context are the geographic implications of the word clear. Indeed, when the personal names of some *Yamanaya* workers are given in a dossier of Nebuchadnezzar II (ca. 592 B.C.), they appear to be Luwian or Anatolian names.²⁸ This implies that the term may have been used not just for Greek-speakers, but also for a range of maritime western groups including Anatolians and Cypriots. It is important to note that Mesopotamian ideas about the *Iamanaja/Yamanaya* may well have differed from Aegean ideas about Ionians.

The 6th-century material might suggest a shift in ideas about the location of the Ionians. In the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* (147, 152), the Ionians are described as gathering on the island of Delos for a festival, implying that they traveled to Delos from an unspecified elsewhere. A fragmentary poem of Ibykos from the mid-6th century is similarly obscure, and Ionians are included in a list of Greek groups including Lakedaimonians (fr. 282A.28 Campbell). Two further texts link the Ionians specifically to Attica. The first is a reference to the eponymous hero Ion in the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women* (fr. 10.24 Most), where Ion is listed as a descendant of the Athenian autochthon Erechtheos, and the second is a fragmentary poem by Solon, where Attica is referred to as the “foremost country of Ionia” (πρεσβυτάτην . . . γαῖαν [Ι]ωνίης, fr. 4 West).²⁹ The earliest potential usage of the term in an eastern Aegean context comes from a fragment of Sappho from the early 6th century B.C. (fr. 98.12 Campbell). Here Sappho refers to “Ionia’s cities” when discussing events relating to her own homeland of Lesbos and luxury goods imported from the Lydian capital of Sardis. In the original papyrus,

24. See Rollinger 2001, pp. 237–243; 2007; 2009; 2011; Luraghi 2006, pp. 30–33.

25. The Ionians are first recorded as seaborne raiders in the reign of Tiglath-Pileser III, ca. 730 B.C. They appear again in several texts of Sargon II (721–705 B.C.), who claimed to have defeated them 715 B.C. (Sargon, *Annals*, lines 117–119). Sargon’s successor, Sennacherib (704–681 B.C.), claimed to have defeated Ionians again in 694 B.C., according to the later historian Berossos (*FGrH* 680 F7.31). Some years later, Esarhaddon (680–679 B.C.) once

more claimed that the king of Ionia was sending him tribute (Leichty 2011, p. 135, no. 60, line 10).

26. See, e.g., the inscription of Esarhaddon (n. 25, above) which mentions *Iaman* alongside Cyprus. This suggests that more direct knowledge about the *Iamanaja* had become available to the Assyrians by this time.

27. Evidence for trade with *Yawan* mostly comes from the private archives of merchants in Babylon; see Liverani 1991. In the Old Testament, Ezekiel 27 also presents *Yawan* as a trading region, which exchanges bronze items and

slaves with Phoenician merchants.

28. See Rollinger 2009, p. 37.

29. Scholars have usually translated πρεσβυτάτην here as “oldest,” arguing that Solon was making a reference to Athens as the mother-city of the Ionians and therefore the oldest land of Ionia (e.g., Fowler 2013, 574). But there is no obvious reason from either the text or its quoted context as to why the translation “oldest” should be preferred over “foremost,” and I have opted to use the latter to avoid investing the fragment with a significance that does not stem from the text itself.

however, the first letter of the word “Ionia” is missing (the Greek text reads [α]ονίαζ πόλις). Our reading of the word depends on the reconstruction of the initial letter, and while some scholars have reconstructed this as “of Ionia” (Ἰαονίαζ), others have reconstructed it as “of Maeonia” (Μαονίαζ), a toponym associated with the central territory of Lydia around the Hermos River valley. Sometime later, the Milesian geographer Hekataios appears to have called his home region Ionia when describing the locations of several Ionian cities (e.g., Chios, *FGrH* 1 F141; Erythrai, *FGrH* 1 F228; Miletos, *FGrH* 1 F240). Our evidence for Hekataios’s work, however, comes from quotations and summaries in much later texts, and we cannot assume that these later sources necessarily used terminology in precisely the same way as Hekataios did. Texts from the 6th century, therefore, offer no coherent sense of where Ionia was located, and they certainly give no indication that it is should be in western Anatolia.

This lack of clarity gradually gives way over the course of the 6th century. By the end of the century there was a clear identification between Ionians as a group of people and a territory called Ionia in the eastern Aegean and Anatolia. By the time Pindar wrote about the Ionian Revolt in the early 5th century, he assumes his audience would have immediately understood who the “Ionian people” were and where they were to be located (Ἰάονι . . . λαῶ, fr. 52b Race). The slow spread of the term “Ionia” may perhaps be linked to the change in use of the term “Asia.” As “Asia” increasingly became used to refer to an entire continent, its original meaning was perhaps replaced by “Ionia.” The reasons for this change remain obscure.³⁰ The increasing sense of geographical specificity seems to have been limited to Greek-speakers, however. When the term *Yauna* starts to appear in Persian sources from the late 6th century, it is used in a broad sense to refer to all Greeks, although distinctions are sometimes made between “*Yauna* who live by the sea” and “*Yauna* who live beyond the sea,” as well as “*Yauna takabara*” (this seems to designate the *Yauna* who wear *petasos*-style hats).³¹

It therefore seems that while there was a long-held concept of the Ionians as a group, they were not associated with the eastern Aegean and Anatolia either immediately before the supposed time of the Ionian Migration, or for several centuries afterward. Instead, although it is difficult to ascribe any geographical location to the early Ionians, the surviving data may point to the western Aegean. It is not until the later 6th century that we see a connection emerging between the terms “Ionia” and “Ionians” and the eastern Aegean. Prior to this, this region seems to have been known, among other names, as “Asia.” When the connection between Ionia and the Ionians does first appear, it is tentative and contested, and the toponym also continues to be associated with the western Aegean. It is not until the very end of the 6th century that we can confidently say the Ionians as a group and Ionia as a region were clearly linked.

This late date for the equation of Ionia with the Ionians has important implications. Ideas about both the region and the people remained unchanged for centuries after the date of the supposed migration—in the 8th and 7th centuries, the texts still make reference to Ionians in the western Aegean and still use the name of Asia for the eastern Aegean. Had there been a large-scale migration in the Early Iron Age (or indeed, in the latter stages of the Late Bronze Age), we might expect the change in

30. It is interesting to note that the new term “Ionia” carried Hellenic ethnic associations from the 6th century onward, whereas before the 6th century there are no clear ethnic implications of the old term “Asia.” We may perhaps speculate that this reflects changing ideas about identity and ethnicity in the region. I am indebted to Jana Mokrišová for this point.

31. Rollinger 2009, pp. 39–43.

terminology to happen closer to the time of the migration, rather than more than four centuries later. This early historical evidence therefore cannot be interpreted as supporting the idea of an Ionian Migration. Indeed, based on this evidence, if we were to identify a period of significant cultural or demographic change we would locate it in the 6th century.

THE ARCHAEOLOGY OF IONIA

THE LATE BRONZE AGE

The best direct evidence for the origins and early history of the Ionian cities comes from archaeological investigation. Unfortunately, the Late Bronze and Early Iron Age levels of most Ionian sites can be difficult to access as they lie beneath the more substantial remains of later periods, and they usually have been disturbed or partially destroyed by this later construction activity. In addition, changing environmental factors mean that the LBA and EIA phases of some sites are now either below the groundwater level or covered by deep deposits of silt from the region's rivers. Nonetheless, there is a growing body of archaeological evidence for early Ionia, which can be divided into two main categories: (1) unstratified evidence and (2) well-stratified deposits. Due to the problems of preservation and excavation mentioned above, a substantial proportion of the evidence belongs to the first category; coming from unstratified or insecure contexts, chance finds, and including survey material. This less-detailed but more extensive evidence can be considered alongside the second category, which comprises more detailed but more limited evidence from sites that have seen dedicated excavation of LBA and EIA levels where secure deposits and contextual information are available.

During the LBA, there is widespread evidence for settlement across the region that would later become known as Ionia, including at sites of many of the later Ionian cities (Fig. 1). The nature of these settlements is not always clear, due in part to our limited understanding of indigenous Anatolian material culture. Where it survives, domestic architecture seems to have varied in form, including both rectilinear and curvilinear structures; indeed, both types are found alongside each other at Level II.1 Klazomenai (on the Limantepe mound), and Level V Miletos.³² Within settlements, domestic buildings, craftworking areas, and storage spaces occurred together in relatively close proximity, as is the case with the eight kilns found at Miletos, and the kilns and workshop area at Klazomenai (Limantepe).³³ Some settlements seem to have been fortified, including Smyrna (in the Bayraklı area), Bademgediği Tepe, Ephesos (on the Ayasuluk mound), and Miletos.³⁴ In most cases, burial seems to have been in dedicated extramural necropoleis, such as the cemeteries north and west of Panaztepe, and the chamber tombs at Değirmentepe outside Miletos.³⁵ It seems that some cult activity occurred within settlements, as well as at the locations of later temples such as the Artemision at Ephesos and Klaros in Kolophonian territory.³⁶ In general, there appears to have been a high degree of local variation in terms of both material culture and social practices. This state of affairs fits well with the contemporary Hittite historical sources, which

32. Klazomenai: Erkanal and Aykurt 2008, p. 232; Mangaloğlu-Votruba 2011, p. 46. Miletos: Schiering 1959–1960, pp. 7–8. LBA curvilinear structures are also known from Phokaia; see Özyğit 2005, p. 44.

33. Klazomenai: Erkanal and Aykurt 2008, pp. 229–231. Miletos: Niemeier 1997.

34. Smyrna (Bayraklı): Cook 1958–1959, p. 121. Bademgediği Tepe: Meriç 2007, pp. 29–30. Ephesos (Ayasuluk): Bammer 1994; Büyükkolancı 2007, p. 23. Miletos: Niemeier 1998; 2007a, p. 15.

35. Panaztepe: Günel 1999a. Değirmentepe: Niemeier 1998, pp. 36–37; 2005, p. 13; Niemeier and Niemeier 1997, pp. 203–205.

36. Artemision at Ephesos: Bammer 1994; Kerschner 2011. Klaros: Şahin 2011, pp. 154–155.

depict the region as politically fragmented and comprised of several independent principalities and city-states that occasionally joined together in alliances or federations.³⁷

There is considerable scholarly discussion of the ethnic and cultural character of the region during the LBA, with the debate usually focusing on four main axes of comparison for material culture. These are (1) the Mycenaean Aegean (i.e., the western and southern Aegean); (2) the Hittite sphere in central Anatolia; (3) northwestern Anatolia (i.e., the area later known as Aiolis and the Troad); and (4) the local indigenous western Anatolian tradition.

Mycenaean pottery is known from across the region, including the later Ionian cities of Phokaia, Smyrna, Klazomenai, Erythrai, Chios, Ephesos, and Miletos (Fig. 1).³⁸ Mycenaean-style tombs have been found at several locations, including Kolophon and Miletos (Fig. 1).³⁹ At some sites, it is possible to infer Aegean social practices as well as Mycenaean styles of material culture. This is true of food preparation and cult practices at Klazomenai (Limantepe) and cult practices at Ephesos (in the Artemision area).⁴⁰ At Miletos, Mycenaean cult activity is implied by finds of *phi* and *psi* figurines; mortuary ritual at the Değirmentepe chamber tombs appears to have followed Mycenaean traditions; and ceramic production and technologies were also markedly Mycenaean in character.⁴¹ In addition, substantial quantities of the Mycenaean fine wares from Miletos seem to have been locally produced rather than imported, suggesting Mycenaean techniques of ceramic production.⁴²

Overall, evidence for interaction with the western Aegean varies from site to site. While this must be partly due to differences in preservation and research, it may also indicate some real differences in engagement. In particular, there seems to be a divergence between the southernmost parts of Ionia and the rest of the region. Although not discussed in this article, sites to the south of Ionia such as Iasos and Müsegebi bear some similarities to Miletos in the mode and extent of their engagement with the Mycenaean world.⁴³ This enhanced interaction with the western Aegean seems to be a regional phenomenon, common across the southeastern Aegean from Miletos to Rhodes. This phenomenon is traditionally interpreted as Mycenaean settlers founding “colonies,” but it has also sometimes been explained through the local appropriation of styles and practices and the development of a local *koine*.⁴⁴ North of this area and throughout much

37. Mac Sweeney 2010.

38. Phokaia: Özyğit 2005, p. 44.
Smyrna: Cook 1952, pp. 104–105.
Klazomenai: Erkanal and Aykurt 2008; Mangaloğlu-Votruba 2011; Aykurt 2014.
Erythrai: Akurgal 1967, p. 461; Cook and Blackman 1970–1971, p. 41.
Chios (Kato Phana): Beaumont 2007, p. 143.
Ephesos: Bammer 1994; Büyükkolancı 2000, 2007.
Miletos: Niemeier and Niemeier 1997; Niemeier 1998; 2005; 2007a, pp. 14–16.
Mycenaean ceramics are also known from Klaros,

the sanctuary associated with Kolophon; see Şahin 2011, pp. 154–155.
An overview of Mycenaean influence, activity, and material culture in western Anatolia is offered in Kelder 2004–2005.

39. Kolophon: Bridges 1974.
Miletos: see n. 35, above.

40. Klazomenai (Limantepe): Mangaloğlu-Votruba 2011, pp. 47, 51.
Ephesos (Artemision): Kerschner 2011, p. 19.

41. Niemeier and Niemeier 1997;

Niemeier 1997; 1998; 2007a, pp. 14–16; Kaiser and Zurbach 2015.
Değirmentepe tombs: see n. 35, above.

42. See n. 38, above.

43. Mountjoy 1998; Kelder 2004–2005; Mokrišová 2016.

44. For the former interpretation, see Niemeier 2007b; for the latter, see Mountjoy 1998 (who coins the term “Lower Interface” for the area between Rhodes and Miletos). See Mokrišová 2016 for a full discussion of the subject.

of Ionia, engagement with the western Aegean seems to have been both qualitatively and quantitatively different, and there is less suggestion of Mycenaean colonization.

In comparison to Mycenaean material, evidence for Hittite influence or engagement in western Anatolia is scant.⁴⁵ While the Hittite textual sources offer valuable information on geopolitical dynamics in the region as seen from a central Anatolian perspective, the physical traces of Hittite engagement are few. Characteristically Hittite ceramic forms, well known from across the empire, are conspicuous by their absence. One aspect of Hittite imperial material culture that is present in the region is the tradition of monumental landscape relief carvings, sometimes accompanied by Luwian hieroglyphic inscriptions. Local rulers in Ionia seem to have adopted this Hittite means of expressing power, and several Hittite-style rock monuments are known, including at Akpınar, Karabel, and Surat kaya (Fig. 1).⁴⁶ The interpretation of this evidence is generally agreed on: while there was interaction and engagement with the Hittite sphere in Ionia, the region was never fully under Hittite political control or cultural influence. Instead, specific elements from the Hittite vocabulary of power were appropriated and deployed within local contexts and local frames of meaning.

Evidence for interaction with the north mostly comes in the form of ceramics, and specifically northwestern Anatolian gray-ware pottery. Examples of such ceramics have been found at several sites in the region (Fig. 1), including the later Ionian cities of Smyrna (Bayraklı) and Klazomenai (Limantepe).⁴⁷ These gray wares have yet to be found at any site farther south than Bademgediği Tepe, highlighting once again a difference in the material culture of sites in the far south of Ionia (which lack gray wares) and those in the rest of the region. The prevailing interpretation of gray wares found in Ionia is local adoption, and it is assumed that they indicate contact and interaction rather than colonization or settlement from the north.⁴⁸

The final factor in the characterization of LBA Ionia is the local. Little is understood of local traditions in either pottery or other cultural forms, and the study of coastal sites relies heavily on comparisons with better-known inland sites such as Sardis and Beycesultan. This is problematic given that traditions on the coast may have differed from those inland. Nonetheless, indigenous ceramic types have been identified and studied at several sites in LBA Ionia, including gold- and silver-slipped wares, red-wash wares, and wares featuring metal skeuomorphism.⁴⁹

The presence of distinct ceramic traditions in LBA Ionia has been variously interpreted by different scholars,⁵⁰ but it is not yet possible to assess their relative significance. No detailed information is currently available about the relative quantities of different wares at most of the excavated sites. In the absence of detailed published data from a range of locations that include cult and burial sites as well as settlements, it is impossible to make reliable assessments about how popular indigenous styles were in comparison to either Mycenaean ceramics or northwestern Anatolian gray wares; in the case of central Anatolian wares, the evidence—or rather the conspicuous lack of it—is clearer, and does seem to indicate that these styles were not very popular at all.

45. Glatz 2009; Mac Sweeney 2010.

46. Harmanşah 2015, pp. 98–100, 113–116, 162–164.

47. For northwest Anatolian gray wares and their distribution, see Bayne 2000; Pavúk 2007, 2010. Smyrna (Bayraklı): Akurgal 1983, pp. 15–16; Bayne 2000, pp. 157–173. Klazomenai (Limantepe): Günel 1999b. Bademgediği Tepe: Meriç 2003, 2007.

48. See interpretive comments in the references in n. 47, above.

49. Gold- and silver-slipped wares: Bademgediği Tepe (Meriç 2007, p. 32); Ephesos (Kerschner 2006, p. 371). Red-wash wares: Ephesos (Kerschner 2006, p. 371), Miletos (Kaiser 2009, p. 162). On indigenous traditions in general, see Pavúk 2015; Raymond et al. 2016. It is worth noting that at Miletos specifically, there appears to be a marked reduction in the quantity of local Anatolian wares in the final Phase VI of the LBA; see Kaiser and Zurbach 2015.

50. See, e.g., n. 44.

THE EARLY IRON AGE

The archaeological evidence from EIA Ionia consists primarily of unstratified material with limited contextual information, as there are few firmly dated archaeological contexts for the 12th to early 9th centuries. Settlements are known from across the region (Fig. 2), although architectural remains tend to be very poorly preserved. At some sites, there appears to have been a slight shift in the location of settlement between the LBA and EIA levels. At Klazomenai, for example, occupation spread from the Limantepe mound to the west around the bay.⁵¹ Domestic structures once more appear in both curvilinear and rectangular forms; both are found together at Smyrna (Bayraklı), although there seems to have been some preference for curvilinear buildings at Klazomenai (on the mound of Limantepe) and Phokaia.⁵² It seems that craftworking areas, storage facilities, and domestic areas continue to be located in close proximity to each other, as at Klazomenai (Limantepe) and Phokaia,⁵³ but due to the disturbed nature of the deposits, we cannot be certain about spatial demarcation within settlements. Evidence for mortuary practices is rare in EIA Ionia. Intramural burial is attested at Klazomenai (Limantepe),⁵⁴ and extramural necropoleis have been identified at Kolophon, involving both tumulus and cist graves.⁵⁵ Cult practice can be inferred both at sites that also had LBA cult remains, such as the Artemision at Ephesos and Klaros at Kolophon, and at new locations, such as the Heraion on Samos.⁵⁶

Our picture of EIA Ionia is patchier than that of the region during the LBA, as is the case for many parts of the Aegean and Anatolia. For a long time there was very little archaeological material uncovered at all, and this was often less impressive, with poorer quality finds and architecture. As a result, the EIA has traditionally been interpreted as a “Dark Age” characterized by poverty, backwardness, and insularity. But more EIA remains have come to light in recent years, and evidence has begun to emerge for some level of continuing complexity and long-distance contacts during this period. Consequently, some scholars now interpret the changes of the EIA in terms of social transformation and flexibility/instability in political structures, rather than collapse and decline.⁵⁷ Overall, it is evident that there was both change and continuity during the LBA–EIA transition.

First, despite the changes in settlement location such as that at Klazomenai mentioned above, there nonetheless is considerable continuity in the locations of many settlement and cult sites. Examples include the continuity of cult at the Artemision in Ephesos and of settlement in the Bayraklı area of Smyrna.⁵⁸ Second, there is a degree of continuity in social complexity, specialization, and technical expertise, as indicated by the existence of craftworking facilities, such as the ironworking forge at Phokaia, and the continued importance of Miletos as a regional center for pottery production. Third, there is a degree of continuity in cultural forms. Of these three points, the extent of change and continuity in cultural forms has attracted particular scholarly attention. As with the Late Bronze Age, questions of the ethnic and cultural makeup of the region dominate the literature on the Early Iron Age.

51. The earliest remains found in this main settlement area of Klazomenai are Protogeometric in date; see Ersoy 2004, p. 44.

52. Smyrna (Bayraklı): Akurgal 1983, pp. 16–17. Klazomenai (Limantepe): Aytaçlar 2004; Erkanal and Aykurt 2008, pp. 224–226. Phokaia: Özyğit 2005, pp. 44–45.

53. Klazomenai (Limantepe) pottery kiln: Ersoy, Güngör, and Cevizoğlu 2011, pp. 171–172. Phokaia ironworking facility: Özyğit 2005, p. 44; Yalçın and Özyğit 2013.

54. Erkanal and Aykurt 2008, pp. 225–226; Ersoy et al. 2010, p. 191.

55. Mariaud 2011; Gassner et al. 2017.

56. Artemision: Kerschner 2003a, 2011; Forstenpointer, Kerschner, and Muss 2008. Klaros: Şahin et al. 2009, pp. 116–117. Heraion: Jarosch 1994.

57. E.g., Bachhuber and Roberts 2009. For a discussion of the terminology of the “Dark Age” and changing approaches to the LBA–EIA transition, see Dickinson 2006, pp. 10–23.

58. Ephesos: Kerschner 2007, 2011. Smyrna: Akurgal 2010.

Figure 2. Map of Early Iron Age Ionia. N. Mac Sweeney

Change is indeed apparent in the material record, especially in the ceramic assemblage. The most frequently discussed aspect of this is the appearance of Protogeometric pottery. This new ceramic style appears at several sites, including the later Ionian cities of Phokaia, Smyrna, Erythrai, Klazomenai, Teos, Ephesos, Samos, and Miletos (Fig. 2).⁵⁹ Its arrival is often interpreted as evidence for migrant Ionians. The Protogeometric

59. Phokaia: Özyüit 2005, pp. 44–45. Smyrna: Akurgal 1983, pp. 16–17. Klazomenai: Ersoy 2007, pp. 151–153. Erythrai: Cook and Blackman 1964–1965, p. 44; 1970–1971, p. 41. Teos:

Cook and Blackman 1964–1965, p. 45; Kadioğlu 2012, p. 8. Ephesos: Kerschner 2003b; 2006, pp. 370–373; Büyükkolancı 2007. Samos (Pythagorio): Tsakos 2007, p. 190. Miletos: Krumme

2003. Protogeometric pottery has also been found at the cult site of Klaros, in the territory of Kolophon; see Şahin et al. 2009, pp. 116–117.

style, however, was not the only ceramic innovation of the period: a new handmade ware with incised and beaded decoration is also found at some sites, including the Artemision at Ephesos.⁶⁰ The appearance of similar pottery at EIA Troy has traditionally been interpreted as marking the arrival of migrants from Thrace, although a contemporary resurgence of handmade pottery is also documented in central and southern Anatolia.⁶¹ In addition to this, small amounts of pottery that originated from farther afield, including central Anatolia, also appear in Ionia.⁶² There was, however, continuity as well as change in ceramic traditions at all sites. Local styles from the LBA were found alongside the new wares, and it has been demonstrated that ceramic production at Miletos and Ephesos continued to make use of the same clay beds and paste technologies.⁶³

As with the LBA, the contemporary presence of different ceramic traditions is interpreted differently by different scholars. The main debate focuses on Protogeometric pottery, with some arguing that its appearance is a clear indicator of incoming migrants and others arguing that its emergence should be seen in the context of local ceramic traditions and developments.⁶⁴ And as with the LBA, a significant problem is the lack of detailed information about the relative quantities of different wares at individual sites. One site for which such information is available is Ephesos, and specifically from the area of the Artemision, where the Protogeometric was by far the most popular ceramic style, constituting about 77% of the total ceramic assemblage.⁶⁵ But it is not yet clear how representative this one location might be, as information from other sites is not currently available. Since the Artemision assemblage appears to be a ritual deposit, we must also acknowledge that it may differ from settlement assemblages. It is also worth noting that the absolute amounts of Protogeometric pottery documented from Ionia are relatively small.⁶⁶

Overall, the paucity of available archaeological evidence from LBA and EIA Ionia precludes much in the way of firm conclusions. Nonetheless, it seems clear that this material does not offer support for the idea of the Ionian Migration. There is indeed evidence for social and cultural change during the EIA, at the time the Ionian Migration is thought to have occurred. This evidence primarily consists of innovations in ceramic traditions, although we might perhaps also include slight shifts in settlement location within a local area, and possibly an increased preference for curvilinear over rectilinear buildings. However, the arrival of a substantial new population does not seem to be the best explanation for these perceived changes for three reasons.

First, in quantitative terms, if there had been a major migration we might expect to find clearer evidence for it, that is, to find more change on a larger scale. This is not to say there was no cultural change, simply that one might expect more of it in the wake of mass migration. As it currently stands, there is considerable continuity from the LBA: in some ceramic traditions; in the general locations of settlements and cult sites (if not always their precise location); in the use (if not the relative popularity) of curvilinear architecture; in the multifunctional use of space within settlements; and in the preservation of craft traditions and technical

60. Kerschner 2006, p. 371.

61. For ceramics at Troy during the EIA, see Hnla 2012; Rose 2014, pp. 38–40. For the resurgent tradition in handmade ceramics in central Anatolia, see Genz 2011, p. 346. For the comparable phenomenon in southern Anatolia, see Bouthillier et al. 2014, p. 153.

62. Kerschner 2011, pp. 23–24.

63. For limited continuity in local wares at Ephesos (Artemision), see Kerschner 2006, p. 371. On continuity in clay beds and technologies, see Kerschner 2005. For a discussion of local and indigenous elements in the ceramic assemblage from Miletos, see Kaiser and Zurbach 2015.

64. For the former view, see Herda 2013, p. 426. For the latter argument, see Vaessen 2014, pp. 141–200.

65. Kerschner 2006, pp. 370; 2011, p. 24.

66. Lemos (2007, pp. 721–722) explicitly argues that these small quantities are inconsistent with the idea of the Ionian Migration. Discoveries during the last decade have not been in great enough quantities to negate this concern.

knowledge. Second, in qualitative terms, the nature of the observed novelties do not currently suggest the “deep change” associated with new migrant populations.⁶⁷ We cannot identify a significant shift, for example, in foodways, subsistence strategies, or domestic architecture. The changes observed in the archaeological record do not require migration—they can better be explained with reference to a combination of external factors, such as trade and exchange, and internal factors, such as shifts in local preferences and sociocultural needs. Third (and related to the previous point), it is not completely clear that the innovations perceived in the EIA were necessarily external in their origins at all. It is often assumed that Protogeometric pottery originated in Attica, but difficulties with chronology have led some scholars to argue that it may have developed more or less independently in the northern or eastern Aegean.⁶⁸ If the central principles of Protogeometric style did emerge organically from preexisting ceramic traditions in Ionia, then there would be no reason to assume any external impetus for its appearance. This would not preclude the incorporation of external influences, and individual stylistic features from the Attic or Euboian Protogeometric traditions, for example, could have been assimilated into a primarily local ceramic tradition. However, more and better-quality data is needed before any firm conclusions can be reached on this point. Indeed, the lack of evidence prevents us from confirming much about EIA Ionia at all. On balance, nonetheless, and especially on the basis of the first two points, the archaeological evidence as it currently stands does not point to a large-scale migration from the western Aegean to Ionia during the EIA.

This conclusion does not, however, exclude the possibility of any movement around the Aegean at this time. Recent work in theoretical archaeology has stressed that the movement of people can happen in many different forms, including but not restricted to migration.⁶⁹ It may be useful in this context to think of this less in terms of migration, and more in terms of mobility. Indeed, as we have seen, the evidence would be consistent with a high degree of personal mobility on a small to medium scale. This would certainly have included people traveling from the western to the eastern Aegean, as perhaps illustrated by those specific elements of the Ionian Protogeometric style that do seem to have originated in Attica and Euboea.⁷⁰ This Aegean mobility was a long-established phenomenon by the start of the EIA; the Bronze Age material demonstrates that there were close and regular interactions around the Aegean for many centuries, perhaps including the settlement of migrant individuals and

67. Yasur-Landau (2010, pp. 9–33) has set out a methodology for distinguishing the “deep change” associated with migration from cultural change which occurs for different reasons. Reasons of space preclude a full discussion of this, but suffice to say that the fundamental principle is sound—the nature of change that would happen as

the result of migration is likely qualitatively distinct.

68. For the northern Aegean, see Vaessen 2014, pp. 154–177; for the eastern Aegean, see Vaessen 2014, pp. 177–199.

69. The distinctions between migration, mobility, and other modes of population movement are currently being

re-theorized across archaeology. For some relatively recent publications on the topic, see Lightfoot 2008; Isayev 2013; van Dommelen 2014.

70. Kerschner (2006, pp. 371–372) notes the Attic influences on the Protogeometric wares from the Ephesian Artemision; for Euboian influences, see Lemos 2007.

groups. In addition, broader patterns of movement are also implied by the circulation of metals—the discovery of the ironworking facility at Phokaia indicates that Ionia was involved in this wider trade. Therefore, while the archaeological evidence is not consistent with the idea of an Ionian Migration, it is potentially consistent with the idea that there was some mobility, albeit on a much smaller scale and in a more disorganized fashion than often presumed, with immigrants settling alongside a preexisting local population.

THE GEOMETRIC AND ARCHAIC PERIODS

The archaeology of Ionia during the Geometric and Archaic periods (late 9th to 6th centuries B.C.) provides an important broader context. By the latter part of this period, all 13 Ionian cities had been established, as well as the region's major cult sites.⁷¹ By this stage, the Ionian cities were “Greek”: the material record largely conforms to patterns that we would now consider to be Greek, linguistic evidence indicates the inhabitants were predominantly Greek speaking (see below), and historical sources demonstrate they considered themselves ethnically related to the inhabitants of mainland Greece (e.g., Mimnermos, fr. 9 West; Hdt. 8.22).

During this period, the Ionian cities developed a set of shared cultural forms and social practices, as well as engaging in some collective activities. One well-documented common cultural form is the “East Greek” tradition in pottery production, whereby ceramics of this region became distinct from those of other parts of the Aegean and Anatolia.⁷² Another shared cultural form was a characteristic style of sculpture, with common conventions for bodily representation and a shared corporeal ideal that was markedly different from that of the central and western Aegean.⁷³

An important focus for collective activity was the sanctuary of the Panionion. This sanctuary was established both as the practical headquarters for the Ionian League and as a common religious space for League members. While its origins remain unclear, later literary and epigraphic sources suggest the Panionion was founded following an internecine conflict known as the Meliac War, thought to have occurred sometime in the 8th or

71. Phokaia: Özyğit 2006. Smyrna: Cook 1958–1959; Akurgal 1983. Klazomenai: Ersoy 2004. Erythrai: due to the limited amount of investigation, this period is mostly known from the Athena Temple area (Rubinstein 2004, pp. 1073–1076). Chios: the modern town of Chios is built directly on top of ancient Chios and evidence for the urban center itself is therefore largely lost, although some sense of the *polis* during the Archaic period can be gained from the sanctuary at Kato Phana (Beaumont 2007) and from finds from across the island (Archontidou-Argyri 2000). Teos: Kadioğlu 2012, p. 8.

Lebedos: while there has been limited archaeological investigation and nothing is currently known of earlier periods, it is evident from the historical sources that Lebedos was already occupied by the Archaic period (Tuna 1986; Greaves 2010, p. 100). Kolophon: Iron Age graves of uncertain date were found near the city (Mariaud 2011; Gassner et al. 2017), and excavators in the 1920s reported finding Archaic ceramics in deep soundings beneath the 4th-century houses (Mac Sweeney 2013, p. 126, with references). Ephesos: Kerschner 2003b. Samos: Tsakos 2007. Priene: the location of the Archaic city

of Priene remains unknown, but it is clear from the historical evidence that Priene was a well-established *polis* by this period. Miletos: see Greaves 2002 for the archaeological evidence and Gorman 2001 for a more historical account. Myous: relatively little remains of the Archaic settlement, due to the reuse of its masonry in later periods (particularly in Miletos). For what remains, see Greaves 2010, p. 104.

72. For a traditional view, see Cook and Dupont 1998; for a reanalysis, see Kerschner and Schlötzauer 2005.

73. Baughan 2011.

7th century. This war reportedly involved several Ionian cities and ended with the destruction of the city of Melie, the division of its territory among the victors, and the institution of both the Ionian League and Panionion as a means of ensuring future Ionian unity.⁷⁴ Whatever the circumstances surrounding its foundation, it is evident that by the Late Archaic period the Panionion had become a crucial focus for Ionian collective activity. League members came together regularly for the festival of the Panionia in honor of Poseidon Helikonios, and also for irregular political summits (Hdt. 1.148).

The likely remains of the Panionion have been found on the northern slope of Mt. Mykale near the modern village of Güzelçamlı, Turkey. At a site there known as Otomatik Tepe, a monumental altar of the 4th century B.C. was constructed on an artificial terrace, close to a bouleuterion, which implies that the site was used for meetings and assemblies.⁷⁵ An inscription from this period identifies the area as the Panionion and describes a reinstitution of certain cultic regulations.⁷⁶ Pre-4th-century remains on Otomatik Tepe consist only of a few 6th-century sherds, and this has led to the suggestion that the sanctuary was initially located at a site higher on Mykale known as Çatallar Tepe. At Çatallar Tepe, the remains of a destroyed 7th-century settlement have been found, including a small cult building with a round altar dated to ca. 650–590 B.C. Over this structure a hekatompodon temple was built ca. 560 B.C., which was itself destroyed toward the end of the 6th century. In addition to the naos and pronaos, the hekatompodon also featured a room identified as a *lesche* (λέσχη), whose walls were hung with weaponry and where ceramic finds indicate feasting.⁷⁷ If this hekatompodon was indeed the first Panionion, this might indicate that early meetings of the Ionian League were carried out in an almost sympotic context.

Despite this evidence for shared cultural forms and social practices, there was also variation from city to city. For example, while a characteristic “East Greek” ceramic tradition did emerge, there is a clear divergence between north and south Ionian ceramics.⁷⁸ The ceramic traditions of individual cities also had distinctive features, from the Milesian preference for reserving areas from paint to the polychrome paint of Klazomenian black-figure pottery.⁷⁹ Mortuary practices also varied both between and within cities. On Samos, cremations went either marked or unmarked, and coexisted alongside built tombs. The famed painted sarcophagi of

74. For the Panionion, see Mac Sweeney 2013, pp. 178–187, with references. The most important primary sources for the Meliac War are Vitruvius *De arch.* 4.1.4, and the inscription in Gaertringen and Fredrich [1906] 1968, pp. 40–43, no. 37. It is unclear from the sources whether Melie was an Ionian city or a Karian one, but all accounts of the peace settlement make it clear that Ionian cities fought on both sides of the conflict.

75. Kleiner, Hommel, and Müller-

Wiener 1967.

76. For a discussion of the ritual implications of this inscription for the League, see Kowalzig 2005.

77. For the remains on Çatallar Tepe and the suggestion for this site as the early Panionion, see Lohmann 2005, 2007, 2012. There is, however, some disagreement over whether the early Panionion should indeed be located on Çatallar Tepe, and an alternative suggestion is that the sanctuary had always been located on Otomatik

Tepe; see Herda 2006b.

78. For the distinctions between northern and southern Ionian sequences, see Kerschner and Schlottzhauer 2005. For a more traditional discussion of north and south Ionian traits in Wild Goat-Style pottery specifically, see Cook and Dupont 1998, pp. 32–70.

79. For the particularities of Milesian pottery of the Archaic period, see Schlottzhauer 2006. For Klazomenian black figure, see Cook and Dupont 1998, pp. 95–107.

Klazomenai are not found in southern Ionia. At Kolophon, inhumations and cremations are both found within mounds.⁸⁰ Similarly, while the new technology of coinage was adopted across the region in the Archaic period, the Ionian cities minted their coins on different weight standards, which did little to facilitate exchange and economic interaction.⁸¹ While there is therefore evidence for convergence and collectivism among the Ionian cities, there are also signs of local autonomy and individual civic traditions. This impression gained from the archaeological evidence is supported by historical sources, which offer many examples of both Ionian collectivism and the fiercely independent stance of individual cities.⁸²

Another characteristic feature of Ionia in the Archaic period was cultural diversity. As mentioned above, the cities during this period were certainly “Greek.” At the same time, however, they were also hybrid and cosmopolitan communities that incorporated significant non-Greek elements. Throughout this period, Lydian styles, objects, and practices were fashionable in the Ionian cities.⁸³ In the Geometric period, “East Greek” pottery cannot always be clearly distinguished from ceramics of indigenous Anatolian manufacture,⁸⁴ and in the Archaic period, there was also ambiguity in architecture.⁸⁵ Similarly, Anatolian influences can be seen in the style and construction of fortification walls at several Ionian cities.⁸⁶ Although small in number, epigraphic finds and historical records document the continued use of Anatolian languages at the Ionian cities,⁸⁷ as well as the existence of both individuals and aristocratic families with Karian and Lydian names.⁸⁸ Furthermore, as will be discussed below, Ionian Greek was also influenced by the neighboring Anatolian languages.⁸⁹ But while there was cultural diversity across Ionia, the nature and extent of this diversity varied. At Ephesos, for example, there was a particular willingness to embrace external ceramic styles, as well as particularly strong cultic links with the Lydian capital of Sardis.⁹⁰ At Miletos, connections seem stronger with Karia. Karian names and the Karian language were used, and the Karian goddess Hekate received a civic cult, whereby she was honored at the gates of the city during the New Year festival, and had an altar at the center of the agora.⁹¹

80. Samos: Tsakos 2001. Klazomenai: Hürmüzli 2004. Kolophon: Mariaud 2011 (the date of these burials is not completely clear; some may date to the EIA, although it seems highly likely that some at least belong to the Geometric and Archaic periods). A comprehensive analysis of mortuary practices in Archaic Ionia is currently underway under the auspices of Olivier Mariaud.

81. Meadows 2011.

82. See Mac Sweeney 2013, pp. 157–197, for a discussion of Ionian unity and disunity.

83. Crieaard 2009, pp. 61–62; Kistler 2012.

84. DeVries 2000, p. 356.

85. Karian architectural decoration is not easily distinguishable from Ionian; see Ateşlier 2010.

86. Greaves 2010, p. 117.

87. For Karian inscriptions, see Adiego 2007a, pp. 24 (Ephesos, in para-Karian), 29 (Smyrna [Bayraklı]), 145 (Didyma). For Miletos, see n. 87, below.

88. For individuals with Karian names at Miletos, see Herda 2009, pp. 77–78; Mac Sweeney 2013, p. 65, with references. For individuals with Lydian names at Miletos, see Mac Sweeney 2013, p. 68. For a dynasty with claimed Lydian ancestry at Kolophon, see Mac

Sweeney 2013, pp. 128–129.

89. Kearns 1992, pp. 368–74; Adiego 2007b, 2007c, 2007d; Tzitzilis 2007; Colvin 2010.

90. See Kerschner 2007 for Ephesian ceramics; Dusingberre 2003, pp. 235–237 for cultic links between Artemis of Ephesos and of Sardis.

91. For Karian names and language at Miletos, see nn. 87, 88, above. For Hekate in Miletos and the Karian origins of the goddess, see Herda 2011, esp. fig. 3, for a plan of the Milesian agora. For the New Year festival, see the *Molpoi* inscription, 25–29; for a critical edition, see Herda 2006a.

The Ionian cities were also cosmopolitan in a wider sense. Considerable quantities of imports from the Near East have been found, often deposited in a ritual context. The Heraion on Samos is particularly known for its Egyptian and Near Eastern votives, which appear in quantities far greater than at comparable sanctuaries elsewhere in the Aegean.⁹² Egyptian influence on Ionian sculptural styles and decorative arts is also well documented.⁹³ Such cultural receptivity should be understood in the context of the close interaction between Ionians and various Near Eastern groups, which often occurred through trade, the movement of itinerant craftspeople, and the hire of mercenary soldiers.⁹⁴ At the same time, individuals from the Ionian cities were involved in travel even farther afield, trading and often settling in locations as diverse as Siris in Italy, Massalia in Gaul, Histria and Olbia in the Black Sea, and Naukratis in Egypt.⁹⁵

During the Geometric and Archaic periods, therefore, the Ionian cities were well established and flourishing. They engaged in wide-ranging networks of trade and interaction, and were prosperous enough to support major investments in civic architecture, cult, and the arts. This was a time of intense and innovative cultural activity in Ionia, from the emergence of new literary forms in poetry and prose to the development of scientific and philosophical thinking.⁹⁶ The Ionian cities were Greek, but they were also cosmopolitan communities, with indigenous Anatolian traditions playing an ongoing role in cultural and social life, and where influences from farther afield were welcomed. The dynamics of Ionian (dis)unity at this time were complex. On one hand, there was some cultural cohesion and a limited amount of collective action in the political, religious, and social spheres, and on the other hand there were also strong currents of local particularism, manifested not only in material culture but also in inter-*polis* interactions. This interplay between the local and the regional has important implications for our study of Ionian origins—not in terms of the physical origins of the Ionian cities in the ELA, but in terms of the social and cultural origins of Ionian identity.

LINGUISTIC EVIDENCE FROM IONIA

As no linguistic evidence survives from ELA and the supposed time of the Ionian Migration, we are dependent on evidence from later periods to form a picture of language use in Ionia.⁹⁷ I will first outline this evidence before considering its import for the question of the Ionian Migration.

92. For the Samian Heraion in general, see Kyrieleis 1993; see also Jantzen 1972 for the bronzes and Freyer-Schauenburg 1966 for the ivories.

93. For Egyptianizing elements in the Klazomenian sarcophagi, see Hürmüzli 2004, p. 197. For Egyptianizing elements in Ionian sculpture, see Greaves 2010, p. 188.

94. For trade, see Greaves 2010,

pp. 84–85; for itinerant craftspeople, see Morgan 2009, p. 50; For mercenaries, see Luraghi 2006.

95. This trade and settlement is often considered under the term “Greek colonization.” See Osborne 2009, pp. 79–92; Vlassopoulos 2013, pp. 78–127.

96. For developments in literary forms and in particular historiographi-

cal prose, see Pearson 1939. For Ionia and philosophy, see Curd and Graham 2008.

97. This section will necessarily be brief, as the limits of my own expertise prevent me from detailed comment. I am therefore especially grateful to Stephen Colvin for his helpful comments and guidance on the linguistic arguments.

The existence of a distinct Ionic dialect of Greek can be identified in the 7th century in the elegiac poetry of Ionian authors such as Mimnermos of Kolophon and Kallinos of Ephesos.⁹⁸ Roughly contemporary with this, inscriptions from Ionia display a similarly local idiom in script—dedicatory inscriptions from the Samian Heraion in the late 7th century are the earliest known examples.⁹⁹ The small amount of material from the 7th century and a greater quantity from the 6th century demonstrates that common Ionic forms of both literary language and inscribed script were used across the region. This implies shared social practices surrounding literature and language, as well as the shared cultural forms themselves. These common Ionic linguistic features distinguished the region from its neighbors in Anatolia: “Dorian” Greek dominated to the south, “Aiolian” Greek to the north, and Karian and Lydian in the inland regions.

While the language of Ionia differentiated it from its immediate neighbors, it also served to link it with other members of the Ionian *ethnos* in the western Aegean. Ionian Greek is closely related to that of Attica, Euboia, and the central Aegean, so much so that they are considered as belonging to the same Ionic dialect. While there are some morphological and phonological differences between the Greek used in Ionia and that used in Attica and the central Aegean, these are relatively minor.¹⁰⁰ This basic picture is consistent with the idea of an Ionian Migration. The linguistic similarities between the Greek of Ionia and Attica, for example, could potentially be explained by them both being derived from the same “parent” dialect. This dialect could potentially have been spoken by the inhabitants of Early Iron Age Attica, and brought over to Ionia during the migration.

There are several factors that complicate this picture, however. First, there seems to have been some variation within the shared linguistic tradition of Ionia. Herodotos (1.142) stated that there were differences in the spoken language of northern and southern Ionia during his own time, with Chios and Erythrai sharing some additional local variations, and Samos having its own particular linguistic idiosyncrasies. While there are some indications of this in the grammar of inscriptions from Erythrai and Chios, divergences in spoken language do not generally seem to have been carried through into the inscribed script, which remains fairly uniform across the region.¹⁰¹ Clearer evidence of linguistic variation comes from divergences between the inscribed script and literary texts. For example, note the substitution of *k-* for *p-* at the start of certain pronouns; while the Homeric epics and the Ionian inscriptions use a *p-*, Ionian poets of the 7th and 6th centuries often use a *k-*.¹⁰² Divergences such as these serve as a reminder that none of the available evidence represents “everyday” language as it would have been spoken in the Ionian cities—rather, both literary language and inscribed script are specialized uses of language that must be understood in their specific social and cultural contexts.

A second complicating factor is that the Ionic dialect and script were not restricted to the region of Ionia. Inscriptions at the supposedly Dorian settlements of Halikarnassos, Kos, and Rhodes were written using the Ionic script, and those from Halikarnassos were even written in the Ionic dialect.¹⁰³ Similarly, Herodotos of Halikarnassos chose to write his *Histories* neither in Doric nor in the Attic of his adopted Athens, but in a

98. For Ionic dialect, see Panayotou 2007; Colvin 2010.

99. Jeffery 1990, p. 328.

100. For the similarities and differences between Ionic and Attic Greek, see Panayotou 2007; Colvin 2010. These linguistic differences were explicitly acknowledged as early as the 6th century; the Athenian politician and poet Solon referred to the language of Athens as “Attic” and not “Ionian” (Solon, fr. 36.10 West). Solon’s reasons for using this term may, of course, have been driven more by political concerns rather than linguistic accuracy. This argument finds a parallel with the idea that Ionian identity may have also coalesced in Anatolia and moved westward (Hall 2002, pp. 67–73).

101. See Garbrah 1978 for the grammatical features of the inscriptions from Erythrai; see Jeffery 1990, p. 327, for the general uniformity of the script.

102. This relates in particular to interrogatives and related pronouns from the pronominal stem **k^wo-*; see Colvin 2014, p. 141.

103. Jeffery 1990, pp. 349–353.

version of Ionic.¹⁰⁴ The Ionic dialect was used by authors from even farther afield, including Hesiod from Boiotia and Tyrtaos from Sparta, who both used forms of literary Ionic appropriate to the genres in which they were composing (epic and elegiac, respectively). It is fairly well documented that different dialects were associated with different literary genres and forms, and that some authors (most notably tragedians) used different dialects within the same piece of work. Indeed, dialect switching related to genre and subject matter seems to have been standard practice in the Archaic period.¹⁰⁵ In both inscriptions and literary works, the choice of dialect seems to have been driven not primarily by ethnic affiliation, but by the expectations of genre.

Furthermore, Ionic Greek was not the only language used within Ionia itself. As noted above, Lydian and Karian are attested in the Ionian cities, their use varying from place to place. There was also linguistic contact between Greek and Anatolian languages, resulting in loanwords in Ionic Greek from Lydian, Phrygian, Lycian, and Karian.¹⁰⁶ Some level of multilingualism and language switching seems highly likely, as illustrated by the fragments of the 6th-century lyric poet Hipponax. Greek and Lydian forms appear together in Hipponax's poetry, implying that the intended audience had some familiarity with the Lydian language. It has been suggested that Hipponax's work is perhaps indicative of popular language as it may have been spoken in Ephesos at the time, in contrast to the more reified literary language used by other poets.¹⁰⁷ Such linguistic flexibility should perhaps not be surprising given that it has long been demonstrated that multilingualism is the norm in human populations—modern, historical, and ancient.¹⁰⁸

What might we infer from this linguistic information about the likelihood of an Ionian Migration? In the absence of evidence contemporary to the supposed date of the migration, the earliest conclusions that can reliably drawn relate to the 7th century B.C. At this time, we can be confident of a level of linguistic cohesion spanning the region, which may also have extended slightly further to the south. While we cannot be sure of the nature of everyday spoken language, it seems that in epigraphy and literature the people of Ionia predominantly used a local form of the Greek language. Their dialect was closely related to the contemporary dialect of Attica, but it also shared elements with the dialect spoken in neighboring Aiolis, all while remaining distinct from both. As already mentioned, this evidence has traditionally been interpreted as supporting the idea of the Ionian Migration, following the assumption that the Ionic dialect would have been carried to the eastern Aegean by migrants from the west. The

104. Herodotos wrote in a highly literary form of Ionic influenced by Homeric language, on the one hand making use of the new "scientific" language of what is sometimes known as the "Ionian Enlightenment" (i.e., the language of the Milesian school of philosophy), while at the same time employing certain usages of the language of epic.

105. See Tribulato (2010, p. 389) on the connection between dialect and literary genre, which was, as she claims, "one of the steadfast rules of Greek literature." Morpurgo-Davies (2002, pp. 157–158) argues that this dialect switching may have contributed to an emerging sense of commonalities that separated the Greek dialects from non-

Greek languages.

106. Adiego 2007b, 2007c, 2007d; Tzitzilis 2007; Hawkins 2010.

107. Hawkins 2013.

108. For a standard work on this subject in modern linguistics, see Thomason 2001. For multilingualism in the ancient world specifically, see Mullen 2012.

evidence we have is certainly consistent with this explanation, but the explanation is problematic for three main reasons.

First, as already mentioned, our evidence for the Ionic dialect does not predate the 7th century. While a form of Greek must have been spoken in Ionia prior to this, we cannot be sure if it was as close to Attic as its 7th-century successor.¹⁰⁹ While we can therefore be sure of the link between the Ionic dialect of Ionia and that of Attica in the Archaic period, we cannot be certain of the linguistic situation prior to this era. It is usually assumed that Ionian and Attic stemmed from the same tradition, with the language carried to the eastern Aegean by migrants from the west, and that the two variants diverged gradually over time. It has been argued, however, that the opposite might in fact be true—that initial linguistic diversity was followed by a gradual convergence over time. Similarities between Attic and Ionic may have developed over the course of the EIA and Archaic period, with influences traveling from Ionia westward rather than the other way around.¹¹⁰ We can only imagine that the cultural prestige of Ionia during the Archaic period would have been an important factor driving this process.

Second, even when greater quantities of evidence appear in the Archaic period, it seems that languages, dialects, and scripts were used in flexible and complex ways. Not only was the Ionic dialect and script employed outside Ionia, but other (in particular Anatolian) languages and scripts were used within Ionia. Despite the close link between language and identity in many instances, it seems that there was no straightforward equation between Ionic dialect and script on the one hand, and an Ionian identity or ethnicity (or even the region of Ionia) on the other.

Finally, there are some problems with the assumption that the dominance of Ionic Greek in Archaic-period Ionia was necessarily the result of a significant change in population or even in the everyday language of the region. As demonstrated by Parker, linguistic change can happen for a range of reasons, including but not limited to population change.¹¹¹ Historical examples illustrate how language shift can happen through trade and exchange, multilingualism, and the preferential use of certain linguistic forms in privileged social situations.¹¹² It should be noted here that our evidence once more pertains only to literary works and public inscriptions. While the everyday language of the general population likely bears some relation to this, it also must necessarily have been distinct from the artificial languages associated with elite cultural and political production. When

109. The only extant evidence for the 8th century, the language of the Homeric epics, bears significant similarities to the Aeolian dialect of the north. This evidence is not particularly helpful, as the language of the Homeric poems is an artificial construct and is highly unlikely to reflect contemporary spoken language accurately. For Homeric language, see Horrocks 2007. Jeffery (1990, p. 326) argued that the Ionian script likely predates the 7th century, because the earliest examples

already demonstrate a well-developed tradition in letter forms. There is no way to be sure, therefore, precisely how distinctive either the Ionian dialect or script may have been in the 8th century.

110. For this argument in relation to the Ionic dialect, see Negri 1982. A similar argument has been made for the emergence of the Greek language as a whole, where historical conditions led to a situation where several related but distinct languages or dialects combined by a process of “dialectological coales-

cence” into a single language; see Garrett 1999; Colvin 2007, p. 9.

111. Parker 2008, pp. 435–437.

112. Thomason (2001, pp. 129–156) identified seven distinct mechanisms for language change that do not rely on large-scale migration. Indeed, it is documented that dialect change is more likely to occur through different rates in the spread of isoglosses (innovations in speech) than through migration; see Parker 2008, p. 437.

considering this localized written *koine*, the later case of *koine* Greek in the Hellenistic period may be a useful analogy—the spread of this *koine* did not involve a diaspora of *koine* speakers overwhelming and outnumbering local populations, but rather the spread of a new linguistic culture and an associated new form of identity.¹¹³

In conclusion, the linguistic evidence does not offer clear evidence either for or against the Ionian Migration. While the linguistic situation in Archaic Ionia may perhaps have been owed to a significant population transfer from the western to the eastern Aegean in the EIA, it is by no means certain that it did so. What *is* certain is that any putative population movement cannot have been the sole factor influencing the linguistic landscape of Archaic Ionia.

LITERARY SOURCES FOR THE ORIGINS OF THE IONIAN CITIES

In the final section of this article, I will consider later literary sources that mention the foundations of the Ionian cities. The historical, archaeological, and linguistic evidence discussed to this point has not provided clear support for the idea of the Ionian Migration. It is not from this, but rather from the later literary material, that the concept of an Ionian Migration initially emerged. We might therefore expect to find strong support for the idea of an Ionian Migration in the literary evidence. But as will become clear over the course of this section, the Ionian Migration is not the only model of origins that emerges from the literary texts.

The earliest references to the foundations of the Ionian cities appear in early Greek epic poems, and not just the *Iliad*, but also in the fragmentary poems of the *Nostoi* and the *Epigoni*, which can only be roughly dated to sometime between the 8th and 6th centuries B.C.¹¹⁴ These references are oblique, and come in the form of passing allusions where the poet assumes knowledge of the full backstory. From this point onward, it is possible to trace several distinct traditions that were repeated, reworked, and reimagined over the course of 20 centuries or so until the 12th century A.D., ending with the commentaries of Ioannes Tzetzes and Eustathios of Thessalonika. Within this time frame, I have identified 111 different authors writing in ancient Greek and Latin who made reference to the foundations of the Ionian cities (Table 1). While this may not be a completely exhaustive list, I have tried to be as comprehensive as possible in gathering this literary material, basing my data collection not only on previous scholarship but also on textual corpora, particularly the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*. Although the imperfections of my data collection may well mean that other references need to be added to this list in the future, I hope that the corpus already gathered is substantial enough to offer a reasonable representation of the literary material as a whole.

On a methodological note, I have chosen to assess this material in terms of authors, rather than texts or relevant passages. Quantifying individual texts would lead to a situation where a single author might use a repeated formulaic expression in several different short texts, and that this would be

113. I am grateful to Stephen Colvin for this point.

114. See Fantuzzi and Tsagalis 2015 for the Epic Cycle. See also West 2013 for the *Nostoi* and the other epic poems of the Trojan Cycle. A timeline for their composition is proposed in West 2013, p. 25.

TABLE 1. LITERARY TEXTS THAT MENTION THE ORIGINS OF THE IONIAN CITIES

<i>Author</i>	<i>References</i>	<i>Ionian Migration</i>	<i>Other Greek Migration</i>	<i>Indigenous Origins</i>	<i>Cretan Migration</i>	<i>Near East</i>
Aelian	<i>VH</i> 8.5	X		X		
Aelius Aristeides	17.1–5; 18.2; 20.20; 21.3–4, 21.20; 22.5; 29.27	X	X	X		
Agias of Troezen	<i>Epigonoí</i> , fr. 3 West		X			
Alkidamas	<i>Od.</i> 100		X			
Alexander Aetolus	Fr. 3 Magnelli	X				
Ammianus Marcellinus	22.8.12; 28.1.4	X				
Anacreon	Fr. 463 Campbell		X			
Anon.	<i>Anth. Pal.</i> 9.670		X			
Anon.	<i>Anth. Pal.</i> 11.442	X				
Anon.	Constantinian excerpts, <i>De insidiis</i> , pp. 15, 17–19	X	X			
Anon.	<i>De Milteo</i> , <i>FGrH</i> 496 F4			X		
Antimachos of Teos	<i>Nostoi</i> , fr. 1 West		X			
Antipater of Sidon	<i>Anth. Pal.</i> 9.790	X				
Antoninus Liberalis	<i>Met.</i> 30, 34			X	X	X
Apollodoros of Athens	<i>FGrH</i> 244 F62, F63b	X				
[Apollodorus]	<i>Bibl.</i> 1.4.3; 3.1.2, 3.14.4; <i>Epit.</i> 6.2–4		X		X	X
Apollonios Rhodios	<i>Argon.</i> 1.159, 1.185–189; 2.865–867	X		X		
Aratos	<i>Phaen.</i> 1.637–640		X			
Aristarchos of Samothrace	[Plut.] <i>Hom.</i> 3; Clem. Al. <i>Strom.</i> 1.21.117	X				
Aristoboulos of Kassandreia	<i>FGrH</i> 139 F6		X			
Aristokritos	<i>FGrH</i> 493 F1, F3			X	X	
Aristotle	Frr. 76, 556 Rose	X				
Arnobius of Sicca	<i>Ad. nat.</i> 6.5				X	
Asios of Samos	Fr. 7 West			X		X
Athenaios	Deip. 1.26b–c, 1.287b–c, 1.31d; 2.43d; 6.267a; 8.361d; 15.672a–c	X	X	X		
Callimachus	<i>Aet.</i> 3.80–83b Harder; <i>Hymn</i> 3 225–227, 237–247	X		X		
Clement of Alexandria	<i>Strom.</i> 1.21; <i>Protr.</i> 3.45.3	X			X	
Demokritos	Diog. Laert. 1.1.22					X
Diodorus Siculus	5.79.1–2, 5.81.4–8, 5.84.2–4; 15.49.1–3		X	X	X	
Diogenes Laertius	1.1.22, 1.1.29, 1.5.83	X	X			X
Dionysios of Halikarnassos	4.25.4–6	X				
Dionysius Periegetes	822–829			X		
Douris of Samos	<i>FGrH</i> 76 F74					X
<i>Ekloge Historion</i>	<i>Anecdota Graeca</i> 2.193, 29–30 Cramer			X		
Ephoros	<i>FGrH</i> 70 F114a, F125–F127, F165	X	X	X	X	

TABLE 1—*Continued*

<i>Author</i>	<i>References</i>	<i>Ionian Migration</i>	<i>Other Greek Migration</i>	<i>Indigenous Origins</i>	<i>Cretan Migration</i>	<i>Near East</i>
Eratosthenes	<i>FGrH</i> 241 F1a	X				
<i>Etymologicum Magnum</i>	s.v. Ἀσελγαίνεν, Ἀστυπαλαία, Ἐφεσος	X	X	X		
Euripides	<i>Ion</i> 74, 1585–1587	X				
Eusebios	<i>Chron.</i> 68; <i>Praep. evang.</i> 2.6.5	X			X	
Eustathios	<i>Comm. Dionys. Per.</i> 823	X	X	X		
Harpokration	s.v. Ερυθράιοι	X				
Hekataios	<i>FGrH</i> 1 F141, F228	X		X		
Hellanikos	<i>FGrH</i> 4 F48, F101, F125	X	X			
Heracleides of Ponticus	Fr. 26a Schümtrumpf		X			
Herodoros	<i>FGrH</i> 31 F45				X	
Herodotos	1.142–150; 5.97.2; 6.21; 8.22; 9.97	X	X	X		
[Hesiod]	<i>Melampodia</i> fr. 278 M–W		X			
Hesychius	s.v. Κοδμεῖοι		X			
Homer	<i>Il.</i> 2.646–649, 2.867–873			X	X	
Hyginus	14.3, 14.14–16; 58; 275.7			X		X
Iamblichos	<i>VP</i> 2		X			
Ion of Chios	<i>FGrH</i> 392 F1, F29		X	X	X	
Isokrates	<i>Paneg.</i> 122	X				
Kallinos of Ephesos	Strabo 14.4.3 [C 668]		X			
Kleitophron	Fr. 5 West	X	X			
Konon	<i>FGrH</i> 26 F1.2, F1.4, F1.47	X	X	X		
Kreophylos	<i>FGrH</i> 417 F1	X				
Kritias	Fr. 1 Diehl		X			
Lycophron	<i>Alex.</i> 1377–1386	X		X		
Maiandrios	<i>FGrH</i> 491–492 F1, F10			X	X	
Malakos	<i>FGrH</i> 552 F1		X			
Maximus of Tyre	<i>Or.</i> 29.7	X				
Menekrates	Strabo 13.3.3 [C 621]			X		
Menodotos	<i>FGrH</i> 541 F1		X	X		
Metrodoros	<i>FGrH</i> 184 F9			X		
Mimnermos	<i>FGrH</i> 578 F2		X			
Nearchos	<i>FGrH</i> 133 F29			X		
Nicolaus of Damascenus	<i>FGrH</i> 90 F51, F53	X	X			
Nicander of Kolophon	<i>FGrH</i> 271–272 F5; <i>Alex.</i> 9–11; <i>Heteroeumena</i> , fr. 46 Gow and Schofield	X	X	X		
Nonnos	<i>Dion.</i> 13.546–556			X		

Continued on next page

TABLE 1—*Continued*

<i>Author</i>	<i>References</i>	<i>Ionian Migration</i>	<i>Other Greek Migration</i>	<i>Indigenous Origins</i>	<i>Cretan Migration</i>	<i>Near East</i>
Oppian	<i>H.</i> 3.400–413					X
Ovid	<i>Met.</i> 9.441–665; 10.298–518			X	X	X
Panyassis	<i>FGrH</i> 440 T1, fr. 25k Matthews	X				X
Parthenius	<i>Anat. narr.</i> 11, 14	X			X	
Pausanias	1.35.6; 7.2–5, 7.24.5–6; 9.33.2, 9.37.8	X	X	X	X	X
Phanodikos	<i>FGrH</i> 397 F4b		X			
Pherecydes	<i>FGrH</i> 3 F102, F142, F155; <i>Ant. Lib. Met.</i> 34	X	X	X		X
Philostephanos	Fr. 1 <i>FHG</i> iii 29F		X			
Philostratos	<i>Imag.</i> 2.8.6; <i>Her.</i> 43.7; <i>VA</i> 8.7.25	X				
Photios	<i>Bibl.</i> 186	X	X	X		
Pindar	Paus. 7.2.6–9			X		
Pliny the Elder	<i>HN</i> 5.31, 5.38			X		
Plutarch	<i>De mul. ver.</i> 16 [<i>Mor.</i> 253f–254b]; <i>Quaest. Graec.</i> 56 [<i>Mor.</i> 303d–e]; <i>De Glor. Ath.</i> 7 [<i>Mor.</i> 349b–350b]; <i>Thes.</i> 20	X	X	X		
[Plutarch]	<i>Hom.</i> 2.3	X				
Polyaenus	<i>Strat.</i> 8.35, 8.43	X				
Polybios	16.12	X				
Pomponius Mela	1.76–79		X	X		
Schol. Apollonios Rhodios	<i>Argon.</i> 1.185–188a, 1.308b, 1.955–960e; 2.865–872b	X	X	X	X	X
Schol. Aratos	<i>Phaen.</i> 626		X			
Schol. Aristides	<i>Panathenaikos</i> 110	X	X	X		
Schol. Aristophanes	<i>Vesp.</i> 1490a	X				
Schol. Callimachus	<i>Jovem.</i> 77b	X				
Schol. Homer	<i>Il.</i> 20.404 (Geneva Manuscript)	X	X			
Schol. Lycophron	<i>Alex.</i> 881, 1378–1379, 1383–1385	X	X	X		
Schol. Nicander	<i>Alex.</i> 9c, h; 11a, c; <i>Ther.</i> 958	X	X	X		
Schol. Plato (T+)	[<i>Hipparch.</i>] 229d; <i>Symp.</i> 208d	X	X			
Servius	<i>Comm. Verg. Aen.</i> 10.763		X			
Simonides of Amorgos	<i>FGrH</i> 8 F2			X		X
Stephanos Byzantion	s.v. Βέννα, Ἐρυθραί, Ὑφεσος, Μίλετος, Σμύρνα, Τέως, Χίος,	X	X	X	X	
Strabo	7.7.2 [C 321–322]; 9.2.12 [C 404]; 11.5.4 [C 505]; 12.3.21 [C 550], 12.8.5 [C 573]; 13.3.3 [C 621]; 14.1.2–4 [C 651–652], 14.1.6–7 [C 635], 14.1.12 [C 636], 14.1.15 [C 637], 14.1.21 [C 640], 14.2.27 [C 661–C 662], 14.5.16 [C 675]	X	X	X	X	

TABLE 1—*Continued*

<i>Author</i>	<i>References</i>	<i>Ionian Migration</i>	<i>Other Greek Migration</i>	<i>Indigenous Origins</i>	<i>Cretan Migration</i>	<i>Near East</i>
<i>Suda</i>	s.v. Ἰωνία	X				
Themistagoras	<i>FHG</i> 4.512 fr. 1		X	X		
Theocritus	<i>Id.</i> 28.3	X				
Theodoret	<i>Graec. affet. cur.</i> 8.30				X	
Theopompos	<i>FGrH</i> 115 F276, F346		X	X		
Thucydides	1.2.6, 1.12; 2.15; 6.82.3–4; 7.57.4	X				
Timotheos of Miletos	Fr. 791.235–236 Campbell		X			
Tzetzes	<i>ad. Lyk.</i> 980, 1278	X	X	X		
Vellius Paterculus	1.4	X				
Vitruvius	<i>De Arch.</i> 4.1.4–5	X		X		
Zenobios	4.3; 5.17, 5.71	X		X		

“counted” as more than another author writing extensively on the subject within one treatise. Quantifying passages would result in a situation where several passing references at different points within a single text would be “counted” as more than a single long passage that treated the subject in detail. In addition, there are instances where the same passage of text provides evidence for the work of different authors in different periods, as, for example, when Pausanias (7.2.6) cites Pindar. An assessment based on individual passages would “count” this singly as one piece of text. This one passage, however, provides evidence for a story being told at two distinct points during antiquity—first in the 5th century B.C. by Pindar, and again in the 2nd century A.D. by Pausanias.¹¹⁵ It is this “telling of stories” that is of greatest significance for this article, and I have therefore opted to approach the material in terms of authors.

In Table 1, therefore, the entry for each author aims simply to record the evidence for that particular author mentioning the origins of the Ionian cities, and, where possible, the nature of the origin they alluded to. This should be taken as demonstrating no more or no less than that (1) the author in question addressed this subject, and (2) the author did so with reference to the mythic traditions specified. I have not attempted to weight these entries according to importance, popularity, or detail, as I am not aware of any satisfactory way of doing so. For example, I would not be confident in attempting to quantify the relative popularity of different authors and texts. The *Histories* of Herodotos is therefore weighed the same as the fragmentary *Deliaka* of Phanodikos, despite the incontrovertible fact that the former was much more widely read and influential in antiquity than the latter. Similarly, the brief and almost throwaway reference in Maximus of Tyre’s *Oration* (29.7) is weighed the same as the detailed discussion by Strabo (14.1.2–4 [C 651–652]), simply because I am not confident that

115. I am grateful to Jonathan Hall for bringing this particular issue to my attention.

there is any good way of accounting for this distinction. A full consideration of all these factors requires a detailed analysis of each individual author and text, which cannot be undertaken in this article due to constraints of space. As I discuss this large and complex body of evidence in detail elsewhere from a more literary perspective,¹¹⁶ in this article I will present only a brief overview of the material specifically as relevant to the issue of historical Ionian foundations.

It is important to acknowledge from the outset that the nature of this material is problematic for two main reasons. First, there is the quality of the data. Many of the relevant passages are not fully preserved, surviving only as fragments quoted or paraphrased in the works of later authors. When approaching these fragments, we cannot always be sure what the context of the original passage might have been, or how far the later author altered the content or the sense of the original work. This is a common problem when dealing with fragmentary texts, especially given that only a small proportion of Graeco-Roman literature has survived from antiquity to the present day.¹¹⁷ We must assume, therefore, that we only have access to a small part of all the literary material that was originally written on the subject of Ionian foundations. Second, there is the nature of ancient literary evidence itself. References and stories preserved in the literary texts would only ever have represented a small proportion of the wider discourse, much of which would have been carried out in the oral tradition, civic ritual, cult, decorative arts, and other media. Even if we had access to the complete range of all the literary material from antiquity, this would therefore only represent a subsection of the wider discourse.¹¹⁸ The evidence examined here is therefore incomplete in two ways: first in that it is only a part of the literary evidence that would originally have existed; and second in that the literary evidence represents only a part of the wider discourse around Ionian foundations.¹¹⁹

Nonetheless, some important conclusions can still be drawn from this problematic and partial evidence. The texts that have survived have done so because they were of continuing interest; otherwise, they would not have been copied and preserved. At the same time, the choice to copy and keep certain texts would ensure their availability in later periods, an indicator to later generations of their potential value. Similarly, the stories and ideas contained within the surviving texts are also likely to be those that were particularly dominant or in some way deemed significant by the ancient authors who quoted them and their likely audiences; otherwise, they would not have been selected for inclusion and documentation. At the same time,

116. This body of evidence as a whole is currently under study by Mac Sweeney; see also Mac Sweeney 2013 for detailed treatments of selected texts.

117. It has been estimated that only 1% of ancient literature survives to the present day (Blum 1991, p. 8, n. 34).

In addition, it is important to note that we know of several lost works that directly addressed the topic of

Ionian foundation, such as the local histories of Heropythos, Xenophanes, and Erxias.

118. See Mac Sweeney 2015 for such foundation discourses.

119. Indeed, I have excluded inscriptions from this analysis, although relevant inscriptions exist that assume a historiographical tone, e.g., the Parian Marble and the Lindian Chronicle. Although literary material should not,

in an ideal situation, be viewed separately from contemporary writing cultures (and indeed from other contemporary forms of cultural expression), the literary corpus derives cohesion from the tradition of textual copying and transmission. Therefore, in the interests of practicality, I have limited myself here to texts that have been preserved through this tradition only.

by the fact of being committed to writing, the selected elements would have been further disseminated and would likely come to occupy a more conspicuous place within wider tradition.¹²⁰ Overall, while we cannot know how representative the trends in the surviving literary evidence are of the wider discourse, we can be confident that they bear some relationship to that discourse and share some of its key characteristics.

What, then, are the patterns in the surviving evidence? While there are several distinct traditions in the literary evidence for Ionian origins, the best known is that of the Ionian Migration. References are made to this story by 61 known authors.¹²¹ As mentioned in the introduction, the story of the Ionian Migration tells of how ethnic Ionians, primarily—although not exclusively—from Athens, migrated eastward across the Aegean and established the Ionian cities under the leadership of the sons of Kodros, the mythical king of Athens. There is some disagreement over which one of Kodros' sons was the overall leader of the expedition—some claim it was Androklos (e.g., Pherecydes, *FGrH* 3 F155), but most say it was Neileus (e.g., Aelian, *VH* 8.5). The earliest evidence for this story dates to the 6th century B.C., according to the claims of two Byzantine sources. We are told that Panyassis wrote about “Kodros, Neileus, and the Ionian settlement” (περὶ Κόδρον καὶ Νηλέα καὶ τὰς Ἰωνικὰς ἀποικίας; *FGrH* 440 T1), and also that Hekataios wrote that Erythrai was founded by Knopos, another son of Kodros (*FGrH* 1 F228). The fullest surviving account of the myth is that of Pausanias (see pp. 381–382, above). Pausanias describes how after Kodros' death, his sons quarreled over who would succeed their father to the kingship of Athens. They sought advice from the oracle at Delphi, who decreed in favor of the eldest son, Medon. In response, Neileus and several of his brothers sought their fortunes elsewhere, setting sail for Anatolia and founding the Ionian cities.

The Ionian Migration was not the only tradition in circulation, and there were several other accounts of the cities' origins. From the surviving

120. The relationship between a broad cultural tradition and the elements of the tradition that become fixed in text is characterized as a “biofeedback loop” by Kurke (2011, p. 39).

121. In nn. 121–126, passages are included that either (a) explicitly tell stories of Ionian origins, or (b) make more oblique allusions to these stories but assume their readers have knowledge of the stories. Passages making reference to the Ionian Migration story are (in alphabetical order by name of author): Ael. *VH* 8.5; Aristid. *Or.* 17.1–5, 21.3–4, 22.5, 29.27; Alexander Aetolus, fr. 3 Magnelli; Amm. Marc. 22.8.12, 28.1.4; Anon. *Anth. Pal.* 11.442; Anon. Constantinian excerpts, *De insidiis*, pp. 15, 19; Antip. Sid. *Anth. Pal.* 9.790; Apollodoros of Athens, *FGrH* 244 F62, F63b; Ap. Rhod. *Argon.* 1.159;

Aristarchos of Samothrace, in Clem. Al. *Strom.* 1.21.117 and in [Plut.] *Hom.* 2.3; Arist. fr. 76, 556 Rose; Ath. *Deip.* 8.361d; Callim. *Aet.* 3.80–83b Harder, *Hymn* 3.225–227; Clem. Al. *Strom.* 1.21.117; Diog. Laert. 1.1.29; Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 4.25.4–6; Ephoros, *FGrH* 70 F125–F127; Eratosthenes, *FGrH* 241 F1a; *Etym. Magn.*, s.v. Ἀσελγαίνειν; Eur. *Ion* 74, 1585–1587; Euseb. *Chron.* 68; Eust. *Comm. Dionys. Per.* 823; Harp., s.v. Ἐρυθραῖοι; Hekataios, *FGrH* 1 F228; Hellanikos, *FGrH* 4 F48, F125; Hdt. 1.142–147, 5.97.2, 6.21, 8.22, 9.97; Isok. *Paneg.* 122; Kleitophron, fr. 5 West; Konon, *FGrH* 26 F1.2, F1.47; Kreophylos, *FGrH* 417 F1; Lycoph. *Alex.* 1377–1386; Maximus of Tyre 29.7; Nic. *Alex.* 9–11; Nic. Dam. *FGrH* 90 F53; Panyassis, *FGrH* 440 T1; Parth. *Amat. narr.* 14; Paus. 7.2, 7.4–5, 7.24.5–6, 9.37.8; Pherec. *FGrH* 3

F155; Philostr. *Imag.* 2.8.6, *Her.* 43.7, *VA* 8.7.25; Photios, *Bibliotheca* 186; Plut. *De glor. Ath.* 7 [*Mor.* 349b–350b], *De mul. vir.* 16 [*Mor.* 253f–254b]; [Plut.] *Hom.* 2.3; Polyaeus, *Strat.* 8.35, 8.43; Polyb. 16.12; Schol. Ap. Rhod. *Argon.* 1.955–960e; Schol. Aristid. *Panathenaios* 110; Schol. Ar. *Vesp.* 1409a; Schol. Callim. *Jov.* 77b; Schol. Hom. *Il.* 20.404 (Geneva Manuscript); Schol. Lycoph. *Alex.* 1378–1379, 1383–1385; Schol. Nic. *Alex.* 9h; Schol. Pl. *Symp.* 208d; Steph. Byz., s.v. Βέννα, Ἐρυθραῖ, Μίλητος; Strabo 7.7.2 [C 321–322], 12.3.21 [C 550], 14.1.2–4 [C 651–652], 14.1.6–7 [C 635], 14.1.21 [C 640]; Suda, s.v. Ἰωνία; Theoc. *Id.* 28.3; Thuc. 1.2.6, 1.12, 2.15, 6.82.3–4, 7.57.4; Tzet. *ad Lyk.* 980; Vell. Pat. 1.4; Vit. *De arch.* 4.1.4–5; Zen. 4.3, 5.17.

evidence, the second most popular tradition is that of the Ionian cities being established by migrant *oikists* (heroic founders) from the western Aegean, but not from Athens as part of a Kodrid Ionian Migration. This tradition appears in the work of 53 different authors, the earliest of which are the anonymous authors of the poems in the Epic Cycle the *Epigonoí* (fr. 3 West) and the *Nostoi* (fr. 1 West). Both of these make reference to the Iliadic seer Kalchas dying in Kolophon following his encounter with Mopsos, the son of Kolophon's Theban founder, Manto. The 53 authors in this group mention founders arriving in Ionia from the Peloponnese (including from Pylos, Epidauros, Arkadia, and Argos, but most commonly from Achaia), central Greece (including Phokis, Orchomenos, and Euboeia, but most commonly Thebes), and northern Greece (Thessaly and Aitolia).¹²²

The third major tradition that emerges from the extant literary sources is the idea of indigenous Anatolian foundation, and many tales represented the Ionian cities as having been initially established and occupied by Karians, Leleges, or other autochthons sprung from nature spirits. References to such stories appear in the work of 49 different authors, the earliest of which is the *Iliad* (2.867–873) followed by the 6th-century author Asios of Samos (fr. 7 West).¹²³ Among this group, myths of cities

122. The relevant passages are: Aristid. *Or.* 18.2, 20.20, 21.3–4; Agias of Troizen, *Epigonoí*, fr. 3 West; Alkidamas, *Od.* 100; Anac. fr. 463 Campbell; Anon. *Anth. Pal.* 9.670; Anon. Constantinian excerpts, *De insidiis*, pp. 17, 18; Antimachos of Teos, *Nostoi*, fr. 1 West; [Apollod.] *Bibl.* 1.4.3; [Apollod.] *Epit.* 6.2–4; Arat. *Phaen.* 1.637–640; Aristoboulos of Kassandrea, *FGrH* 493 F6; Ath. *Deip.* 1.25b–c, 1.28b–c, 2.43d, 6.267a, 15.672a–e; Diod. Sic. 5.81.4–8, 15.49.1–3; Diog. Laert. 1.5.83; Ephoros, *FGrH* 70 F126; *Etym. Magn.*, s.v. Ἀστυπαλαία; Eust. *Comm. Dionys. Per.* 823; Hellanikos, *FGrH* 3 F101; Hdt. 1.142–150; Heraclid. *Pont.* fr. 26a Schrümpf; [Hes.] *Melampodia*, fr. 278 M–W; Hsch., s.v. Καδμεῖοι; Iambl. *VP* 2; Ion of Chios, *FGrH* 392 F1, F9 von Blumental; Kallinos, in Strabo 14.4.3 [C 668]; Kleitophon, fr. 5 West; Konon, *FGrH* 26 F1.4; Kritias, fr. 1 Diehl; Malakos, *FGrH* 552 F1; Menodotos, *FGrH* 541 F1; Mimnermos, *FGrH* 587 F2 (fr. 9 West); Nic. Dam. *FGrH* 90 F51; Nic. *FGrH* 271–272 F5; Paus. 7.2–5, 7.24.5–6, 9.33.2, 9.37.8; Phanodikos, *FGrH* 397 F4b; Pherec. *FGrH* 3 F102, F142; Philostephanos, fr. 1 *FGrH* iii 29F; Photios, *Bibliotheca* 186; Plut. *Thes.* 20; Pompon. Mela 1.76–79; Schol. Ap. Rhod. *Argon.* 1.308b; Schol. Aratos *Phaen.* 1.636; Schol. Aristid.

Panathenaikos 110; Schol. Hom. *Il.* 20.404 (Geneva Manuscript); Schol. Lycoph. *Alex.* 881; Schol. Nic. *Alex.* 9c, 11a, *Ther.* 958; Schol. Pl. (T+) [*Hippiarchos*] 229d; Serv. *Comm. Verg. Aen.* 10.763; Steph. Byz., s.v. Τέως; Strabo 9.2.12 [C 404], 14.1.2–4 [C 651–652], 14.1.12 [C 636], 14.2.27 [C 661–662], 14.5.16 [C 675]; Themistagoras, *FHG* 4.512 fr. 1; Theopomp. *FGrH* 115 F276, F346; Timoth. *Per.*, fr. 791.235–236 Campbell; Tzetz. *ad Lyk.* 1278. I am including within this category passages where the Athenian hero Theseus is claimed as a founder of Smyrna or Chios (directly or indirectly), as this constitutes a mainland Greek foundation that is unrelated to the Ionian Migration. Passages that make reference to Theseus as a founder are: Ion of Chios fr. 29 von Blumental; Aristid. *Or.* 17.1–5, 18.2, 20.20; Anon. *Anth. Pal.* 9.670.

123. The relevant passages are (including references to Karians, Leleges, Pelasgians, nature spirits, and Amazons): Ael. *VH* 8.5; Aristid. *Or.* 17.1–5, 18.2, 21.3–4, 21.20; Anon. *De Mileto*, *FGrH* 496 F4; Ant. Lib. *Met.* 30; Ap. Rhod. *Argon.* 1.185–189, 2.865–867; Aristokritos, *FGrH* 493 F1; Asios, fr. 7 West; Ath. *Deip.* 1.31d, 2.43d, 15.672a–e; Callim. *Hymn* 3.237–247; Diod. Sic. 5.84.2–4; Dionys. *Per.* 822–829; *Ekloge Historion, Anecd. Ox.* 2.193, 29–30; Ephoros, *FGrH* 70 F114a,

F127, F165; *Etym. Magn.*, s.v. Ἀσέλ-γαίνειν, Ἀστυπαλαία, Ἐφεσος; Eust. *Comm. Dionys. Per.* 823; Hekataios, *FGrH* 1 F141; Hdt. 1.142–150; Hom. *Il.* 2.867–873; Hyg. *Fab.* 14.3, 14.14–16; Ion of Chios, *FGrH* 392 F1; Konon, *FGrH* 26 F1.2; Lycoph. *Alex.* 1377–1386; Maiandrios, *FGrH* 491–492 F10; Menekrates, in Strabo 13.3.3 [C 621]; Menodotos, *FGrH* 541 F1; Metrodoros, *FGrH* 184 F9; Nearchos, *FGrH* 133 F29; Nic. *Heteroeumena*, fr. 46 Gow and Schofield; Nonnos, *Dion.* 13.546–565; Ov. *Met.* 9.441–665; Paus. 1.35.6, 7.2–4; Pherec., *FGrH* 3 F155; Photios, *Bibl.* 186; Pind., in Paus. 7.2.6–9; Plin. *HN* 5.31, 5.38; Plut. *Quaes. Graec.* 56 [*Mor.* 303d–e]; Pompon. Mela 1.76–79; Schol. Ap. Rhod. *Argon.* 1.185–188a, 1.308b, 1.955–960e, 2.865–72b; Schol. Aristid. *Panathenaikos* 110; Schol. Lycoph. *Alex.* 1378–1379, 1383–1385; Schol. Nic. *Alex.* 11a, 11c, *Ther.* 958; Simon., *FGrH* 8 F2; Steph. Byz., s.v. Χίος, Μίλητος, Σύμωρον; Strabo 7.7.2 [C 321–322], 11.5.4 [C 505], 12.3.21 [C 550], 12.8.5 [C 573], 13.3.3 [C 621], 14.1.2–4 [C 651–652], 14.1.6–7 [C 365], 14.1.15 [C 657], 14.1.21 [C 640]; Themistagoras, *FHG* 4.512 fr. 1; Theopomp. *FGrH* 115 F276; Tzetz. *ad Lyk.* 980; Vitruv. *De arch.* 4.1.4–5; Zen. 5.71

being founded by Amazons are a particularly interesting subgroup: 14 of these authors mention the Amazonian origins of Smyrna and Ephesos.¹²⁴

There are also two significant minor traditions that emerge from the surviving corpus of texts. The first of these is a group of stories that claim some Ionian cities were originally founded by Cretans, including an eponymous hero Miletos and the various sons of Rhadamanthos. This idea of Cretan origins is preserved in the works of 20 different authors.¹²⁵ The other is a group of tales that recount an even more exotic origin, such as Phoenicia or Assyria, for several civic founders. These stories appear in the works of 14 different authors claiming Near Eastern origins for the founders of Smyrna, Samos, and Miletos.¹²⁶

There is considerable diversity, therefore, in the accounts of Ionian origins offered by Greek and Latin literary texts. The story of the Ionian Migration is the most commonly told of these, as it is recounted in or alluded to by just over half of the authors known to have mentioned the subject (61 out of 111 authors). We know, however, of a similar number of authors who made reference to Aegean migrant founders who arrived independently from any Ionian Migration (60 out of 111; this includes the 53 authors who mentioned founders from the western Aegean, as well as an additional seven authors who mentioned Cretan migrants rather than western Aegean ones).¹²⁷ Although we have evidence for slightly fewer authors mentioning an indigenous Anatolian origin for the Ionian cities, the number of these is still significant (49 authors out of 111). As an index of the complexity and diversity of the discourse surrounding Ionian foundations, it is noteworthy that out of the 111 authors known to have addressed the subject, 50 made reference to more than one mythic tradition within their work. The discourse of Ionian foundations was therefore strongly characterized by plurality.

At this point, I would like to reiterate the problematic nature of this evidence, and to highlight that these numbers cannot be taken as straightforwardly representative of the opinions held during antiquity. It is also significant that this evidence covers a span of perhaps 20 centuries, and that the popularity of different stories changed over time. Also, the material is drawn from many different literary genres, and some stories were more popular than others among certain groups of writers and in different

124. The relevant passages are: Ath. *Deip.* 1.31d; Callim. *Hymn* 3.237–247; Dionys. *Per.* 822–829; Ephoros, *FGrH* 70 F114a; *Etym. Magn.*, s.v. Ἐφεσος; Eust. *Comm. Dionys. Per.* 823; Maiandrios, *FGrH* 491–492 F9; Paus. 7.2.6–9; Pind., in Paus. 7.2.6–9; Plin. *HN* 5.31; Plut. *Quaes. Graec.* 56 [*Mor.* 303d–e]; Pompon. Mela 1.76–79; Steph. Byz., s.v. Σμύρνα, Ἐφεσος; Strabo 11.5.4 [C 505], 12.3.21 [C 550], 14.1.2–4 [C 651–652].

125. The relevant passages are: Ant. Lib. *Met.* 30; [Apollod.] *Bibl.* 3.14.4; Aristokritos, *FGrH* 493 F3; Arn. *Adv. nat.* 6.5; Clem. Al. *Protr.* 3.45.2;

Diod. Sic. 5.79.1–2, 5.84.2–4; Ephoros, *FGrH* 70 F127; Euseb. *Praep. evang.* 2.6.5; Herodotos, *FGrH* 31 F45; Hom. *Il.* 2.646–649; Ion of Chios, *FGrH* 392 F1; Maiandrios, *FGrH* 491–492 F10; Nic. *Heteroeumena*, fr. 46 Gow and Schofield; Ov. *Met.* 9.441–665; Parth. *Amat. narr.* 11; Paus. 7.2–3; Schol. Ap. Rhod. *Argon.* 1.185–188a; Steph. Byz., s.v. Μίλητος; Strabo 12.8.5 [C 573], 14.1.2–4 [C 651–652], 14.1.6–7 [C 365]; Theodoret, *Graec. affect. cur.* 8.30.

126. The relevant passages are: Ant. Lib. *Met.* 34; [Apollod.] *Bibl.* 3.1.2; Asios, fr. 7 West; Democr., in Diog.

Laert. 1.1.22; Diog. Laert. 1.1.22; Douris of Samos, *FGrH* 76 F74; Hyg. *Fab.* 58, 275.7; Oppian, *H.* 3.400–413; Ov. *Met.* 10.298–518; Panyassis, fr. 25k Matthews; Paus. 7.4; Pherec., in Ant. Lib. *Met.* 34; Schol. Ap. Rhod. *Argon.* 2.865–72b; Simon., *FGrH* 8 F2.

127. Of the 20 authors who mentioned Cretan founders, 13 are also known to have mentioned western Aegean founders. The remaining seven are: [Apollodoros], Arnobios of Secca, Clement of Alexandria, Eusebios, Herodotos, Parthenios, and Theodoret.

genres.¹²⁸ Taking this highly problematic body of material together as a whole in order to examine the historicity of the Ionian Migration must therefore be done only with extreme caution.

With all caveats in place, what can this problematic body of material tell us about the EIA origins of the Ionian cities? As mentioned in the introduction, scholars arguing for the historicity of the Ionian Migration assert that these later literary texts contain kernels of historical truth, preserving myths that originally began as historical memories and were passed down over the centuries in the oral tradition.¹²⁹ Those who reject the historicity of the Ionian Migration, however, argue that both the formation of the oral tradition and the composition of literary texts are creative processes, and that the resulting distortions to any historical information would be so great as to render the literary accounts effectively useless as sources for historical Ionian foundations.¹³⁰ My own personal tendency is to favor the latter position, as I believe the texts have much more to offer as evidence for the time they were written in, rather than as evidence for the time they were written about. Nonetheless, it is of course possible that some elements of historical truth were preserved in the oral tradition, and that some of these can be found in the surviving literary material.¹³¹ But if there is a kernel of historical truth in the texts, what might this kernel be?

It is often assumed that at the essential core of the literary evidence lies the story of the Ionian Migration, and that stripping the myths of later exaggeration and invention would leave us with the key elements of the Ionian Migration story: a migration from the Greek mainland to the eastern Aegean during the EIA, led by or primarily composed of Athenians.¹³² As we have already established, this is certainly the kernel of a good number of the relevant texts. But it is also evident that the Ionian Migration story does not lie at the core of all of the literary material, or even of a substantial majority of it. We cannot speak of the Ionian Migration as “the” standard story, and certainly not as “the party line.”¹³³

Some scholars have proposed alternatives for this central kernel, seeking to rationalize the diversity of the literary sources. This rationalization has been accomplished in two main ways. First, there have been attempts to conflate different stories. Instead of the cities being founded by distinct groups of migrants from various separate locations, it is suggested that foundations occurred when mixed groups of migrants arrived together. Therefore, instead of a foundation being due to either Athenians or Thebans or Orchomenians, it is suggested that it can be attributed to a single mixed

128. E.g., stories of the Ionian Migration were at their most popular during the 1st century B.C. and the 1st century A.D., while stories about the Cretan origins of Ionia are to be found almost exclusively in works of universal history and geography, but not in local histories or performance poetry. This is currently under study by Mac Sweeney.

129. E.g., Niemeier 2007a; Herda 2009, 2013.

130. E.g., Cobet 2007.

131. As argued by Kerschner (2006) on the grounds of plausibility, and by Sakellariou (1990) with an attempt at scientific identification of “authentic recollections.”

132. This is assumed, e.g., both by Greaves (2010, pp. 222–224) in his refutation of the idea of the Ionian Migration, and Herda (2013, p. 426) in his assertion of it.

133. Cf. Fowler 2013, pp. 573–576. To draw a modern analogy, we can no more claim that the Ionian Migration

was the overwhelmingly dominant account of Ionian origins in antiquity than we can claim that exiting the European Union was the overwhelming preference of the British people in the so-called Brexit referendum of 2016. While 52% (and therefore a majority) of the votes cast in the referendum did call for a “Brexit,” this was by no means indicative of either unity or coherence in popular sentiment among the wider British population.

group comprised of migrants from all three areas combined.¹³⁴ This kind of mythic conflation has a long history, and it occurred in antiquity as well as in modern scholarship (e.g., Hdt. 1.146). Another rationalizing approach is to bring different traditions together by layering them chronologically, assuming that different stories represent different historical episodes. For example, the explanation commonly given for why some texts claim a Peloponnesian origin for the migrants is that some authors are simply “misremembering” an earlier chapter of the Ionian Migration story. The Ionians, it is thought, initially lived in the Peloponnese, but migrated to Athens in the time of Kodros’s father, Melanthos, before later migrating from Athens to Ionia. It is therefore argued that the stories positing Peloponnesian founders in Ionia have confused the two distinct historical migrations.¹³⁵ Similarly, alternative traditions for the foundation of a single city often are explained by a series of successive foundations. It has been suggested, for example, that Miletos was initially occupied by indigenous Karians, then later taken over by Cretan migrants, and finally seized and founded as a Greek *polis* by Ionian migrants.¹³⁶ As with approaches based on mythic conflation, this type of mythic layering can also be found in antiquity (e.g., Ephoros, *FGrH* 70 F127).¹³⁷ Both of these rationalizing approaches have the virtue of acknowledging diversity in the literary sources, but both are nonetheless problematic when seeking to identify a potential historical “kernel.”¹³⁸

The problems derive from the fact that a rationalizing approach collapses different mythic traditions into a single, overarching narrative, seeking not so much to explain the divergent traditions as to explain them away. Both of the approaches outlined above aim at a singular coherent historical “truth,” imposing order on the relative chaos of the literary material and creating a linear sequence of discrete and easily identifiable “events.”¹³⁹ This does not allow for the plurality that was a vital part of the mythic discourse. Pluralities of meaning and function were central to the way foundation myths functioned. Myths were understood differently by different audiences, in different social contexts, and when encountered through different media. The contemporary existence of parallel and apparently contradictory mythic traditions does seem not to have been as problematic for an ancient audience as it is for a modern one.¹⁴⁰ We have already seen how plurality was explicitly acknowledged in this particular

134. E.g., Cook 1962, p. 24.

135. E.g., Vanschoonwinckel 2006, pp. 122–125.

136. E.g., Herda 2009, pp. 67–101. The appeal of this particular explanation is that it seems to match neatly the archaeological evidence. At Miletos, the remains of the prehistoric settlement are overlain by Middle and Late Bronze Age layers that show significant cultural influences from Minoan Crete, which are in turn overlain by EIA layers that include some cultural influences from Attica. The evidence for cultural change in the archaeological record is,

in actuality, much more complex than this model allows, as we have seen in previous sections.

137. For rationalizing approaches to myth in antiquity more generally, see Hawes 2014.

138. See McNerney 2014 for similar rationalizing approaches to the literary material surrounding Pelasgians and Leleges.

139. The problems with adopting this rationalizing approach to the literary sources are evident when we consider analogous approaches to other types of evidence. The equivalent approach to

ceramic material would involve joining together different fragments, from different shapes, made in different wares, and dating from different periods into a single, giant, reconstructed “Franken-pot.” The problems with adopting such an approach are obvious. See the arguments against such rationalization in Hall 2002, pp. 35–36.

140. For a discussion of coexisting variants in foundation myths, see papers in Mac Sweeney 2015. For an introduction to the different functions of and approaches to myth, see Graf 1993.

body of literary texts, with 50 out of 111 authors making reference to more than one mythic tradition in their work. We should therefore aim to establish a “kernel” for our sources which embraces rather than irons out this plurality.

Such a kernel cannot take the form of a single linear narrative, and it cannot focus on discrete “moments” of foundation. Rather, it would necessarily be chaotic and impressionistic—a snapshot rather than a story. Reviewing the literary evidence in its entirety, the overwhelming impression is not of foundation events, but rather of ongoing development and emergence. The sense is less of distinct and unidirectional “migrations” and more of Brownian motion, with individuals, families, and groups moving, settling, moving again, trading, intermarrying, visiting, and working in a range of places, for a range of reasons, on a temporary or a permanent basis. The texts suggest that the people involved in these activities originated from locations across the Aegean, including the eastern Aegean and Anatolia, and that some may have even come from as far afield as the Near East. If we are willing to place greater trust in the accuracy of both literary authors and the oral tradition, we might also suggest that a significant proportion of these people had roots in Attica, Thebes, Achaia, and the local area of Ionia itself. The “kernel” described here may be unattractive—it is certainly confusing, messy, and chaotic—but it is closer to the literary evidence than other “kernels” suggested in the scholarship to date. Where, then, does this leave our investigations of fact and fiction in the Ionian Migration?

CONCLUSION—DOUBLE ORIGINS

By combining a broad overview of historical, archaeological, and linguistic evidence with a more detailed discussion of literary sources, we can come to two conclusions about the origins of the Ionian cities. The first concerns the origins of the cities themselves—the physical foundation of settlements and communities. The second concerns the origins of these cities as “Ionian”—the social and cultural establishment of a particular Ionian identity.

Concerning the origins of the cities themselves, there is little evidence consistent with idea of the Ionian Migration as an historical “fact.” The archaeological evidence currently available demonstrates two things: (1) that many of these sites were settled long before the EIA, and (2) that the cultural changes observed in the EIA are neither quantitatively nor qualitatively suggestive of a large-scale influx of people. Similarly, the historical evidence does not imply that there was a significant change during the EIA either in the way that the region was characterized or in the geographic associations connected with the group known as “Ionians.” The linguistic evidence is the only body of data that may potentially be consistent with the idea of an Ionian Migration, although it does not, by itself, provide positive proof of such a migration. The factual veracity of the Ionian Migration is therefore not strongly supported by the available contemporary evidence.

It is now widely recognized that the myth of the Ionian Migration is not historically accurate, and few scholars would continue to assert the strict

veracity of the story. Instead, most proponents of the idea now argue that the main points of the myth can be rationalized and moderated to fit the evidence. While these scholars reject the details of the Ionian Migration story, they nonetheless maintain that there is truth at its essential core—the idea of a large-scale movement of people from the western Aegean and primarily Athens during the EIA that resulted in the foundation of the Ionian cities.¹⁴¹ It is assumed that this central idea emerges from the later literary sources, meaning that it is their historical “kernel.” There remains substantial debate over whether such a kernel can contain anything in the way of useful historical fact, given the selective and creative processes involved in the formation both of the oral tradition and of literary sources.¹⁴² If, however, we are to accept the potential for some historical fact to be transmitted through such a kernel, a significant issue remains—the contents of this kernel itself. By considering the literary material in its entirety, it is evident that the idea of the Ionian Migration does not lie at the heart of the existing body of literary evidence. Instead, the story can be found in only roughly half of the texts, and in many of these instances it is presented alongside other parallel or alternative origin myths.

If we were to replace the idea of the Ionian Migration with a kernel that better represented the literary evidence, this kernel would be far messier. Our model would be of disorganized civic origins, where mobile individuals and small groups from across the Aegean and Anatolia moved around the wider region, with some eventually settling in Ionia alongside the local inhabitants at various different points in time. This kernel is consistent with the archaeological evidence, which suggests that there was some cultural change but also much continuity in the EIA, with no clear event horizon marking the sudden arrival of any specific incoming group. The archaeological material also suggests a range of external connections and influences during this time, with Ionia linked into complex networks of interaction and mobility not just with Attica, Achaia, Thebes, and other places mentioned in the literary texts, but also with other Aegean regions such as Euboea, as well as with central Anatolia and the wider Near East. By combining the archaeological and historical evidence we can contextualize this picture further. It is evident that mobility around the Aegean had a long history, but the sociopolitical circumstances of the EIA may potentially have facilitated more mobility than in previous periods. In particular, the reduction of centralized state control after the end of the LBA and the increased flexibility in social structures may have offered more opportunity and incentive for movement. This heightened mobility would also satisfactorily explain the later linguistic situation that is documented for Archaic Ionia.

While the limits of the evidence may prevent us from reaching any firm conclusions about the origins of the Ionian cities as settlements and communities, this evidence is nonetheless consistent with a model of origins that is gradual, complex, and messy, and it is characterized neither by any specific moment of foundation led by an individual *oikist* nor by a series of discrete horizons where distinct migrant groups arrived. Instead, the accretion of people is more likely to have been complicated and gradual, with the unique nature of each community developing over time. Indeed,

141. E.g., Niemeier (2005, p. 21) states that the idea of a coherent colonization led by an Athenian *Kodrid oikist* is “unhistorical,” but he nonetheless still upholds the concept of large-scale migration primarily involving people from Attica.

142. The debate continues today despite calls over the last three decades for a middle way between credulity and hypercriticism (Sakellariou 1990; Hall 2002, p. 25; Kerschner 2006).

the idea of “origin” may be more relevant to the Ionian cities than that of “foundation,” as it implies an ongoing process rather than an event. Rather than seeking to locate the foundations of the Ionian cities in the EIA, we might better aim to understand the complex origins and development of these communities over the *longue durée*, with a focus on the EIA as a particularly fluid and formative period. While our evidence should not lead us to posit any specific episodes of migration during this period, it is nonetheless consistent with the ongoing arrival of migrants, in a piecemeal and disorganized fashion, from a range of different places, that played a central role in the early development of these cities.

There is perhaps one temporal horizon that can be discerned in the available evidence, which comes from the historical data: the origin of the specifically “Ionian” identity of the cities. There was a conspicuous shift in terminology over the course of the 6th century B.C., whereby the region previously known as Asia came to be called Ionia. This seems to have happened at roughly the same time as changes were occurring in the conceptualization of “Hellas.”¹⁴³ The contemporary archaeological material indicates a greater coherence in material culture around this time, as well as common social conventions. The 6th century is also the earliest date for which we have evidence of collective Ionian activity at the Panionion, both at the location of the later sanctuary on Otomatik Tepe and at the Archaic hekatompèdon on Çatallar Tepe. This correspondence between different forms of evidence is suggestive. It implies that we should place the origins of a widely recognized concept of Ionian identity (and perhaps also the Ionian League) in the 6th century. This 6th-century date is later than often presumed,¹⁴⁴ and it is likely that it represents the end point of a long process through which Ionian identity was gradually formed. After all, the idea of an Ionian identity was an extremely ancient one, dating back at least to the LBA. There are also several signs of shared social and cultural practices that predate the 6th century, which can be found not only in material culture, but also (conspicuously) in language and script, as an identifiable Ionian dialect and writing system appears in the 7th century. We can therefore postulate a period, perhaps including much of the 7th and 6th centuries B.C., when a collective identity was being constructed, debated, and negotiated within Ionia, crystallizing toward the end of the 6th century into a widespread and general recognition of what it meant to be an Ionian.¹⁴⁵ To paraphrase both Myres and Hall, we might therefore shift our inquiries from the “*coming of Ionians to Anatolia*” to the “*becoming of Ionians in Anatolia*.”¹⁴⁶ This avenue of focus may be viewed as a second origin of the Ionian cities—the birth of their identity as Ionian, rather than their birth as cities.

This second of these origins necessitated discussion of the first. Constructing an Ionian identity involved debate about a shared past. We know of several lost works of local history written by Ionian authors from the 6th and early 5th centuries, including both civic histories such as Xenophanes’ *Kolophonika* and regional histories such as Bias’ *Peri Ionias* and Panyassis’ *Ionika*. In this context, the idea of an Ionian Migration may have first emerged if it had not existed previously, or gained prominence if it had previously existed, as it offered both a unifying origin myth for the Ionian cities and a rationale for their exclusivity.¹⁴⁷ Indeed, the first attestation of

143. See n. 19, above, and Hall 2002, pp. 129–143.

144. An earlier date for a coherent Ionian identity is argued for by Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1906), Hall (2002, pp. 71–73), and Herda (2009, pp. 30–31). The idea of a 6th-century date is also argued for by Crielaard (2009, p. 72).

145. By this, I refer specifically to the identity of being “Ionian” in terms of the 13 cities of the Ionian League, and not to belonging more generally to the Ionian *ethnos* or the region of Ionia.

146. Myres 1930; Hall 2002, pp. 45–47.

147. This was previously argued by Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1906, p. 72), albeit for an earlier date, and by Sakellariou (1990, p. 37) in relation to Achaian collective origins.

the Ionian Migration story reportedly comes from locally based Archaic historiographers (Hekataios, *FGrH* 1 F228; Panyassis, *FGrH* 440 T1).¹⁴⁸ The rise to prominence of the Ionian Migration myth should therefore be seen in this 6th-century context—that is, in the context of emerging Ionian identity—rather than as due to the veracity of its claims concerning the Early Iron Age. Similarly, the continued popularity of the myth cannot be explained with reference to its historical accuracy or otherwise. As already mentioned, the myth would have been politically expedient at several points during antiquity, not just with the coalescing of Ionian identity in the 6th century B.C. Notably, it would have spoken to Athenian imperial ambitions in the eastern Aegean during the 5th century B.C., and to Athens' attempts to recover some position of ideological and symbolic prominence during the 4th century.¹⁴⁹ The story would once again have gained traction during what is known as the “Second Sophistic” period around the 2nd century A.D., when Roman imperial patronage saw a rise in Athens' fortunes as a center of learning and culture.¹⁵⁰

While the myth of the Ionian Migration remained popular throughout antiquity, so too did alternative stories of Ionian origins. It seems that from the outset, Ionian identity and a shared Ionian past could be constructed in other ways, most notably through the story of the Meliac Wars. At the same time, several stories actively addressed the issue of *becoming* Ionian and acquiring an Ionian identity. Smyrna reportedly became Ionian either through kinship (Strabo 14.1.4 [C 633–634]) or through conquest by Kolophon (Mimnermos, fr. 9 West; Hdt. 1.150). Similarly, Chios became Ionian either through choice (Ion of Chios, *FGrH* 392 F1) or through conquest by Erythrai (Hekataios, *FGrH* 1 F141). It was also claimed that Klazomenai owed its Ionian origins to conquest by Kolophon (Paus. 7.3.8–9), Ephesos to conquest by Samos (Malakos, *FGrH* 552 F1), and Samos to conquest by Ephesos (Paus. 7.2.2–3). We have further hints that Chios might have claimed credit for the foundation and Ionian identity of both Samos and Teos, while Teos may have made a similar claim for Ephesos, and Ephesos for Smyrna.¹⁵¹ While one model for becoming Ionian might have been through shared commonalities, another seems to have been through shared conflicts. There appears to have been a plurality of models and a range of different routes available for becoming Ionian. The discourse of “Ionianness” was a rich and complex one, within which the origins of cities played a key role.

While we cannot consider the story of the Ionian Migration to be historical “fact,” it is not helpful to condemn it as “fiction.”¹⁵² Fictions, stories, and above all, the Greek concept of *mythos* were all vital in the shaping of real identities and in the intricacies of lived experience. While there may be no place for the Ionian Migration in the writing of EIA Ionian history and individual city origins, there is certainly a place for it in the writing of later regional history and the origins of Ionian identity.

148. Although Panyassis is not usually considered to be a historiographer, I have designated him as such in this context because his poem “Ionika,” purported to recount Ionian history. I do not mean to imply that Panyassis wrote prose historiography as we would understand it.

149. See n. 10, above. The changing trends in the popularity of the Ionian Migration and related myths are currently under study by this author.

150. For the Second Sophistic, see Whitmarsh 2005.

151. Mac Sweeney 2013, pp. 187–194.

152. Cf. Hall 1997, p. 185.

REFERENCES

- Adiego, I. J. 2007a. *The Carian Language* (Handbook of Oriental Studies 1: The Near and Middle East 8), Leiden.
- . 2007b. "Greek and Carian," in Christidis 2007, pp. 758–762.
- . 2007c. "Greek and Lycian," in Christidis 2007, pp. 763–767.
- . 2007d. "Greek and Lydian," in Christidis 2007, pp. 768–772.
- Akurgal, E. 1967. "İldırı kazısı (Haberler)," *Belleten* 123, pp. 460–461.
- . 1983. *Alt-Smyrna I: Wohnschichten und Athenatempel*, Ankara.
- Akurgal, M. 2010. *Smyrna Bayraklı Höyüğü/The Bayraklı Mound*, Izmir.
- Antonaccio, C. M. 2009. "(Re)Defining Ethnicity: Culture, Material Culture, and Identity," in *Visual Culture and Social Identity in the Ancient Mediterranean*, ed. T. Hodos and S. Hales, Cambridge, pp. 32–53.
- Archontidou-Argyri, A. 2000. *Χίος τ' ἔναλος πόλις Οἰονπίωνος*, Mytilene.
- Ateşlier, S. 2010. "Lydia Pişmiş Toprak Mimari Lehvaları: Lydian Architectural Terracottas," in *Lidyalılar ve Dünyaları: The Lydians and their World* (Yapı Kredi Yayınları 3055), ed. N. D. Cahill, Istanbul, pp. 225–232.
- Aykurt, A. 2014. "An Example of Mycenaean Pictorial Pottery: Krater from Liman Tepe," in *Armağan Erkanal'a Armağan: Anadolu Kültürlerine Bir Bakış. Some Observations on Anatolian Cultures Compiled in Honor of Armağan Erkanal*, ed. N. Çınardalı-Karaaslan, A. Aykurt, N. Kolankaya-Bostancı, and Y. H. Erbil, Ankara, pp. 55–74.
- Aytaçlar, N. 2004. "The Early Iron Age at Klazomenai," in Moustaka et al. 2004, pp. 17–41.
- Bachhuber, C., and G. Roberts, eds. 2009. *Forces of Transformation: The End of the Bronze Age in the Mediterranean. Proceedings of an International Symposium Held at St. John's College, University of Oxford, 25–26th March 2006*, Oxford.
- Bakker, E. J., ed. 2010. *A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language* (Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World), Chichester.
- Bammer, A. 1994. "Geschichte-Neugeschrieben: Mykene im Artemision von Ephesos," *ÖJb* 63, pp. 29–40.
- Baughan, E. P. 2011. "Sculpted Symposiasts of Ionia," *AJA* 115, pp. 19–53.
- Bayne, N. 2000. *The Grey Wares of North-West Anatolia in the Middle and Late Bronze Age and the Early Iron Age and Their Relation to the Early Greek Settlements* (Asia Minor Studien 37), Bonn.
- Beaumont, L. 2007. "Chios: The Kato Phana Archaeological Project," in Cobet et al. 2007, pp. 137–148.
- Beloch, K. J. 1913. *Griechische Geschichte 1: Die Zeit vor den Perserkriegen*, Strassburg.
- Blum, R. 1991. *Kallimachos: The Alexandrian Library and the Origins of Bibliography* (Wisconsin Studies in Classics), Madison.
- Boedeker, D., and D. Sider, eds. 2001. *The New Simonides: Contexts of Praise and Desire*, Oxford.
- Bossert, H. T. 1946. *Asia*, Istanbul.
- Bouthillier, C., C. Colantoni, S. Debruyne, C. Glatz, M. M. Hald, D. Heslop, E. Kozal, B. Miller, P. Popkin, N. Postgate, C. S. Steele, and A. Stone. 2014. "Further Work at Kilise Tepe, 2007–2011: Refining the Bronze to Iron Age Transition," *AnatSt* 64, pp. 95–161.
- Bridges, R. A. 1974. "The Mycenaean Tholos Tomb at Kolophon," *Hesperia* 43, pp. 264–266.
- Bryce, T. 2009. *The Routledge Handbook of the People and Places of Ancient Western Asia: From the Early Bronze Age to the Fall of the Persian Empire*, New York.
- Büyükkolancı, M. 2000. "Excavations on Ayasuluk Hill in Selçuk/Turkey: A Contribution to the Early History of Ephesus," in *Die Ägäis und das westliche Mittelmeer: Beziehungen und Wechselwirkungen, 8. bis 5. Jh. v. Chr. Akten des Symposions, Wien 24. bis 27. März 1999* (*DenkschrWien* 288), ed. F. Krinzinger, Vienna, pp. 39–43.
- . 2007. "Apaşa, das alte Ephesos und Ayasoluk," in Cobet et al. 2007, pp. 21–26.
- Cameron, A., ed. 1989. *History as Text: The Writing of Ancient History*, London.
- Caspari, M. O. B. 1915. "The Ionian Confederacy," *JHS* 35, pp. 173–188.
- Chadwick, J., L. Godart, J. T. Killen, J.-P. Olivier, A. Sacconi, and I. A. Sakellarakis. 1986. *Corpus of Mycenaean Inscriptions from Knossos I* (Incunabula graeca 88), Cambridge.
- Christidis, A.-F., ed. 2007. *A History of Ancient Greek: From the Beginnings to Late Antiquity*, Cambridge.
- Cline, E. H. 1997. "Achilles in Anatolia: Myth, History and the Aššuwa Rebellion," in *Crossing Boundaries and Linking Horizons: Studies in Honor of Michael C. Astour on His 80th Birthday*, ed. G. D. Young, M. W. Chavalas, and R. E. Averbeck, Bethesda, pp. 189–210.
- Cobet, J. 2007. "Das alte Ionien in der Geschichtsschreibung," in Cobet et al. 2007, pp. 729–743.
- Cobet, J., V. von Graeve, W.-D. Niemeier, and K. Zimmermann, eds. 2007. *Frühes Ionien: Eine Bestandsaufnahme. Panionion-Symposium Güzelcamlı, 26. September–1. Oktober 1999* (Milesische Forschungen 5), Mainz.
- Colvin, S. 2007. *A Historical Greek Reader: Mycenaean to the Koine*, Oxford.
- . 2010. "Greek Dialects in the Archaic and Classical Ages," in Bakker 2010, pp. 200–212.
- . 2014. *A Brief History of Ancient Greek*, Oxford.
- Cook, J. M. 1952. "Archaeology in Greece, 1951," *JHS* 72, pp. 92–112.
- . 1958–1959. "Old Smyrna, 1948–1951," *BSA* 53–54, pp. 1–34.
- . 1962. *The Greeks in Ionia and the East* (Ancient Peoples and Places 31), London.
- Cook, J. M., and D. J. Blackman. 1964–1965. "Greek Archaeology in Western Asia Minor," *AR* 11, pp. 32–62.
- . 1970–1971. "Archaeology in Western Asia Minor 1965–70," *AR* 17, pp. 33–62.
- Cook, R. M., and P. Dupont. 1998. *East Greek Pottery*, London.

- Crielaard, J. P. 2009. "The Ionians in the Archaic Period: Shifting Identities in the Changing World," in *Ethnic Constructs in Antiquity: The Role of Power and Tradition* (Amsterdam Archaeological Studies 13), ed. T. Derks and N. Roymans, Amsterdam, pp. 37–84.
- Curd, P., and D. W. Graham, eds. 2008. *The Oxford Handbook of Presocratic Philosophy*, Oxford.
- DeVries, K. 2000. "The Nearly Other: The Attic Vision of Phrygians and Lydians," in *Not the Classical Ideal: Athens and the Construction of the Other in Greek Art*, ed. B. Cohen, Leiden, pp. 338–363.
- Dickinson, O. 2006. *The Aegean from Bronze Age to Iron Age: Continuity and Change between the Twelfth and Eighth Centuries B.C.*, London.
- Dietrich, M., and O. Loretz. 1998. "Amurru, Yaman, und die Ägäischen Inseln nach den Ugaritischen Texten," in *Past Links: Studies in the Languages and Cultures of the Ancient Near East Dedicated to Professor Anson F. Rainey* (IOS 18), ed. S. Isre'el, I. Singer, and R. Zadok, Winona Lake, pp. 335–363.
- Dusinberre, E. R. M. 2003. *Aspects of Empire in Achaemenid Sardis*, Cambridge.
- Erkanal, H., and A. Aykurt. 2008. "Limantepe 2006 Yılı Kazıları," *Kazı Sonuçları Toplantısı* 29, pp. 223–242.
- Ersoy, Y. E. 2004. "Klazomenai: 900–500 B.C.: History and Settlement Evidence," in Moustaka et al. 2004, pp. 43–76.
- . 2007. "Notes on History and Archaeology of Early Clazomenae," in Cobet et al. 2007, pp. 149–178.
- Ersoy, Y. E., H. Cevizoğlu, Ü. Güngör, P. Ulusoy, F. Özbay, and F. Ercan. 2010. "2008 Yılı Klazomenai Kazısı," *Kazı Sonuçları Toplantısı* 31, pp. 185–254.
- Ersoy, Y. E., Ü. Güngör, and H. Cevizoğlu. 2011. "2009 Yılı Klazomenai Kazısı," *Kazı Sonuçları Toplantısı* 32, pp. 169–182.
- Fantuzzi, M., and C. Tsagalis, eds. 2015. *The Greek Epic Cycle and Its Ancient Reception*, Cambridge.
- Forstenpointner, G., M. Kerschner, and U. Muss. 2008. "Das Artemision in der späten Bronzezeit und der frühen Eisenzeit," in *Die Archäologie der ephesischen Artemis: Gestalt und Ritual eines Heiligtums*, ed. U. Muss, Vienna, pp. 33–46.
- Fowler, R. L. 2013. *Early Greek Mythography II: Commentary*, Oxford.
- Freyer-Schauenburg, B. 1966. *Elfenbeine aus dem samischen Heraion: Figürliches, Gefässe, und Siegel* (Universität Hamburg, Abhandlungen aus dem Gebiet der Auslandskunde 70), Hamburg.
- Gaertringen, F. H. von, and C. J. Fredrich. [1906] 1968. *Inschriften von Priene*, Berlin.
- Garbrah, K. A. 1978. *A Grammar of the Ionic Inscriptions from Erythrae: Phonology and Morphology* (Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie 60), Meisenheim.
- Garrett, A. J. 1999. "A New Model of Indo-European Subgrouping and Dispersal," *Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* 25, pp. 146–156. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3765/bls.v25i1.1180>
- Garstang, J., and O. R. Gurney. 1959. *The Geography of the Hittite Empire* (Occasional Publications of the British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara 5), London.
- Gassner, V., U. Muss, B. Grammer, M. Gretscher, and O. Mariaud. 2017. "The Urban Organization of Kolophon and Its Necropoleis: The Results of the 2011–2014 Surveys," *Hesperia* 86, pp. 43–81.
- Genz, H. 2011. "The Iron Age in Central Anatolia," in *The Black Sea, Greece, Anatolia, and Europe in the First Millennium B.C.* (Colloquia antiqua 1), ed. G. R. Tsetschladze, Leuven, pp. 331–368.
- Glatz, C. 2009. "Empire as Network: Spheres of Material Interaction in Late Bronze Age Anatolia," *JAnthArch* 28, pp. 127–141.
- Gorman, V. B. 2001. *Miletos: The Ornament of Ionia*, Ann Arbor.
- Graf, F. 1993. *Greek Mythology: An Introduction*, trans. T. Marier, Baltimore.
- Greaves, A. M. 2002. *Miletos: A History*, London.
- . 2010. *The Land of Ionia: Society and Economy in the Archaic Period*, Chichester.
- Günel, S. 1999a. *Panaztepe II: M. Ö. bine tariblendirilen Panaztepe Seramiginin Batı Anadolu ve Ege Arkeolojisiindeki Yeri ve Önemi/Die Keramik von Panaztepe und ihre Bedeutung für Westkleinasien und die Ägäis im 2. Jahrtausend* (Türk Tarih Kurumu yayınları VI-51), Ankara.
- . 1999b. "Vorbericht über die mittel- und spätbronzezeitliche Keramik vom Liman Tepe," *IstMitt* 49, pp. 41–82.
- Güterbock, H. G. 1986. "Troy in Hittite Texts? Wilusa, Ahhiyawa, and Hittite History," in *Troy and the Trojan War. Proceedings of a Symposium Held at Bryn Mawr College, October 1984*, ed. M. J. Mellink, Bryn Mawr, pp. 33–44.
- Haider, P. W. 2008. "War ein 'Gross Ionien' tatsächlich um 1360 v. Chr. in Westkleinasien existent? Eine kritische Analyse zu den Lesungen und Identifizierungen der jüngst entdeckten topographischen Namenlisten aus der Regierungszeit Amenophis' III," *Klio* 90, pp. 291–306.
- Hall, J. M. 1997. *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity*, Cambridge.
- . 2002. *Hellenicity: Between Ethnicity and Culture*, Chicago.
- Harmanşah, Ö. 2015. *Place, Memory and Healing: An Archaeology of Anatolian Rock Monuments*, New York.
- Hawes, G. 2014. *Rationalising Myth in Antiquity*, Oxford.
- Hawkins, J. D. 1998. "Tarkasnawa King of Mira: 'Tarkondemos,' Bogaköy Sealings, and Karabel," *AnatSt* 48, pp. 1–31.
- . 2009. "The Arzawa Letters in Recent Perspective," *British Museum Studies in Ancient Egypt and Sudan* 14, pp. 73–83.
- Hawkins, S. 2010. "Greek and the Languages of Asia Minor to the Classical Period," in Bakker 2010, pp. 213–227.
- . 2013. *Studies in the Language of Hipponax* (Munich Studies in Historical Linguistics 14), Bremen.
- Heinhold-Krahmer, S. 1977. *Arzawa: Untersuchungen zu seiner Geschichte nach den hethitischen Quellen* (Texte der Hethiter 8), Heidelberg.
- Herda, A. 2006a. *Der Apollon-Delphinios-Kult in Milet und die Neujahrsprozession nach Didyma. Ein neuer*

- Kommentar der sog. Molpoi-Satzung*, Mainz.
- . 2006b. "Panionion-Melia, Mykalessos-Mykale, Perseus, und Medusa: Überlegungen zur Besiedlungsgeschichte der Mykale in der frühen Eisenzeit," *IstMitt* 56, pp. 43–102.
- . 2009. "Karkiša-Karien und die sogenannte ionische Migration," in *Die Karer und die Anderen*, ed. F. Rumscheid, Bonn, pp. 27–108.
- . 2011. "How to Run a State Cult: The Organization of the Cult of Apollo Delphinios in Miletos," in *Current Approaches to Religion in Ancient Greece. Papers Presented at a Symposium at the Swedish Institute at Athens, 17–19 April 2008*, ed. M. Haysom and J. Wallensten, Stockholm, pp. 57–93.
- . 2013. "Greek (and Our) Views on the Karians," in *Luwian Identities: Culture, Language, and Religion Between Anatolia and the Aegean* (Culture and History of the Ancient Near East 4), ed. A. Mouton, I. Rutherford, and I. Yakubovich, Leiden, pp. 421–506.
- Hnila, P. 2012. "Pottery of Troy VIIb: Chronology, Classification, Context and Implications of Trojan Ceramic Assemblages in the Late Bronze Age/Early Iron Age Transition" (diss. Eberhard Karls Universität).
- Hodder, I., ed. 2012. *Archaeological Theory Today*, 2nd ed., Cambridge.
- Hornblower, S. 2015. *Lykophron: Alexandra*, Oxford.
- Horrocks, G. 2007. "The Language of Homer," in Christidis 2007, pp. 475–481.
- Hürmüzli, B. 2004. "Burial Grounds at Klazomenai: Geometric through Hellenistic Periods," in Moustaka et al. 2004, pp. 77–95.
- Isayev, E. 2013. "Mediterranean Ancient Migrations 2000–1 B.C.E.," in *The Encyclopedia of Global Human Migration* 4, ed. I. Ness, Oxford, pp. 2126–2129.
- Jantzen, U. 1972. *Ägyptische und orientalische Bronzen aus dem Heraion von Samos (Samos VIII)*, Bonn.
- Jarosch V. 1994. *Samische Tonfiguren des 10. bis 7. Jahrhunderts v. Chr. aus dem Heraion von Samos (Samos XVIII)*, Bonn.
- Jeffery, L. H. 1990. *The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece: A Study of the Origin of the Greek Alphabet and Its Development from the Eighth to the Fifth Centuries B.C.* (Oxford Monographs on Classical Archaeology), rev. A. W. Johnston, Oxford.
- Johnson, M. 2010. *Archaeology Theory: An Introduction*, 2nd ed., Chichester.
- Jones, S. 1997. *The Archaeology of Ethnicity: Constructing Identities in the Past and Present*, London.
- Kadioğlu, M. 2012. *Teos Rehber Kitap/ Teos Guide Book*, Ankara.
- Kaiser, I. 2009. "Miletus IV: The Locally Produced Coarse Wares," in *The Minoans in the Central, Eastern, and Northern Aegean: New Evidence. Acts of a Minoan Seminar 22–23 January 2005 in Collaboration with the Danish Institute at Athens and the German Archaeological Institute at Athens* (Monographs of the Danish Institute at Athens 8), ed. C. F. MacDonald, E. Hallager, and W.-D. Niemeier, Athens, pp. 159–165.
- Kaiser, I., and J. Zurbach. 2015. "Late Bronze Age Miletus: The Anatolian Face," in *Nostoi: Indigenous Culture, Migration, and Integration in the Aegean Islands and Western Anatolia during the Late Bronze and Early Iron Ages*, ed. N. C. Stampolidis, C. Maner, and K. Kopanias, Istanbul, pp. 557–580.
- Kearns, J. M. 1992. "The Languages of Lydian Ionia" (diss. Univ. of California, Los Angeles).
- Kelder, J. 2004–2005. "The Mycenaean in Western Anatolia," *Talanta* 36–37, pp. 49–86.
- Kerschner, M. 2003a. "Zum Kult im früheisenzeitlichen Ephesos: Interpretation eines protogeometrischen Fundkomplexes aus dem Artemisheiligtum," in *Griechische Keramik im kulturellen Kontext. Akten des Internationalen Vasen-Symposiums in Kiel vom 24.–28.09.2001*, ed. B. Schmaltz and M. Söldner, Münster, pp. 246–250.
- . 2003b. "Stratifizierte Fundkomplexe der geometrischen und subgeometrischen Epoche aus Ephesos," in *Probleme der Keramikchronologie des südlichen und westlichen Kleinasien in geometrischer und archaischer Zeit. Internationales Colloquium Tübingen 24.3.–26.3.1998*, ed. B. Rückert and F. Kolb, Bonn, pp. 43–59.
- . 2005. "Appendix: A New Provenance Group of Pottery Produced at Ephesos," in "The Provenance of Aegean- and Syrian-Type Pottery Found at Tell Kazel (Syria)," L. Badre, M.-C. Boileau, R. Jung, and H. Mommsen, *Ägypten und Levante* 15, pp. 36–37.
- . 2006. "Die Ionische Wanderung im Lichte neuer archäologischer Forschungen in Ephesos," in "Troianer sind wir gewesen"—*Migrationen in der antiken Welt* (Stuttgarter Kolloquium zur Historischen Geographie des Altertums 8), ed. E. Olshausen and H. Sonnabend, Stuttgart, pp. 364–382.
- . 2007. "Das Keramikbild von Ephesos im 7. und 6. Jahrhundert," in Cobet et al. 2007, pp. 221–245.
- . 2011. "Approaching Aspects of Cult Practice and Ethnicity in Early Iron Age Ephesos Using Quantitative Analysis of a Proto-geometric Deposit from the Artemision," in *Early Iron Age Pottery: A Quantitative Approach. Proceedings of the International Round Table Organized by the Swiss School of Archaeology in Greece (Athens, November 28–30, 2008)* (BAR-IS 2254), ed. S. Verdan, T. Theurillat, and A. Kenzelmann Pfyster, Oxford, pp. 19–27.
- Kerschner, M., and U. Schlotzhauer. 2005. "A New Classification System for East Greek Pottery," *Ancient West and East* 4, pp. 1–56.
- Kistler, E. 2012. "À la lydienne . . . mehr als nur eine Mode," in *Tryphe und Kultritual im archaischen Kleinasien: Ex oriente luxuria?*, ed. L.-M. Günther, Wiesbaden, pp. 59–73.
- Kleiner, G., P. Hommel, and W. Müller-Wiener. 1967. *Panionion und Melie*, Berlin.
- Kowalzig, B. 2005. "Mapping Out Communitas: Performances of Theoria in Their Sacred and Political Context," in *Pilgrimage in Graeco-Roman and Early Christian Antiquity: Seeing the Gods*, ed. J. Elsner and I. Rutherford, Oxford, pp. 41–72.

- Krumme, M. 2003. "Geometrische Keramik aus Milet," in *Griechische Keramik im kulturellen Kontext. Akten des Internationalen Vasen-Symposiums in Kiel vom 24.–28.09.2001*, ed. B. Schmaltz and M. Söldner, Münster, pp. 244–245.
- Kurke, L. 2011. *Aesopic Conversations: Popular Tradition, Cultural Dialogue, and the Invention of Greek Prose*, Princeton.
- Kyrieleis, H. 1993. "The Heraion at Samos," *Greek Sanctuaries: New Approaches*, ed. N. Marinatos and R. Hägg, London, pp. 99–122.
- Leichty, E. 2011. *The Royal Inscriptions of Esarhaddon, King of Assyria (680–669 B.C.): Royal Inscriptions of the Neo-Assyrian Period 4*, Winona Lake.
- Lemos, I. S. 2007. "The Migrations to the West Coast of Asia Minor: Tradition and Archaeology," in Cobet et al. 2007, pp. 713–727.
- Lightfoot, E., ed. 2008. *Movement, Mobility, and Migration* (Archaeological Review from Cambridge 23), Cambridge.
- Liverani, M. 1991. "The Trade Network of Tyre According to Ezek. 27," in *Ab, Assyria . . . Studies in Assyrian History and Ancient Near Eastern Historiography Presented to Hayim Tadmor* (Scripta Hierosolymitana 33), ed. M. Cogan and I. Eph'al, Jerusalem, pp. 65–79.
- Lohmann, H. 2005. "Melia, das Panionion, und der Kult des Poseidon Helikonios," in *Neue Forschungen zu Ionien. Fabri İşik zum 60. Geburtstag gewidmet*, ed. E. Schwertheim and E. Winter, Bonn, pp. 57–91.
- . 2007. "The Discovery and Excavation of the Archaic Panionion in the Mycale (Dilek Dagları)," *Kazı Sonuçları Toplantısı* 28, pp. 575–590.
- . 2012. "Ionians and Carians in the Mycale: The Discovery of Carian Melia and the Archaic Panionion," in *Landscape, Ethnicity, and Identity in the Archaic Mediterranean Area*, ed. G. Cifani and S. Stoddart, Oxford, pp. 32–50.
- Luraghi, N. 2006. "Traders, Pirates, Warriors: The Proto-History of Greek Mercenary Soldiers in the Eastern Mediterranean," *Phoenix* 60, pp. 21–47.
- Mac Sweeney, N. 2010. "Hittites and Arzawans: A View from Western Anatolia," *AnatSt* 60, pp. 7–24.
- . 2013. *Foundation Myths and Politics in Ancient Ionia*, Cambridge.
- , ed. 2015. *Foundation Myths in Ancient Societies: Dialogues and Discourses*, Philadelphia.
- Mangaloğlu-Votruba, S. 2011. "Liman Tepe'de Geç Hellas IIIC Dönemi," *Anadolu/Anatolia* 37, pp. 43–73.
- Mariaud, O. 2011. "The Geometric Graves of Colophon and the Burial Customs of Early Iron Age Ionia," in *The "Dark Ages" Revisited. Acts of an International Symposium in Memory of William D. E. Coulson, University of Thessaly, Volos, 14–17 June 2007*, ed. A. Mazarakis Ainan, Volos, pp. 687–703.
- . Forthcoming. "Ionia," in *A Companion to the Archaeology of Early Greece and the Mediterranean*, ed. I. S. Lemos and A. Kotsonas, Chichester.
- McInerney, J. 2014. "Pelasgians and Leleges: Using the Past to Understand the Present," in *Valuing the Past in the Greco-Roman World*, ed. J. Ker and C. Pieper, Leiden, pp. 25–55.
- Meadows, A. 2011. "The Chian Revolution: Changing Patterns of Hoarding in Fourth-Century B.C. Western Asia Minor," in *Nomisma: La circulation monétaire dans le monde grec (BCH Suppl. 53)*, ed. T. Faucher, M.-C. Marcellesi, and O. Picard, Athens, pp. 273–295.
- Meriç, R. 2003. "Excavations at Bademgediği Tepe (Puranda) 1999–2002: A Preliminary Report," *IstMitt* 53, pp. 79–98.
- . 2007. "Ein Vorbericht über eine spätbronzezeitliche befestigte Höhensiedlung bei Metropolis in Ionien: Die Arawza-Stadt Puranda?" in Cobet et al., pp. 27–36.
- Meyer, E. 1901. *Geschichte des Altertums 3.1: Das Perserreich und die Griechen: Bis zu den Friedensschlüssen von 448 und 446 v. Chr.*, Stuttgart.
- Mokrišová, J. 2016. "Minoanisation, Mycenaeanisation, and Mobility: A View from Southwest Anatolia," in *Beyond Thalassocracies: Understanding Processes of Minoanisation and Mycenaeanisation in the Aegean*, ed. E. Gorogianni, P. Pavúk, and L. Girella, Oxford, pp. 43–57.
- Morgan, C. 2009. "The Early Iron Age," in *A Companion to Archaic Greece*, ed. K. A. Raflaub and H. van Wees, Oxford, pp. 41–63.
- Morpurgo-Davies, A. 2002. "The Greek Notion of Dialect," in *Greeks and Barbarians*, ed. T. Harrison, Edinburgh, pp. 153–171.
- Morris, S. P. 2001. "Potnia Aswiya: Anatolian Contributions to Greek Religion," in *Potnia: Deities and Religion in the Aegean Bronze Age. Proceedings of the 8th International Aegean Conference, Göteborg, Göteborg University, 12–15 April 2000*, ed. R. Laffineur and R. Hägg, Liège, pp. 423–434.
- Mountjoy, P. 1998. "The East Aegean–West Anatolian Interface in the Late Bronze Age: Mycenaean and the Kingdom of Ahhiyawa," *AnatSt* 48, pp. 33–67.
- Moustaka, A., E. Skarlatidou, M.-C. Tzannes, and Y. E. Ersoy, eds. 2004. *Klazomenai, Teos, and Abdera: Metropoleis and Colony. Proceedings of the International Symposium Held at the Archaeological Museum of Abdera, Abdera, 20–21 October 2001*, Thessaloniki.
- Mullen, A. 2012. "Introduction: Multiple Languages, Multiple Identities," in *Multilingualism in the Greco-Roman Worlds*, ed. A. Mullen and P. James, Cambridge, pp. 1–35.
- Munn, M. H. 2006. *The Mother of the Gods, Athens, and the Tyranny of Asia: A Study of Sovereignty in Ancient Religion*, Berkeley.
- Myres, J. L. 1930. *Who Were the Greeks?* Berkeley.
- Negri, M. 1982. "L'unità intermedia ionico-attico," *Acme* 35, pp. 7–17.
- Niemeier, W.-D. 1997. "The Mycenaean Potters' Quarter at Miletus," in *TEXNH: Craftsmen, Craftswomen, and Craftsmanship in the Aegean Bronze Age. Proceedings of the Sixth International Aegean Conference, Philadelphia, Temple University, 18–21 April 1996 (Aegaeum 16)*, ed. R. Laffineur and P. Betancourt, Liège, pp. 347–352.
- . 1998. "The Mycenaean in Western Anatolia and the Problems of the Origins of the Sea Peoples,"

- in *Mediterranean Peoples in Transition: Thirteenth to Early Tenth Centuries B.C.E. In Honor of Professor Trude Dothan*, ed. S. Gitin, A. Mazar, and E. Stern, Jerusalem, pp. 17–65.
- . 2005. "Minoans, Mycenaeans, Hittites, and Ionians in Western Asia Minor: New Excavations in Bronze Age Miletus-Millawanda," in *The Greeks in the East*, ed. A. Villing, London, pp. 1–36.
- . 2007a. "Milet von den Anfängen menschlicher Besiedlung bis zur Ionischen Wanderung," in Cobet et al. 2007, pp. 3–20.
- . 2007b. "Westkleinasien und Ägäis von den Anfängen bis zur ionischen Wanderung: Topographie, Geschichte, und Beziehungen nach dem archäologischen Befund und den hethitischen Quellen," in Cobet et al. 2007, pp. 37–96.
- Niemeier, W.-D., and B. Niemeier. 1997. "Milet 1994–1995: Projekt 'Minoisch-mykenisches bis protogeometrisches Milet': Zielsetzung und Grabungen auf dem Stadionhügel und am Athenatempel," *AA* 1997, pp. 189–248.
- Nikoloudis, S. 2008. "Multiculturalism in the Mycenaean World," in *Anatolian Interfaces: Hittites, Greeks, and Their Neighbours. Proceedings of an International Conference on Cross-Cultural Interaction, September 17–19, 2004, Emory University, Atlanta, GA*, ed. B. J. Collins, M. R. Bachvarova, and I. C. Rutherford, Oxford, pp. 45–56.
- Obbink, D. 2014. "Two New Poems by Sappho," *ZPE* 189, pp. 32–49.
- Olsen, B. A. 2014. *Women in Mycenaean Greece: The Linear B Tablets from Pylos and Knossos*, New York.
- Osborne, R. 1998. "Early Greek Colonization? The Nature of Greek Settlement in the West," in *Archaic Greece: New Approaches and New Evidence*, ed. N. Fisher and H. van Wees, London, pp. 251–269.
- . 2009. *Greece in the Making, 1200–479 B.C.*, 2nd ed., London.
- Özygıt, Ö. 2005. "2003 Yılı Phokaia Kazı Çalışmaları," *Kazı Sonuçları Toplantısı* 26, pp. 43–50.
- . 2006. "Phokaia," in *Stadtgrabungen und Stadtforschung im westlichen Kleinasien: Geplantes und Erreichtes. Internationales Symposium 6./7. August 2004 in Bergama (Türkei)* (Byzas 3), ed. W. Radt, Istanbul, pp. 303–314.
- Panayotou, A. 2007. "Ionic and Attic," in Christidis 2007, pp. 405–416.
- Parker, H. N. 2008. "The Linguistic Case for the Aiolian Migration Reconsidered," *Hesperia* 77, pp. 431–464.
- Pavúk, P. 2007. "Grey Wares as a Phenomenon," in *Aegean and Balkan Prehistory*, ed. P. Pavúk and B. Horejs, <http://www.aegeobalkan-prehistory.net>; accessed 07/05/2015.
- . 2010. "Minyan or Not: The Second Millennium Grey Ware in Western Anatolia and Its Relation to Mainland Greece," in *MESO-HELLADIKÁ: La Grèce continentale au Bronze Moyen. Actes du colloque international, Athens, 8.–12. March 2006* (BCH Suppl. 52), ed. A. Philippa-Touchais, G. Touchais, S. Voutsaki, and J. Wright, Athens, pp. 931–943.
- . 2015. "Between the Aegean and the Hittites: Western Anatolia in the 2nd Millennium B.C.," in *Nostoi: Indigenous Culture, Migration, and Integration in the Aegean Islands and Western Anatolia during the Late Bronze and Early Iron Age*, ed. N. C. Stampolidis, C. Maner, and K. Kopanias, Istanbul, pp. 81–114.
- Pearson, L. 1939. *Early Ionian Historians*, Oxford.
- Raymond, A., I. Kaiser, L.-C. Rizzotto, and J. Zurbach. 2016. "Discerning Acculturation at Miletus: Minoanisation and Mycenaeanisation," in *Beyond Thalassocracies: Understanding Processes of Minoanisation and Mycenaeanisation in the Aegean*, ed. E. Gorogianni, P. Pavúk, and L. Girella, Oxford, pp. 58–74.
- Rollinger, R. 2001. "The Ancient Greeks and the Impact of the Ancient Near East: Textual Evidence and Historical Perspective (ca. 750–650 B.C.)," in *Mythology and Mythologies: Methodological Approaches to Intercultural Influences. Proceedings of the Second Annual Symposium of the Assyrian and Babylonian Intellectual Heritage Project Held in Paris, France, October 4–7, 1999*, ed. R. M. Whiting, Helsinki, pp. 233–264.
- . 2007. "Überlegungen zur Frage der Lokalisation von Jawan in neuassyrischer Zeit," *State Archives of Assyria Bulletin* 16, pp. 63–90.
- . 2009. "Near Eastern Perspectives on the Greeks," in *The Oxford Handbook of Hellenic Studies*, ed. G. Boys-Stones, B. Graziosi, and P. Vasunia, Oxford, pp. 32–47.
- . 2011. "Der Blick aus dem Osten: 'Griechen' in vorderasiatischen Quellen des 8. und 7. Jahrhunderts v. Chr. Eine Zusammenschau," in *Der Orient und die Anfänge Europas: Kulturelle Beziehungen von der Späten Bronzezeit bis zur Frühen Eisenzeit*, ed. H. Matthäus, N. Oettinger, and S. Schröder, Wiesbaden, pp. 267–282.
- Rose, C. B. 2008. "Separating Fact from Fiction in the Aiolian Migration," *Hesperia* 77, pp. 399–430.
- . 2014. *The Archaeology of Greek and Roman Troy*, Cambridge.
- Rubinstein, L. 2004. "Ionia," in *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis*, ed. M. H. Hansen and T. H. Nielsen, Oxford, pp. 1053–1107.
- Şahin, N. 2011. "Klaros, 2009," *Kazı Sonuçları Toplantısı* 32, pp. 151–163.
- Şahin, N., E. Taştımur, G. Dallık, and I. Önel. 2009. "Klaros, 2007," *Kazı Sonuçları Toplantısı* 30, pp. 113–128.
- Sakellariou, M. B. 1958. *La migration grecque en Ionie* (Collection de l'Institut français d'Athènes 17), Athens.
- . 1990. *Between Memory and Oblivion: The Transmission of Early Greek Historical Traditions*, Paris.
- Schiering, W. 1959–1960. "Südabschnitt," in *Die Ausgrabung beim Athena-Tempel in Milet 1957* (IstMitt 9–10), ed. C. Weickert, pp. 4–30.
- Schlottzauer, U. 2006. "Some Observations of Milesian Pottery," in *Naukratis: Greek Diversity in Egypt. Studies on East Greek Pottery and Exchange in the Eastern Mediterranean* (British Museum Research Publication 162), ed. U. Schlottzauer and A. Villing, London, pp. 133–144.

- Shelmerdine, C. W. 1998. "Where Do We Go from Here? And How Can Linear B Tablets Help Us Get There?" in *The Aegean and the Orient in the Second Millennium. Proceedings of the Fiftieth Anniversary Symposium, University of Cincinnati, 18–20 April 1997* (*Aegaeum* 18), ed. E. H. Cline and D. Harris-Cline, Liège, pp. 291–299.
- Thomason, S. G. 2001. *Language Contact: An Introduction*, Edinburgh.
- Tozer, H. F. 1971. *A History of Ancient Geography*, repr. New York.
- Tribulato, O. 2010. "Literary Dialects," in *The Blackwell Companion to the Ancient Greek Language*, in Bakker 2010, Oxford, pp. 388–400.
- Tsakos, K. 2001. "Die archaischen Gräber der Westnekropole von Samos und die Datierung der samischen Anthemienstelen," *AA* 2001, pp. 451–466.
- . 2007. "Die Stadt Samos in der geometrischen und archaischen Epoche," in Cobet et al. 2007, pp. 189–199.
- Tsetskhladze, G. R., and J. Hargrave. 2011. "Colonisation from Antiquity to Modern Times: Comparisons and Contrasts," *Ancient West and East* 10, pp. 161–182.
- Tuna, N. 1986. "Antik Lebedos yerleşmesi üzerine araştırmalar," *T.A.Ç. Koruma Vakfı Dergisi* 1.2, pp. 57–69.
- Tzitzilis, C. 2007. "Greek and Phrygian," in Christidis 2007, pp. 752–757.
- Vaessen, R. 2014. "Cultural Dynamics in Ionia at the End of the Second Millennium B.C.E.: New Archaeological Perspectives and Prospects" (diss. Univ. of Sheffield).
- van Dommelen, P. 2014. "Moving On: Archaeological Perspectives on Mobility and Migration," *WorldArch* 46, pp. 477–483.
- Vanschoonwinkel, J. 2006. "Greek Migrations to Aegean Anatolia in the Early Dark Age," in *Greek Colonisation: An Account of Greek Colonies and Other Settlements Overseas 1* (*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 193), ed. G. R. Tsetskhladze, Leiden, pp. 115–141.
- Vlassopoulos, K. 2013. *Greeks and Barbarians*, Cambridge.
- West, M. L. 2013. *The Epic Cycles: A Commentary on the Lost Troy Epics*, Oxford.
- Whitmarsh, T. 2005. *The Second Sophistic*, Cambridge.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, U. von. 1906. *Über die ionische Wanderung*, Berlin.
- Yalçın, Ü., and Ö. Özyğit. 2013. "Die Schmiedewerkstatt aus Phokaia: Ein Kurzbericht," *Der Anschnitt: Zeitschrift für Kunst und Kultur im Bergbau* 25, pp. 239–246.
- Yasur-Landau, A. 2010. *The Philistines and Aegean Migration at the End of the Late Bronze Age*, Cambridge.

Naoíse Mac Sweeney

UNIVERSITY OF LEICESTER

SCHOOL OF ARCHAEOLOGY AND ANCIENT HISTORY

UNIVERSITY ROAD

LEICESTER, LE1 7RH

UNITED KINGDOM

nm241@leicester.ac.uk