ALAN M. GREAVES

THE LAND OF IONIA

Society and Economy in the Archaic Period

WILEY Blackwell

THE LAND OF IONIA

ALAN M. GREAVES

THE LAND OF IONIA

Society and Economy in the Archaic Period

WILEY-BLACKWELL
A John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., Publication

This edition first published 2010

Blackwell Publishing was acquired by John Wiley & Sons in February 2007. Blackwell's publishing program has been merged with Wiley's global Scientific, Technical, and Medical business to form Wiley-Blackwell.

Registered Office
John Wiley & Sons Ltd, The Atrium, Southern Gate, Chichester, West Sussex, PO19 8SQ, United Kingdom

Editorial Offices
350 Main Street, Malden, MA 02148-5020, USA
9600 Garsington Road, Oxford, OX4 2DQ, UK
The Atrium, Southern Gate, Chichester, West Sussex, PO19 8SQ, UK

For details of our global editorial offices, for customer services, and for information about how to apply for permission to reuse the copyright material in this book please see our website at www.wiley.com/wiley-blackwell.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
Greaves, Alan M., 1969-
The land of Ionia : society and economy in the Archaic period / Alan M. Greaves.
p. cm.
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 978-1-4051-9900-1 (hardcover : alk. paper) 1. Ionia–Civilization. 2. Ionia–Antiquities. 3. Excavations (Archaeology)–Turkey–Ionia. I. Title.
DS156.I6G74 2010
939′.23–dc22

2009032173

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

Set in 10.5 on 13pt Minion by Toppan Best-set Premedia Limited
Printed in Malaysia

I 2010

Contents

Illustrations

Tables

Preface

J.M. Cook wrote: "The history of the eastern Greeks still remains to be written."[1] A complete history of the region would certainly be a large undertaking and this book does not claim be an encyclopedic account of the rise, fall, and eventual excavation of the great cities of Ionia. Rather, it is an exercise in archaeological interpretation that aims to highlight socio-economic themes and questions regarding the local practices and identity of those communities – the prolegomena to a new history of Ionia. It also aims to be an accessible introduction to these themes, and to the region itself, that is not overburdened with lengthy examples, theory, or footnotes. In this sense it has been inspired by Carl Roebuck's *Ionian Trade and Colonization*,[2] which remains one of the most accessible and useful introductions to Ionia. Through its bibliography and textboxes, it is hoped that this book can provide a point of entry into the rich archaeological material that exists for Ionia and thereby allow people to formulate their own interpretations of it.

Ionia, which consisted of the west coast of what is now Turkey and the Greek islands of Chios and Samos, was one of the most important regions of the ancient Mediterranean. It was simultaneously the meeting point and the battleground between East and West, a fertile birthplace of ideas, and an emblem of ancient civilization throughout time. In modern times, images of its monuments are iconic symbols of archaeology, and its leading cities, such as Ephesos, have become household names. Yet Ionia is a strangely unfamiliar friend. The critical reviews of the material available for the study of Ionia that are presented in this book often appear to highlight how little we actually know about the Archaic period in this most iconic region. Despite nearly a century-and-a-half of excavations and a wealth of discoveries, there have been relatively few works that have dealt directly with Ionia and none that have explicitly sought to examine and define the essential identity of the region and its society using archaeology as its primary source. However, this is changing and the exciting discoveries and modern approaches being applied in Ionia today provide a stimulating basis for any archaeological discussion.

[1] J.M. Cook 1962: 15.
[2] Roebuck 1959.

Geographically, Ionia cannot easily be defined. Its landscape is large and diverse and the limits of what was called "Ionia" in the ancient world do not appear to follow any clearly demarcated physical boundary. For the purposes of this book, discussion will largely be limited to the cities of the Ionian *dodekapolis* (league of 12 cities) that are named by Herodotos (1.142) and which he subdivided into four groups by their dialects. Chronologically, this study is limited to the Archaic period of 700 to 494 BC.[3] This was a formative period in the history of the Greek world and was also when Ionia was arguably at its peak. During this time a changing image of Ionia can be traced through Greek literature, from Homer's depiction of the "Carians" of Miletos as allies of Troy (*Il.* 2.867–75) to Herodotos' portrayal of it as a cultural extension of Greece. To attempt to map too closely onto the region's archaeology the apparent spatial and temporal changes in Ionian culture that can be gleaned from Greek literature would be an exercise in literary positivism (i.e. "cherry-picking" archaeological facts to hang off the existing narrative framework established by that literature; see Chapter 2). Although Archaic Ionia was birthplace to the works of great thinkers such as Thales and Anaximander, and although the importance of their work must be recognized, there is a danger of over-prioritizing these individuals when writing a general history of Ionia. Instead, the objective here is to conduct a systematic review of the evidence for different levels of economic and social activity in Ionia and to build on this an interpretation of the region's history and identity that is largely independent of literary sources. This book is essentially a postmodernist reinterpretation of the socio-economic history of Ionia, which may indeed provide a context in which to understand the production of cultural works such as philosophy, but which does not view them as the end point toward which all study of Ionia should be directed.

This book presents a critical review of the available archaeological information about Archaic Ionia, through an examination of key socio-economic themes that are constructed "from the ground up," i.e. beginning with landscape and the first principles of the agrarian economy and society, with the aim of identifying characteristics of the region and its people that distinguish it from the standard narratives of the Greek "mainland."[4] Several key topics emerge from this analysis: the role of landscape as a determinant of historical development in the region; the socio-economic contexts of Ionian culture; the Anatolian character of elements of the "Greek" communities of Ionia; and various unique elements of Ionian material culture and social practice.

Such a structured critical assessment of the availability and use of archaeological evidence reveals that, despite an apparent abundance of remains, there is often surprisingly

[3] This is the most commonly used starting date for the "Archaic." Some scholars may extend this definition to include the Geometric period, the so-called "Dark Age" of Greece, but restricting this study to these dates allows the author to examine the interplay of archaeological and written sources that are not available in the earlier "Dark Age" period. The end date of 494 BC marks the destruction of Miletos by the Persians following the Battle of Lade, an event that can truly be described as the end of an era in Ionia.

[4] The term "mainland" is used not to imply that Ionia was a region of secondary importance, but to recognize that the narratives constructed from the historically well-attested sites of Athens, Sparta, and Corinth will differ from those not only of Ionia, but also of other regions of the Greek world, such as the islands of the Aegean and Magna Graecia.

little hard archaeology for much of Archaic Ionia and many fundamental questions remain to be answered. In previous studies of Ionia the written sources of history and epigraphy have taken precedence over archaeological evidence, which has often been applied in a seemingly ad hoc way. However, this often belies an underlying set of assumptions about the inherent superiority of Greek culture over Anatolian, the primacy of the historical method over that of archaeology, and the acceptable standards of proof within different communities of practice. This book sets out to reverse such traditional approaches, by taking archaeology as its starting point and principal source material.

Following assessment of the source materials, this book follows a "pyramidal" structure, as laid out in Chapter 2, that builds up from an understanding of the landscape into a discussion of the essential elements of life in Ionia – agriculture and trade, settlement, and warfare – through to the less-urgent social imperatives of religion, art, and ethnic identity. In each of these thematic chapters, discussion of key themes is preceded by a critical review of the available evidence and textboxes provide more detailed explanations of key sites and ideas. Theoretically, the interpretations presented here are framed by the *Annaliste* and world-systems analysis perspectives. The *Annaliste* perspective integrates landscape, archaeology, and history and is therefore a useful method for any study of this kind, and world-systems analysis suggests a way to integrate local activity into inter-regional patterns of culture and exchange.

Casual readers might find that individual chapters are able to provide them with an insight into the evidence base and discussions that are of particular interest to them, whereas readers who follow the chapters from beginning to end will trace the development of the new "ground-up" approach propounded above. The overall aim of the book is to present new perspectives and to provoke discussion; if the reader is left with more questions than answers, then perhaps it has served its purpose.

Alan M. Greaves

Acknowledgments

Funding for the preparation of this book came from the AHRC Research Leave Scheme and the Holgate Visiting Fellowship at Grey College, University of Durham. Further financial support came from the University of Liverpool Research Development Fund and School of Archaeology, Classics and Egyptology and academic research facilities were provided by the British Institute at Ankara.

Many of the foundations for this book were laid whilst researching my PhD *A Socio-Economic History of Miletos* (Leeds, 1999) and I am grateful to my supervisor Roger Brock for his continuing support and Jeeves-like wisdom. That thesis was published as a series of articles (1999, 2000a, 2004, 2007b). My previous book, *Miletos: A history* (Routledge, 2002), was an attempt to produce a succinct archaeological account and diachronic history of that city. The inspiration for this current book came from the challenging and insightful questions of my students at the University of Liverpool during my course "Ionia: A Regional Study." They prompted me to think, and rethink, my ideas about Ionia and encouraged me to write an accessible scholarly book in English. I hope they will enjoy it.

The time and insight so freely given by my academic readers Lesley Beaumont, Alexandra Villing, and Wiley-Blackwell's anonymous reviewers have informed and greatly improved the final text, and are very much appreciated. I am enormously indebted to Susan Williams for proofreading the manuscript and preparing the index, for her diligent grammatical and academic comments, and for her unflagging encouragement and assistance – this book really would not have been possible without her. Throughout this project I have been guided by the fatherly and brotherly advices of Chris Mee and Tom Harrison, respectively. It is a pleasure to also acknowledge the generosity of so many friends and colleagues who have provided comments on specific chapters of the text, namely Zosia Archibald, Catherine Draycott, Warren Eastwood, Matthew Fitzjohn, Phil Freeman, Thomas D. Hall, Victoria Jefferson, Michael Kerschner, Gina Muskett, Joe Skinner, Michael Sommer, Geoff Summers, and Peter Thonemann. The views expressed here are entirely my own, not theirs, and so too are the errors and the oversights.

On a personal note, I would like to thank the many friends who have supported and encouraged me during the long gestation of this book. In particular I would like to thank Angela Burdick, Martyn Chamberlain, and the Grey College SCR, John Clifford, Rachel and Paul Newham, and Karen Wheatley. Finally, none of this would have been possible without the love and support of my brothers and my mother.

The ideas, opinions, and conclusions expressed in this book have grown out of my long association with western Anatolia, working with different research teams. I am grateful to all my collaborators and colleagues in Ionia and beyond for the opportunities they have afforded me and for the insights and perspectives that working with them has given me. I only hope that this book will direct readers toward their own excellent works and that the ideas presented here may prove to be a stimulus for discussion and further consideration of this important region by a new generation of interested readers.

Prologue

> Even those who started from the Government House in Athens and believe themselves to be of the purest Ionian blood, took no women with them but married Carian girls, whose parents they had killed. The fact that these women were forced into marriage after the murder of their fathers, husbands, and sons was the origin of the law, established by oath and passed down to their female descendants, forbidding them to sit at table with their husbands or to address them by name. It was at Miletos that this took place.[5]

This passage of Herodotos clearly lays out the way in which the culture of Greece came to dominate the region of western Anatolia known as Ionia. A single influx of militarily and culturally superior Greeks swept aside the pre-existing "barbarian" (in this case Carian) population and took their land and their women for themselves. Herodotos demonstrates how residual Anatolian cultural traditions were allowed to persist and eventually become subsumed into the fabric of everyday life in Ionia, a life that was unremarkably Greek in other respects, like that of their founding city of Athens.

Anyone who began their study of Ionian culture with Herodotos' *Histories* and set about matching the archaeological evidence to it could easily construct a history of the region that would validate this interpretation.

Anyone who began their study from the starting point of landscape and archaeology, however, would weave an entirely different tale.

[5] Herodotos *Histories* 1.146 [trans. Sélincourt].

1

Finding Ionia

Introduction

Ionia in the Archaic period was at the core of the Greek world that centered on the Aegean Sea and it played a pivotal role in the events documented in the most important surviving historical work of that period: Herodotos' *Histories*. Consequently, in modern times Ionia attracted the attention of antiquarians and archaeologists from an early date and at the key sites of Ephesos and Miletos there have now been near-continuous archaeological excavations for over a century.

Considering this long history of exploration and research, when one begins to study the Archaic period of Ionia by conducting a critical review of the available archaeological source materials, the results are surprisingly, and remarkably, disappointing. Despite the size and crucial importance of this region in the ancient world, and despite its long history of research, the published archaeological information available is of mixed quantity and value and must often be handled with care. A similar review of the available literary and epigraphic evidence reveals that there is little hard evidence to be found here either.

Today there are important ongoing excavations using modern field methods of excavation and analysis at several sites in Ionia, yet the fact remains that the majority of our archaeological knowledge as yet still comes from those excavations that were conducted in an earlier era, often without systematic methods of recording. But as archaeological methods and the kind of questions we are seeking to ask of the material have developed, so the results of these old excavations are less able to answer them. For example, early archaeologists rarely logged and identified the animal bones from their excavations because they were interested in artworks, such as sculpture, and did not yet recognize that faunal evidence could tell us so much about past diets, environments, and human practices. Yet the systematic analysis of animal bones from a recently excavated sanctuary in Ionia, the Sanctuary of Aphrodite on Zeytintepe, Miletos, has been very illuminating and has told us a great deal about sacrificial practices at this site, for which there are no written records.[1]

[1] Peters and von den Driesch 1992.

It has long been recognized that the very act of excavation destroys that which we dig and therefore, once a site has been dug by archaeologists, it has been destroyed.[2] The need to create, and make public, systematic records of what is found during excavations is therefore paramount. However, a recent development in the theoretical understanding of the nature of archaeological evidence has been the recognition that the very act of excavating and recording is, in itself, based on interpretative decisions by the excavator.[3] That is to say that we, the archaeologists, create what we find by the choices we make about where and how to dig. Most archaeological evidence is therefore subjective, not objective, in nature.[4]

With this in mind, if we are ever to be able to make use of the large body of material from previous excavations, it is necessary to appreciate the motivations, interests, and methods of those previous generations of archaeologists who worked in Ionia in order to begin to compensate for biases that may be inherent in the archaeological record as a result. By understanding their objectives, we can begin to understand their methods and put them into a proper context for the age in which they operated. These objectives affected which sites they chose to excavate, the methods they chose to use, which artifacts they chose to keep (or publish) and which they chose to discard (or leave unpublished).

If the objectives of previous generations of archaeologists affected how the archaeological materials from Ionia were found, then they have also affected how they were interpreted. The aim of Classical archaeology has often been to establish, wherever possible, connections between the material remains of the Greek and Roman cultures and their literary and historical legacy. However, in our eagerness to make such connections, we can sometimes make associations between the archaeological evidence and passages of ancient history which might subsequently be interpreted differently, or indeed challenged.[5]

The Source Materials

There are three main categories of source material traditionally used by Classical archaeologists in their attempt to reconstruct ancient societies and their histories, namely archaeology, ancient literary sources, and epigraphy. The remainder of this chapter will review the quantity and nature of these sources as they exist from Ionia before discussing how these might be used and combined to deepen our understanding of society in ancient Ionia in subsequent chapters.

Archaeology

As a region, Ionia has exceptional potential for archaeological research. It is home to a number of exceptionally well-preserved archaeological sites, the most notable being New

[2] Wheeler 1956.
[3] Hodder 1998, 2000.
[4] This theme will be developed further in Chapter 2.
[5] e.g. Greaves 2002: 74–5 on Kleiner 1966.

Figure 1.1 General view of Ephesos.

Priene[6] and Ephesos. At both of these sites, there are ruins so perfectly preserved that visitors can imagine what it must have been like to inhabit the ancient city and walk down those same streets. The ruins of these places, and those of others in the region, are so exceptionally preserved because of certain physical characteristics within the landscape of Ionia itself.

The most famous archaeological sites in the world are often those that have captured a "snapshot in time," usually as the result of some natural disaster. Pompeii, Herculaneum, and Akrotiri on Santorini were preserved because they were buried by volcanic ash in a sudden catastrophic event. In Ionia, Ephesos is one such site. Here, the central part of the excavated area seen by tourists, the Library of Celsus and the Street of the Curetes, was buried by a landslide that covered the ruins in a great depth of soil and resulted in remarkable preservation (Figure 1.1). The ancient city was located between two hills – Panayır Dağı, to the north, and Bülbül Dağı, to the south – from which the

[6] The excavated ruins at Priene are referred to here as "New Priene." These ruins date from the Hellenistic period and it has been argued that the city was refounded here from an as yet unknown location on the plain below. The site of the settlement referred to by Herodotos (referred to here as "Old Priene") has yet to be securely identified, if indeed it was different from its current location. For a summary of the debate see Demand 1990: 140–6. Archaeological research to find the location of "Old Priene" is ongoing.

Figure 1.2 Alluvium at Magnesia.

landslide apparently originated. Landslides are often triggered by seismic events like earth tremors, which are common across Ionia.[7] The hilly terrain and seismic nature of Ionia therefore combined to contribute to creating the superb preservation conditions seen at Ephesos. A catastrophic flood appears to have destroyed the eighth-century BC Temple of Artemis at Ephesos, and important finds, including a number of amber beads, were protected by the resulting layer of soft sand that covered its ruins.[8]

Close to Priene are another set of exceptional ruins – at Magnesia on the Maeander. Although Magnesia was not named as one of the Ionian *dodekapolis* in the Archaic period, its ruins are worth noting here because it is in a similar geographical zone to other sites in Ionia. Unlike New Priene and Ephesos, Magnesia does not sit immediately under a large hill. Instead, the site is in the low-lying valley bottom and consequently it has been covered in silt from the Büyük Menderes river system. The ruins of Magnesia are in such an excellent state of preservation because they became rapidly covered by a great depth of alluvium (Figure 1.2). Remarkable features of Magnesia that have been preserved in this way include the inscribed slabs of the *agora* (market place), the Temple of Artemis, and the famous Skylla capital. The alluviation of the Büyük Menderes may also have been responsible for covering over the ruins of Old Priene, so much so that despite exhaustive

[7] Ergin et al. 1967; Stiros and Jones 1996.
[8] Bammer 1990. See also Box 10.1.

research the location of the Archaic period settlement has yet to be securely identified.[9] If the current attempts at finding the ruins by means of geophysical survey are successful and the city is ever excavated, its ruins may prove to be in the same state of preservation as those of Magnesia.

The alluvial action of the Büyük Menderes River has also led to the preservation of the ruins of Ionia in other, less obvious, ways. The progradation (i.e. silting-up) of the bays on which the great cities of Ionia stood and the resulting swamps made these cities uninhabitable and isolated them from the sea. This meant that the cities were often abandoned, never to be reoccupied on a large scale. Without later settlement phases smothering the classical ruins it has been possible for archaeologists to uncover the complete plans of cities such as Ephesos, whereas excavating and exploring contemporary cities such as Athens are complicated by the presence of modern settlement. The alluviation also left the cities a long way from the coast. This meant that their abandoned ruins could not be easily robbed for stone and the blocks carried away by sea. In the case of Myous, the abandoned city was probably plundered for stone in antiquity and the archaeological remains at the site today are negligible.[10] The sea also played an important role in Charles Newton's work when he was collecting sculptures from the Turkish coast for the British Museum during the mid-nineteenth century. He deliberately began his excavations at Knidos in the theater because of its proximity to the sea and the ease with which its sculptures could therefore be removed.[11] Any visitor to the British Museum's Great Court will immediately be struck by the enormous size and weight of the Knidos lion that Newton retrieved. Such audacious acquisition of sculptures was only possible because of that site's proximity to the sea.

Researching the archaeology of Ionia is made difficult by the practical fact that, as a result of this early antiquarian interest, the artifacts from its most important sites are sometimes widely scattered between different museum collections. For example, statues from the so-called "Chares Group" of statues from Didyma are held in the Balat Miletos Museum, İzmir Museum, İstanbul Museum, the Louvre in Paris, the British Museum in London, and the Altes Museum in Berlin. In order to see the complete group, therefore, researchers need to visit six different museums in four different countries and on two continents. Seeing and appreciating these statues together as a coherent group is therefore impossible.

The landscape of Ionia is very dynamic, and the alluviation of the valleys is the most dramatic illustration of this. This dynamism meant that the cities of Ionia often shifted the focus of their settlements in response to changes in the landscape and this has sometimes had the effect of reducing the number of levels of settlement phases that are overlain or cut into by one another. At Miletos the focus of the city drifted about over time in response to various stimuli, within the general boundaries of the peninsula on which it was located, and as a result the Archaic settlement area on Kalabaktepe Hill, on the edge of the ancient city, was not covered over by subsequent Hellenistic, Roman, and Islamic period building works.[12]

[9] Raeck 2003.

[10] Bean 1966: 246.

[11] Jenkins 1992: 168–91, esp. 185.

[12] Greaves 1999.

Another geological factor that has contributed to the exceptional archaeological remains of Ionia is the fact that the region has good local supplies of marble. Consequently Ionia's architecture and sculptures are of the highest quality, as marble is more durable than many other types of stone. However, this has been a double-edged sword because such sculptural works also attracted the attention of the art market and illegal excavations as a result.

Today the Turkish government strictly forbids the export of antiquities and it has had considerable success in using legal and diplomatic means to force their return to Turkish museums.[13] Unfortunately, illegal excavations continue in Ionia but excavators of all nationalities now work closely with the Turkish and international authorities to identify looted artifacts and campaign for their return. For example, Hans Lohmann demonstrated that looting had taken place at the Çatallar Tepe temple site and was able to show that the building's decorative terracotta roof tiles were unique to that site. He was therefore able to prove that examples of the same tiles from a private collection must have been recently looted from this site and should be returned.[14]

It can be seen that Ionia has enormous potential for any archaeological study because of certain physical characteristics that are favorable to the formation and preservation of rich archaeological deposits. One might therefore reasonably expect that the archaeology of Ionia would be well understood, but this initial impression would be wrong. Iconic images of the ruins of Ephesos raise our expectations that there will be a wealth of archaeological data available for study but, in truth, much of the evidence dates from post-Archaic periods. In fact, the photogenic images that one has come to associate with Ionia often show monuments that obscure earlier phases that may lie beneath. This is particularly the case for the Bronze Age levels at some sites in Ionia.[15]

Exceptional preservation conditions are not uniform across Ionia or even across any one site and not everywhere is as well preserved as Ephesos and Priene. The ruins of Myous are virtually non-existent, for example. Others, such as Miletos, have a complex wealth of archaeology from many different periods, all intercutting and overlaying one another, and others still, such as Lebedos, are virtually unexplored in modern times. Trying to tease out the strands of evidence about Ionia in the Archaic period in order to test a complex set of archaeological questions about the character and identity of the region and its people is no easy task because of this piecemeal pattern of survival and excavation.

In some ways the character of the archaeology itself has been helpful to archaeologists. The fact that the Ionians built their largest and most important temples outside the city walls at Miletos (the Oracle of Apollo at Branchidai-Didyma and the Sanctuary of Aphrodite on Zeytintepe), Ephesos (the Temple of Artemis), Samos (the Temple of Hera), and Kolophon (the Oracle of Apollo at Klaros) meant that the excavation of these temples was unimpeded by an overburden of later settlement material from the city itself. However, the splendor of these temples and their early discovery and excavation has also worked to direct discussion of Ionia in general – and those cities in particular – toward

[13] e.g. Özgen and Öztürk 1996 on the so-called "Lydian Treasure."
[14] e.g. Lohmann 2007b.
[15] Greaves 2007a.

being focused on their large extra-urban temples at the expense of other questions. For example, there was scholarly interest in the temple at Branchidai-Didyma long before excavations of the city that built and effectively owned that temple, Miletos, began.

There have been advances in archaeological excavation techniques that now allow archaeologists to excavate strata that were previously unavailable to them. In the area of the Theater Harbor at Miletos, the raised water table prevented early archaeologists (and potential illicit excavators) from reaching some of the deepest levels. Today the use of modern vacuum-pump technology is allowing excavators to temporarily lower the water table in selected areas in order to expose the earliest levels of the city.[16]

While ongoing planned programs of excavation continue to reveal new information from Miletos, Ephesos, and the Temple of Hera at Samos, the situation is more complicated at sites where there are modern towns built over the archaeological deposits. At Chios town, Samos town (modern Pythagorio), and Phokaia (modern Eski Foça), excavation is limited to windows of opportunity of time and space between building works in the modern cities. These sites are located in relatively stable geological and environmental zones and therefore settlement has continued at the same place for centuries. This is in contrast to the landscape dynamism of the large alluvial valleys which led to the exceptional preservation of archaeological sites in those zones, as noted above. The historical character of these cities also makes them attractive to tourists and developers and at Eski Foça, in particular, archaeologists have had to struggle with developers to protect the city's heritage during a recent boom in building.[17] It is an irony that the growth of tourism, often built on images of Ionia's rich archaeological heritage, is thereby contributing to its destruction.

There are also some complex issues associated with the chronology of Archaic Ionia that complicate matters when attempting to research it. In the Aegean (Figure 1.3) there has existed for a long time a very detailed and precise pottery typology (i.e. a dated sequence of forms and decorative styles) by which archaeological sites can be dated. For the purposes of dating, the most important pottery styles are those of Corinth and Attica, where it has been possible to establish long sequences as a result of intensive studies of the styles from stratified archaeological contexts. Corinthian and Attic pottery was widely traded, and so it is used across the Mediterranean to establish the chronological framework of many sites. Only very recently, and as the result of years of meticulous research of the pottery from the stratified excavations at Miletos, has it been possible to establish such a typology for the pottery styles of Archaic Ionia.[18] This new system of classification, which builds on and incorporates into a new system the existing Ionian pottery classifications, such as Middle Wild Goat style and Fikellura, allows for the integration of Ionian pottery sequences with those of Corinth and Attica. As this new system of classification starts to be adopted, it will have important ramifications for the dating of sites and context in Ionia from which there is little or no imported pottery and for sites outside Ionia for which Ionian pottery is the predominant type, such as in the Black Sea.

[16] Niemeier and Niemeier 1997.
[17] Ö. Özyiğit 2006.
[18] Kerschner and Schlotzhauer 2007.

Figure 1.3 The location of the cities of Ionia and major sites in Aegean Greece.

There is, as yet, no comparable typological sequence for the pottery styles of Ionia's neighboring cultures in Anatolia (Figure 1.4). Although there are many good examples of pottery from these regions in museums and private collections, they have often derived from illicit excavations and so do not have a secure archaeological provenance or stratigraphic context. An example of this is Carian pottery, much of which is thought to come from the village of Damlıboğaz, the ancient city of Hydai, and includes many intact vessels, suggesting that it has been looted from graves.[19] Although many of the local pottery styles of western Anatolia, such as the Carian, appear to have been drawn from those of Ionia, the relationship between them is not always simply derivative. The pottery styles of Ionia and their relationship to those of its neighboring regions will be discussed more fully in Chapter 9.

Without the aid of a precise relative chronology based on local ceramic typologies, and often in the absence of quantities of dateable imported wares, archaeologists working in central Anatolia need to rely on scientific methods of absolute dating. At the Phrygian capital of Gordion, radiocarbon and dendrochronology (tree-ring) dating techniques have been applied in order to test the presumed date of the site, which had previously been based on assumptions about the date of the destruction levels found in the city as

[19] Fazlıoğlu 2007: 254.

Figure 1.4 The location of the cities of Ionia and major sites in Anatolia.

referred to in historical sources. The application of these scientific dating methods has produced results that have challenged previous assumptions about the historical sequence of events at the site. In particular, the "Early Phrygian Destruction" level which had previously been assumed to have been caused by the Cimmerian invasions mentioned by Herodotos has now been redated to a much earlier period and has been reinterpreted by the excavators as being the result of an accidental fire of a considerably earlier date.[20]

Archaeologists working in the two regions that were Ionia's immediate neighbors and most important influences, the Greek world of the Aegean and Anatolia, are therefore using fundamentally different dating methods to achieve their chronologies – one relative and one absolute. The establishment of a system of pottery classification that corresponds to the existing pottery typologies of the Aegean will make it increasingly easy for us to make connections with the west, but the lack of such evidence to the east of Ionia, and the redating of Gordion in particular, has yet to be fully worked through and will make establishing precise correspondence to the east harder.

To sum up, Ionia has enormous potential for archaeological research and boasts some of the finest, and rightly most famous, archaeological sites in the world. Yet when we seek to explore the Archaic period the gloss of this apparent wealth of evidence begins to pale and we find that the state of the evidence is often patchy and unclear. Some of the Ionian cities are virtually unexplored to this day (e.g. Lebedos), some of them have been systematically destroyed (e.g. Myous), others are limited by the presence of modern settlements (e.g. Samos, Chios, Phokaia), and some have not yet been found (e.g. Old Priene). Even at those sites where there appears to be an abundance of evidence, much of this actually

[20] Voigt and Henrickson 2000.

dates from the Hellenistic and Roman periods (e.g. Ephesos) and there are surprisingly few sites with extensive Archaic deposits (i.e. Miletos, Klazomenai, Phokaia, and Erythrai). Accessing the results of these excavations is made difficult for many researchers and students because of the way in which they have, or have not, been published (see below) and because the artifacts from those sites are often scattered among museums in many different countries and in private collections. Even visiting the sites is made difficult because they span two modern nation-states, Turkey and Greece, with a relationship that is sometimes uncomfortable.

Ancient literary sources

A survey of the ancient written sources for Archaic Ionia reveals that here too the material available is limited in nature. In a study of the emergence and geographical distribution of the genres of early Greek literature, Joachim Latacz has demonstrated that the origins of Greek literature lay in Ionian Asia Minor in the eighth, seventh, and sixth centuries BC.[21] Yet very few of these early sources survive intact. There are known to have been a number of historians operating in Ionia during the Archaic period, but their works are either completely lost, as in the case of Kadmos of Miletos, or are preserved only in fragments, as with Hekateus of Miletos.[22]

There are two main bodies of historical material relating to Archaic Ionia. The first of these are the myths of the so-called "Ionian Migration." The second are references to Ionia in the Archaic period from later historians, such as Herodotos, that often deal in detail with events surrounding the Ionian Revolt, at the very end of the Archaic period.

According to mythic tradition, the cities of Ionia were established by migrants from mainland Greece. In this Ionian Migration, people from the Greek "mainland" were led to the shores of Ionia, often by men from Athens, and settled in Ionia, often only after enduring tribulations and hardships, such as war with the native population. We are told that these migrations took place soon after the date of the Trojan War. The pattern that many of these myths take is consistent with that of the foundation myths of the Archaic Greek overseas colonization movement.[23]

There are three schools of thought amongst historians about how to deal with the truth, or otherwise, of the historical tradition of the Ionian Migration. First, there are those who accept it at face value as being essentially factual and seek to apply archaeological evidence to prove the truth of these myths.[24] Secondly, there are those who reject the Ionian Migration and instead seek to develop an understanding of Ionian culture based principally on independent archaeological source material.[25] Finally, there are those who take a particularist approach and seek to nuance the understanding of the mythic tradition to find individual cases where it can be reasonably aligned with the archaeological

[21] Latacz 2007.
[22] Gorman 2001: 82.
[23] Dougherty 1993a. See also Chapters 6, 10, and the Epilogue .
[24] e.g. Vanschoonwinkel 2006.
[25] e.g. Cobet 2007.

evidence.[26] For the purposes of this book, the author will seek to adopt the second route, and reject the myths of the Ionian Migration in favor of trying to define an independent archaeology-based understanding of Ionian culture.

The other main body of literary evidence, including the works of Herodotos and Thucydides, was generated as part of the great flourishing of Greek literature in Athens in the fifth century. During this period, following the end of the catastrophic Ionian Revolt, the Greek cities of Ionia were often under Persian control and at times separated from the center of Greek political affairs and cultural development, but they nevertheless continued to appear in literature and to have had a role in Greek political and military affairs.

There is a danger that, in reading these sources, we may project onto Ionia that which we think to be true of fifth-century Athens simply because Athens is better attested and more widely researched and understood by academics. However, this easy approach would fail to appreciate Ionia's local identity as separate from that of Athens. Ionia is not unique in this respect because there are few regions of the ancient Greek world beyond Athens for which good, consistent independent sources exist, and any predominantly history-based approach to those regions will inevitably be inclined to be Atheno-centric. It is only relatively recently that scholars have sought to truly appreciate the diversity and regionalism that existed within the ancient Greek world.[27]

Neither are these two bodies of historical material, partial as they are, independent of one another. In passages such as his description of the foundation of Miletos (1.1.46), Herodotos is putting across a particular version of the foundation myth of that city that is consistent with the explanation of the origins of the Dorians and Ionians that had become widely accepted by most Greek writers in the fifth century BC.[28] According to some modern commentators, it was politically expedient for Athens to seek to "play up," or even invent, the myth of the Ionian Migration in the fifth century BC because at this time Ionia was being incorporated into the Athenian-controlled Delian League and Athenian Empire.[29] It had also been important for Miletos, the leading city of Ionia, to emphasize its putative Athenian origins when it had been seeking Athenian support for the Ionian Revolt of 499–494 BC. Whatever the Greeks' and Ionians' reasons for promulgating this myth of an Athenian origin for the Ionian Greeks of the Anatolian coast, it must be understood within the context of the fifth-century historians who are our primary sources, rather than as events with a firm foundation in fact. Convincing independent archaeological evidence that could corroborate such an origin is so far lacking.

When dealing with the archaeology of periods and cultures for which there are few, if any, historical accounts, there is a tendency to attach excessive importance to known "events." This is a phenomenon that Anthony Snodgrass has noted and written about with particular reference to the archaeology of the Aegean Bronze Age.[30] This fixation on "events" and the desire of archaeologists to identify them in the archaeological record

[26] e.g. Lemos 2007.
[27] J.M. Hall 1997.
[28] Alty 1982: 2.
[29] e.g. Nilsson 1986.
[30] Snodgrass 1985.