Abstract

This thesis is the first extended study of one of the major ethnic groups in Greek antiquity, the Aiolians. In the Archaic and Classical periods, Aiolian identity is associated with the regions of Boiotia, Lesbos, Aiolis and the other north-western parts of Asia Minor and the nearby islands. Thessaly is sometimes also considered Aiolian. The equivalence of the Aiolians with other intra-Hellenic ethnic groups in ancient sources has prompted a wide-spread assumption that the Aiolians constructed, thought about and expressed their identity in the same way as the better-understood Dorian and Ionian groups. This thesis tests that assumption, following recent studies which have re-examined the evidence for specific aspects of the Aiolians' cultural and political cohesion. This thesis seeks to provide a holistic reconsideration of the weak political cooperation between Aiolians in the wider context of Greek ethnicity and Aiolian culture. The thesis thus also makes a methodological contribution by exploring ways to reincorporate material and cultural evidence into the wider study of ethnicity in the ancient world.

The thesis comprises studies of individual aspects of Aiolian ethnic identity. A preliminary chapter reviews the recent historiography of ethnicity in the modern and ancient worlds, with a particular focus on the characteristics employed to study it. Advancing on the well-established discursive model which focuses on 'intentional' histories, I suggest that the model of 'performativity' which has been useful in gender studies can help scholars to incorporate cultural indicia into the study of Greek ethnicity by investigating how cultural forms may have been imbued with ethnic relevance.

After establishing the scope of the ethnonym 'Aiolians' (Αἰολεῖς) and thus this thesis' range (chapter 2), the second part of the thesis explores ancient constructions and modern analysis of the early history of Boiotia, Lesbos, Aiolis and Thessaly. Chapter 3

considers the literary evidence for Aiolian migrations into these territories. Considering the highly variable tradition, I reconsider the migratory traditions as artefacts of Thessalian–Boiotian and Boiotian–Aiolian kinship. The Aiolians, unusually, did not focus on their heroic leaders or their own ancestry *per se*; the traditions instead codified the historical relationship of the Aiolians with their territory. Chapter 4 turns to a separate examination of the archaeological evidence for the historical migration, which is not decisive. Chapter 5 considers the myths of common descent which have become fundamental to modern scholarship on Greek ethnicity, but in the case of the Aiolians show little ethnic significance.

I then turn in the final part to three fields of action which belonged to the Aiolians' present rather than distant history. I argue throughout that objective modern analysis of cultural features has unjustly dismissed the social discourse surrounding dialect and other cultural practices. Chapter 6 is on musical culture, for which Greeks used ethnic terminology to categorize and label certain aspects. I discuss the poetic discourse surrounding the development of an Aiolian 'mode', one of several signs of the importance of musical culture for Aiolian identity. Chapter 7 discusses the existence of an Aiolian dialect group, considering both the rejection of linguistic criteria for ethnicity and the ongoing controversy over the scientific reality of the Aiolic dialectal group. Finally, chapter 8 addresses the evidence for a sense of solidarity between Aiolians, as evinced not by intentional histories or cultural labels, but by shared communal action. Case studies from the Persian Wars, Peloponnesian War, and Hellenistic religion are considered to demonstrate the intermittence of community action based on ethnic identity. A conclusion summarizes the main arguments and considers the historical obstacles to a fuller expression of Aiolian identity.

Aiolian ethnicity

Myth, culture, and performance



Alexander R. J. Wilson

Merton College

University of Oxford

A thesis submitted for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Trinity 2021

Table of Contents

Abstract 1

Introduction 7

1. In Defence of Ethnicity 21

1.1 Ethnicity and society 25

1.2 Ethnic criteria and ethnic indicia 34

1.3 Performative identities 48

1.4 Conclusions 58

2. Defining the Aiolians 60

3. Aiolian Migrations in Tradition 78

3.1 Thessalian and Boiotian migrations 82

3.1.1 Boiotia in the *Iliad* and the migration tradition 82

3.1.2 Boiotian and Thessalian conflict and tradition 88

3.1.3 Boiotian leadership 97

3.1.4 Thessalian leadership 102

3.1.5 Conclusions: Thessalian origins 107

3.2 Aiolian migration 110

3.2.1 Tradition and variation: sources 111

3.2.2 Aiolian origins 118

3.2.3 Definition of Aiolis and the role of the Penthilidai 128

3.2.4 Conclusions 142

3.3 Aiolian migration: a political context? 144

3.4 Conclusions 147

4. Aiolian Migration in Archaeology 149

4.1 The archaeology of migration and ethnicity 153

4.2 The Aiolian area, LBA to Archaic Period 170

4.3 PG Troy and the Aiolian migration 179

4.4 Conclusions 192

5. Aiolian Kinship Traditions 194

6. Aiolian Music 217

6.1 Music & Greek identity 220
6.2 Modes 222
6.3 Pindar 230
6.4 Terpander and the origins of the modes 242
6.5 Plato, Heraclides and the ethnomusicological discourse 247
6.6 Conclusions 253
7. Aiolian Dialects 255
7.1 Linguistic attitudes in Plato's *Protagoras* 256
7.2 Dialect difference and consciousness 261
7.3 Dialect classification and dialect perception 270
7.4 Aiolic classifications 283
7.5 Vectors of change: linguistics and identity 295
8. Aiolian interactions 301
8.1 Herodotus' disappearing Aiolians 302
8.2 Thucydides' opposed Aiolians 306
8.3 Aiolian ethnic religion 309
Concluding Remarks 319
Bibliography 324

Note on transcription & abbreviations: my policy has been to preserve (Latinate) English forms of Greek words where they are familiar, especially the names of authors. Elsewhere I use a Hellenizing transcription. Abbreviations are those of the *Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 4th edition. All dates are BCE unless otherwise indicated.

Introduction

> Ἕλληνος δ᾽ ἐγένοντο φιλοπτολέμου βασιλῆος
> Δῶρός τε Ξοῦθός τε καὶ Αἴολος ἱππιοχάρμης
>
> [Hes.] fr. 9 M–W

> Ἡρακλείδης δ᾽ ὁ Ποντικὸς ἐν τρίτῳ Περὶ Μουσικῆς οὐδ᾽ ἁρμονίαν φησὶ δεῖν καλεῖσθαι τὴν Φρύγιον, καθάπερ οὐδὲ τὴν Λύδιον· ἁρμονίας γὰρ εἶναι τρεῖς, τρία γὰρ καὶ γενέσθαι Ἑλλήνων γένη, Δωριεῖς, Αἰολεῖς, Ἴωνας.
>
> Heraclid. Pont. fr. 163 Wehrli (= Ath. 14.624c)

> Ἑλλάδος μὲν οὖν πολλὰ ἔθνη γεγένηται, τὰ δ᾽ ἀνωτάτω τοσαῦτα, ὅσας καὶ διαλέκτους παρειλήφαμεν τὰς Ἑλληνίδας· τούτων δ᾽ αὐτῶν τεσσάρων οὐσῶν, τὴν μὲν Ἰάδα τῇ παλαιᾷ Ἀτθίδι τὴν αὐτήν φαμεν…, τὴν δὲ Δωρίδα τῇ Αἰολίδι· πάντες γὰρ οἱ ἐκτὸς Ἰσθμοῦ πλὴν Ἀθηναίων καὶ Μεγαρέων καὶ τῶν περὶ τὸν Παρνασσὸν Δωριέων καὶ νῦν ἔτι Αἰολεῖς καλοῦνται, καὶ τοὺς Δωριέας δὲ ὀλίγους ὄντας καὶ τραχυτάτην οἰκοῦντας χώραν εἰκός ἐστι τῷ ἀνεπιμίκτῳ παρατρέψαι τὴν γλῶτταν καὶ τὰ ἄλλα ἔθη πρὸς τὸ μὴ ὁμογενές, ὁμογενεῖς πρότερον ὄντας.
>
> Strabo 8.1.2

This thesis is a study of the most obscure of the intra-Hellenic ethnic groups: the Aiolians. I use the term ‘intra-Hellenic ethnic group’ to refer to the groups which form the immediate sub-groups of the wider Greek ethnic category, i.e. Dorians, Aiolians and Ionians as the passages from pseudo-Hesiod, Heraclides and Strabo quoted above suggest.[1] These passages represent explicit attempts to define that Greek ethnic category by an enumeration of recognized groups. There were many more ethnic groups in ancient

[1] Achaians appear as a fourth group, e.g. [Hes.] fr. 10(a).23 M–W; see West (1985) 57–58; Hall (2002) 162–63. The term ‘intra-Hellenic’ is Jonathan M. Hall’s, e.g. Hall (1997) xiii; (2002a) xvii; Malkin (2001a) 9; although awkward, I prefer it to some other commonly used labels for these groups, e.g. ‘tribe’ (which has inappropriate modern connotations, and overlaps with one translation of φυλή) or ‘ethnos’ (which makes a false equation between the modern and ancient terminology). The Greek terminology is not consistent: e.g. Heraclid. Ἑλλήνων γένη, Strabo Ἑλλάδος ἔθνη; see Hall (1997); McInerney (2001) 55–58.

Greece than just these three or four (n.b. Strabo's πολλὰ ἔθνη), so these texts cannot be said to account satisfactorily for the full range of ethnicities. Individually, then, and as part of a wider discourse these authors reflect a hierarchy of identities in ancient Greece, implying that many regional ethnic groups were 'nested' within the intra-Hellenic ethnic identities such as the Aiolians, which were themselves nested within Greek identity.[2] Each identity would, it is assumed, have been important to its members generally but influenced their considerations where a particular level of identity was appropriate.

There is some evidence to suggest that these intra-Hellenic groups existed prior to any idea of Hellenicity. Becoming part of a wider Greek identity, however, surely changed ways of thinking about Aiolian identity and history; at about the same time as Hellenic identity and cooperation came to the forefront, we see the articulation of Hellenic identity in terms of a checklist of characteristics – often in contrast with other non-Greek groups. Scholars have carefully studied well-known examples of ethnicity by definition in Herodotus (8.144) and Isocrates (*Paneg.* 4.50) for what they may tell us about the discursive construction of identity and, from a more sceptical perceptive, the politicization of Greek collective identity against non-Greeks (the 'barbarian').[3] In fact, we should address the lists of groups as an ongoing expression of ethnic thinking distinct from lists of ethnic characteristics. Ancient attempts to enumerate which groups were Greek have been studied for their rationalization and structuring of the relations between Greek groups, but we should be conscious of the purposive and likely tendentious

---

[2] 'Nested identity': Hall (1997) xiii. There was surely also a variety of sub-regional identities similar to ethnicity (polis, deme, etc.), and other forms of identity (family, class, religious or labour associations, etc.) which interacted with different levels of identity; see further ch. 1. The complexity of 'ethnic hierarchy' is easily understated when addressed in such abstract terms.

[3] Jones (1996); Flower (2000); Konstan (2001); Mitchell (2007) 1–38 esp. 19–20. Jones (1996) 315 n. 4 argues that Hdt. 8.144 is not a definition, but this does not change the fact that it is a qualitative observation about Greek ethnic identity. On discursive identity, see Hall (1997); Thomas (2001) 213–18; on barbarians, see Hall (1991); Hall (2002) 172–89.

processes of inclusion and exclusion here too. The explicit inclusion of certain groups and implicit exclusion of others in the above three passages could doubtless be just as tendentious. Over the course of the first millennium, Greek identity displaced Aiolian, perhaps more so than for other intra-Hellenic groups. In this thesis, I will explore the relationship between Aiolian areas in this changing context, and the differences and parallels between the constructed history of Aiolianism and the lived experience of Aiolians.

The authors quoted above paint the ethnic picture of ancient Greece in the broadest strokes, elaborating on what were clearly already well-known groups. Their ethnic structures are remarkably consistent over a period of some five centuries, from the mid-sixth to the mid-first century BCE. The intra-Hellenic ethnic groups were surely active before that. The earliest stages of Aiolian identity are associated in ancient literature with migrations *en bloc*, which I consider in chapters 3 and 4. The diminishment of Aiolian identity, along with the other groups, is beyond the scope of this thesis, but it likely reflects a slow reassessment of what were originally less related groups into a single Greek ethnicity.[4] This process was underway in the sixth century; it is key to the pseudo-Hesiodic myth of Hellen and his sons including the eponymous hero Aiolos and his clan (chapter 5).

Intra-Hellenic groups themselves each incorporated the residents of several regions, and often some of the so-called colonial foundations outside of the Aegean Sea. Dorians, Ionians and Aiolians were, then, large imagined communities: Kostas Vlassopoulos has rightly deemed them 'trans-regional' identities.[5] Aiolian identity is

---

4 Fowler (1999); Hall (1997); (2002a).

5 Vlassopoulos (2015) esp. 6.

associated with Boiotians, Lesbians, Aiolians proper (in the north-western parts of Asia Minor), and sometimes with the Thessalians. Some consideration must be given, however, to Strabo's somewhat startling extension of the early Aiolians in the passage quoted above to cover almost all central and northern Greece, which gives the impression of a late change or confusion about who the Aiolians were. It is apparent that properly identifying the Aiolians, as understood in antiquity, and any changes in their definition will be an important task.

Strabo's provocative redefinition notwithstanding, Aiolians appear consistently in lists alongside other intra-Hellenic ethnic groups. There should be no doubt in the face of such consistency that the Aiolians mentioned here represented a significant portion of the population of ancient Hellas. As well as being of equal size and significance, the equivalence of the Aiolians with other intra-Hellenic groups in such texts implies that Aiolians constructed, thought about and expressed their identity in the same way as the better-understood Dorians and Ionians. This assumption has largely gone untested. Despite the current interest in ethnicity in antiquity, there has been only brief consideration in modern scholarship of who the Aiolians were or what their ethnic identity was like. To some extent this is true of all the intra-Hellenic identities, inasmuch as the more limited perspective of individual poleis and regions have dominated consideration of Dorian and Ionian ethnic identity. Jonathan M. Hall, the most prominent scholar of the intra-Hellenic identities, gives very little attention to the Aiolians in either his methodological study of ethnicity, *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity* (1997), or his fuller exploration of the ethnic groups of Greece, *Hellenicity* (2002). He argues that although tradition saw the Aiolians arrive in Asia Minor from Greece, Aiolian identity only arose in Lesbos in the late seventh century – but he also argues that the traditions relating to the Aiolians arose a little earlier and a little further east, in the conflict between

Aiolians and Ionians over the originally Aiolian settlement at Smyrna, before 688 BCE.[6] His consideration of Aiolians outside Asia Minor is even more limited: he touches briefly on the substantial differences between the dialects within the Aiolian dialect group.[7] In the north, the Thessalians are also supposed to have exploited the development of the Aiolian migration to justify control of the Amphiktyonic council, in which case Aiolian identity was entangled with the development of Hellen as the eponym of the Greeks, as I will discuss in chapter 5.[8] The same genealogy which promotes Hellen also, Hall argues, suggests that Aiolians were more closely affiliated to Dorians than to Ionians or Achaians – an idea which Strabo may have preserved.[9] Several regional studies for the presumed Aiolian areas have now appeared, some of them explicitly influenced by the methodology established by Hall.[10] Most of these discussions avoid the question of the elaboration of Aiolian identity within their region, or how the regional identity intersects with the wider identities within which it may be nested. Major questions about who exactly the Aiolians were, and whether their ethnicity shaped their interactions, remain.

A growing body of sceptical scholarship has argued that the Aiolians were a more restricted and less important group than generally believed. Two connected papers which seek to review the evidential basis for the reconstruction of the Aiolian migration in the Early Iron Age have cast doubt on the reality of the Aiolian ethnic group: Brian Rose's 'Separating Fact from Fiction in the Aiolian Migration' highlights the differences between the archaeological record in Asia Minor and the literary traditions for migration,

---

6 Hall (2002) 71; Hdt. 1.149–50; Callinus fr. 2, Mimnermus fr. 9 (both from Strabo 14.1.40); for *terminus ante quem*, Paus. 5.8.7.

7 Hall (2002) 72.

8 Hall (1997) 48; (2002a) 169.

9 Hall (1997) 43, 49.

10 Lesbos and Aiolis: Ellis-Evans (2019); Boiotia: Larson (2007); Beck and Ganter (2015); Schachter (2019); Thessaly, largely religious history: Graninger (2011); Mili (2015).

while Holt Parker's 'Linguistic Case for the Aiolian Migration Reconsidered' makes a hypercritical contribution to the established controversy surrounding the development of Greek dialects and the identification of dialect groups.[11] Their conjoint conclusion is that the Aiolian migration was largely a fifth-century fiction which has been bolstered in modern scholarship by attempts to align the linguistic evidence with the tradition. These papers have been widely cited over the last decade despite several methodological and factual errors.[12] Some of Rose's argument already needs revision in the light of further recent work on the material evidence. In general, Parker and Rose do not consider an explanation of when or how Aiolians and Aiolian identity appeared in the eastern Aegean. Hans Beck, in the first attempt at a comprehensive study of Aiolians, extends the arguments made by Parker and Rose.[13] Beck offers a speculative account of Aiolian relations, suggesting that the formulation of a synthetic ethnic identity arose largely because of quite limited élite interaction in the Archaic period and fifth century. In his view, Aiolian identity originated in Asia Minor, where it enjoyed minimal success, but fizzled out when imported to the Greek mainland in the eighth century, and had functionally disappeared by the time of the Third Sacred War (356–46):

> The Aiolians of Asia Minor were an ethnos of minor importance and with limited recognition there. As an ethnic group in mainland Greece, with a shared tribal agency and identity that cut across the Aegean, they are a phantom.[14]

We have already observed the persistent equation of the Aiolians with other major ethnic groups. Such an argument largely ignores other possible aspects of Aiolian ethnicity. In

---

11 Rose (2008); Parker (2008).
12 Some 100 citations between the two papers. I reconsider specific arguments in chapters 3, 4, and 7.
13 Beck (2019).
14 Beck (2019) 402.

this thesis, I will explore several alternative aspects, in cultural discourses and Hellenistic kinship diplomacy. As I will argue throughout this thesis, at issue is a narrow methodological scope to their studies which leads Beck and others to ignore the wider context. These three recent articles represent only the beginnings of an important reconsideration of the Aiolians, and of the study of the intra-Hellenic ethnic groups. It is hoped that an extended study will rectify some of the deficiencies in our knowledge of the Aiolians which have contributed to such narrowness, but it is also important to consider whether we are asking the right questions about ethnicity in Archaic and Classical Greece.

I focus in this thesis on what brought these regions together, as well as what Aiolian identity meant to each region, polis, and individual. It is important here to have internal evidence for ethnic identification and ascription (though I avoid labels such as 'emic' and 'etic').[15] This higher focus on the trans-regional aggregative nature of the intra-Hellenic identities has often been neglected in favour of examinations of how individual poleis might exploit their position within Greek identities. I am not hostile to local political interpretations, but I am cautious about the assumption that the expedience of ethnic identity across the Aegean could be sustained in the face of local manipulations without any concern for their personal resonance. The constructed past (or 'intentional history') of Greek city states has been a focal point of recent scholarship on politics and ethnicity, but there are other, more performative concerns evident in our sources. Kostas

---

[15] The somewhat outdated anthropological term 'emic' is sometimes still seen for internal perspectives alongside its corresponding term 'etic' for universalizing analytical observations. These are analytical perspectives rather than simple labels for the position of the observer; recent critical approaches to ethnography suggest that insiders are capable of both emic and etic approaches, and that etic perspective as a category over-emphasized the objectivity of the ethnographer: Hall (1997) 18–19. As a demonstrative example of issues: Aristotle and Josiah Ober have both produced 'etic' discussions of Athenian democracy.

Vlassopoulos has thus, in arguing for a greater articulation of types of ethnic group in ancient Greece, argued that Dorians and Ionians had what he refers to as 'cultural features' to motivate communal action, but the Aiolians did not. His examples are 'Dorian simplicity and military valour, Ionian luxuriousness and elegance'.[16] These of course are not cultural features but value judgements, and highly rhetorical ones. They reflect not shared features, but a sense of solidarity and the discourse of ethnically charged conflict. On the other hand, Beck has suggested that distinctive Aiolian cultural customs were perhaps complementary to economic customs (e.g. agriculture and foodways) in a putative Aiolian enclave in Early Iron Age Askra in Boiotia, which was the origin of that unimportant Aiolian ethnicity for which he argued – a community which had a distinctive lifestyle and culture to serve as contrasting ethnic indicia long before it constructed a shared past which emphasized the connection of Aiolians and Boiotians.[17]

This thesis therefore contains a reflection on the kinds of evidence which have become the established focus of scholarly discussions of ethnicity. The solidarity and inter-polis manoeuvring which has been inferred from kinship myth, especially that of the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women*, has played a particularly prominent role, as have other forms of myth and history, and I dedicate two chapters to such material (chapters 3 and 5). I also seek to reincorporate other matters of contemporary practice alongside ethnic groups' construction of their shared past, led by the musical and dialectal indicia indicated in Heraclides and Strabo. Each author focuses on just one apparent criterion – Greek culture in terms of music or language. The later attempt in Strabo evinces greater concern than pseudo-Hesiod for an all-encompassing picture of Greek identity by

16 Vlassopoulos (2015) 12.
17 Beck (2019) 392.

designating one dialectical group as a catch-all, and that is the Aiolians. Strabo has often been used, somewhat credulously, as a source for the real ethnic situation. It is important that, although his discussion comes at the beginning of Strabo's section on the geography of mainland Greece, making some reference to the lay of the land in ethnic terms, Strabo is not drawing (it seems) on the contemporary *or* historical location of Greek ethnic groups. Instead, he directly equates ethnic groups with dialect. Heraclides' discussion of the different musical modes (ἁρμονίαι), the longest surviving fragment of a substantial philosophical essay *On Music*, makes a similar equation between musical style and ethnicity. I will return to each of these passages at appropriate points in the thesis, for both demonstrate a lively process of cultural ethnicization – the conjunction of particular groups within cultural and social practices – on two tiers. Their commonalities make them Greek; their differences make them Dorian, Ionian or Aiolian.

A culture-oriented approach to Greek ethnicity used to be central to how scholars considered ethnicity. For example, in 1979 John Onians could suggest that ethnic thinking was central to the Greek cultural tradition:

> [The Greeks] tended to think in terms of the separate traditions of the different Greek races. This situation came about because of the isolation of these different groups from each other at least until the sixth century. A sixth-century Aeolian would speak the Aeolian dialect, build in an Aeolian style, use Aeolian pottery, and sing and dance to Aeolian music.[18]

It was, according to Onians, only metropolitan fifth-century Athens which moved somewhat beyond ethnic traditions. Hall, in particular, has made a provocative and influential case in his work for dismissing the evidential value of cultural features such

---

[18] Onians (1979) 21.

as dialect and style in the study of historical ethnic discourse. It is impossible, certainly, to agree with Onians' case for how such traditions came to be, and came to bear ethnic significance.[19] Not only have scholars of ethnicity persistently argued (and were indeed arguing so when Onians wrote this) that ethnic culture is not a product of isolation, but Greek historians have shown repeatedly that regional isolation in the 'Dark Age' and early Archaic was a myth.[20] Acknowledging the reality of an interconnected early Greek world does not change the fact that the Greeks did recognize something called 'Aiolian music', a phenomenon which deserves further exploration both for what it can tell us about the expression of ethnic identity and for what it can tell us about music, if an appropriate methodology can be established.

A preliminary chapter seeks to do precisely that: I will review briefly the approaches already applied to Greek ethnic identities and the characteristics which typically give direction to modern studies. I will discuss the way in which cultural forms were imbued with ethnic relevance in Greek discourse and note that Greek possessed a performative vocabulary for ethnicity. I will thus present the use of 'performativity' in modern identity studies as a framework for understanding the application of ethnic significance ('ethnicization') to cultural forms in the ancient world.

The rest of the thesis is formed of studies of individual aspects of Aiolian ethnic identity, based on the characteristics established in chapter 1. Chapter 2 completes the preliminaries by setting the scope for the rest of the thesis. Parker and Beck have claimed that the use of the ethnonym was limited to the area of Lesbos and the north-eastern

---

19 McInerney (2001) 53–54.

20 Lemos (2002) 140–47; more generally, various studies of Mediterranean connectivity, such as Horden and Purcell (2000) and Malkin (2011), incorporate the Aegean.

Aegean and had no wider ethnic significance.[21] As this thesis considers the Aiolians as an intra-Hellenic ethnic group and relies on the explicit ethnicization of practices outside the north-eastern Aegean, it is worth demonstrating the wider use of the ethnonym in the ancient sources. However, it must also be observed that the north-eastern Aegean, Boiotia, and Thessaly have their own internal political and ethnic complexities.

The second part of the thesis, chapters 3 to 5, considers the ancient and modern reconstruction of the Aiolians' past. Each chapter begins with an assessment of the relevant methodology. Chapter 3 considers anew the evidence for the Aiolian migratory traditions. The Thessalian and Boiotian migrations are entangled in northern Greece, but rather than depicting common origins, the tradition suggests a conflictual history by which Thessalians sought to establish their distinct origins. The migration of Aiolians to Asia Minor is separate. I will argue that the legendary migration to Aiolis is not satisfactorily explained by an 'instrumentalist' interpretation of its formulation for the benefit of the prominent Mytilenean Penthilidai in the Archaic period, or to promote Aiolians' relations with Athens in the fifth century. Through the examination of the various traditions, it becomes clear that the each Aiolian group, unusually, did not focus on their heroic leaders or their own ancestry *per se*. The migratory traditions largely concerned themselves with a geography of the regions in which Aiolians dwelt, and only sometimes the point of origin from which they left. I will suggest that Aiolians' experience of migration was a constitutive moment. In Chapter 4, I also consider whether it is necessary or possible to incorporate the archaeological material from Aiolis into our understanding of the migratory tradition. The reconstruction of the prehistorical movement of Aiolians from west to east at the end of the Bronze Age has recently been

---

[21] Parker (2008); Beck (2019).

challenged by Rose's attempts to demonstrate the absence of material evidence for Greeks in this area; I will take the view that there are methodological problems with such studies.

Kinship mythology was a prominent part of Greek ethnic discourse. Although I agree that it has been overvalued by some scholars, I nevertheless consider its contribution to Aiolian identity. Chapter 5 demonstrates the extreme variability of the genealogical tradition of the children of Aiolos, son of Hellen. This stemma was never definitively established, nor does it demonstrate a clear metaphor for personal or group identity. The picture which emerges is one in which early narratives of Aiolos and his children as moral figures have been grafted on to more straightforward kinship myths in the late Archaic period. In the fifth century, however, a tradition of Boiotian and Lesbian/Aiolian kinship was established independently of the Hellenic genealogy. Newly Hellenized territories in Asia Minor also sought normative prestige in the old Greek world through the Aiolians.

The last part of the thesis considers the relevance of performative actions to the contemporary experience of Aiolian ethnicity, focusing on dialect and music. Chapter 6 asks why Greeks used ethnic terminology to categorize and label certain aspects of their musical craft. I will discuss the development of the modes (ἁρμονίαι) of Greek music and their ethnicized names, in particular the emergence of an Aiolian mode, one of several signs of the importance of musical culture for Aiolian identity. It has recently been suggested that such ethnicization arises from the traditional regional associations of the modes. I will argue that the use of ethnic terminology more likely reflects wider stereotypes of the ethnic groups. It is clear that such ethnic associations of the modes were a factor in the late-fifth century controversy over the 'New Music'.

Chapter 7 discusses the existence of an Aiolian dialect group, considering both Hall's rejection of linguistic criteria for ethnicity and the ongoing controversy over the scientific reality of the development of the so-called Aiolic dialectical group. I will argue that emphasis on the objective analysis of historical dialects, which Hall has problematized as an effective basis for identification, does not do justice to the *social* phenomenon in question. Similarities between Aiolic dialects had the potential to be a point of differentiation, and the evidence in ancient sources is that this distinction was overtly considered valid.

The final chapter turns to the evidence for interaction between Aiolian people in the Greek historians and epigraphic evidence. Beck has presented political interactions in particular as evidence for the salience of Aiolian identity. I prefer to present these within the framework of opportunities for performative action. I will draw the first two cases from the Greek historians: Herodotus' treatment of the Aiolians as Medizers, and Thucydides' treatment of the Boiotians and Lesbians' allegiances in the later part of the Peloponnesian War. I will observe that Herodotus largely subsumes the Aiolians within larger groups, while Thucydides uses juxtaposition to highlight his problematization of the Aiolians as a group: both cases, however, tell us more about the authors' approach to ethnicity than they do about Aiolian attitudes. The final case study addresses shared religious practices, for which there is very little evidence. This suggests that cultural discourse enjoyed more importance for the Aiolians, while political cooperation was often quite weak. The mid-fifth century seems to have been a high point of ethnic salience, with a revival in the Hellenistic period.

Finally, this thesis has chronological boundaries. I consider evidence as early as the Late Bronze Age–Early Iron Age transition and as late as the second century CE, but my central focus is on the Archaic and Classical Periods. This was a time when Aiolian

ethnic identity had likely already been formed. There is not adequate evidence from the earlier period to identify the historical origins of the Aiolians, and I am sceptical of attempts to make substantive conclusions out of meagre material. I do not therefore give anything more than tentative suggestions about Aiolian ethnogenesis. Both the Classical Period and the Hellenistic brought substantial changes to the place of ethnic identity within Greek society, and these changes clearly effected the Aiolians too. The Hellenistic Period is also not a major focus here; many important sources, however, are only preserved in Hellenistic texts.

1. In Defence of Ethnicity

> Genetic, linguistic, religious or common cultural features do not ultimately define the ethnic group. These are symbols that are manipulated according to subjectively constructed ascriptive boundaries.[22]

> …we often find an uneasy amalgam of constructivist language and essentialist argumentation. … It reflects the tension between the constructivist language that is required by academic correctness and the foundationalist or essentialist message that may be required if appeals to "identity" are to be effective in practice. Nor is the solution to be found in a more consistent constructivism: for it is not clear why that which is routinely characterized as "multiple, fragmented, and fluid" should be conceptualized as "identity" at all.[23]

Studies of ancient social groups, and especially of those connected by an idea of common descent, have proven extremely popular in recent decades. Numerous studies of specific ethnic identities have now appeared, and theories of ethnicity have also come to influence the study of established aspects of Greek history, such as the Athenian democracy, Spartan control of the Peloponnese, and the expanded cooperative political structures which are normally contrasted with the Greek polis, i.e. the *ethnos* and the *koinon*. A recurrent theme of such studies of ethnic identity is the argument that ethnicity is flexible, negotiable, and dynamic. It is this engaging potential to connect historical *groups* of people with the linguistic, religious, and cultural features which Jonathan M. Hall identifies in the first quote above, as well as with the literary myths which Hall sees as expressions of the key criteria of putative common descent and shared territory (seeing the connections between group and symbols of identity as both expressive and subject to

---

22 Hall (1997) 11.

23 Brubaker (2004) 33.

manipulation), which makes ethnicity an attractive historical paradigm. Nor is the flexibility limited to shifting symbolic content in response to contemporary circumstances; the make-up of the group and (thus) its defining criteria are considered equally negotiable. Scholars both of antiquity and of modern society have, however, increasingly expressed concerns that this emphasis on ethnic flexibility overstates ethnic identity's resilience to change. Thus Rogers Brubaker (second quote) identifies the tension between the scholarly idea of ethnicity as a social construction, particularly one whose instances are 'multiple, fragmented and fluid', and its effectiveness in practice, for which identity must be considered an essential aspect of each member of the group.

There is a serious dilemma for the historian in the balance of ethnic identities' emotional affectiveness and their constructedness. The established methodology of ethnic studies, by focusing on the dynamic manipulation of group make-up and group expression, worryingly assumes the connection of cultural material to the ethnic group, perhaps without sufficient consideration of the group and its consequent relationship to such manipulations. Brubaker, a sociologist, attributes the tension between constructivist and emotive approaches to academic 'protagonists of identity politics', caught between analytical and activist stances. Contemporary sociology and history (especially diachronic studies) both require a clear recognition of the absence of objective bases for identity. Political activism relies upon the identification which members make with the group and its essentialized characteristics to justify and motivate action (a reliance which is not unique to ethnicity or race). Historical studies, however, rely equally upon an assumption of the affective appeal of ethnic identity. For Classical Greece, the French scholar Édouard Will found some solution in rejecting any real sense of solidarity or

shared culture.[24] Will argued that the appeal of ethnic identity was purely rhetorical; aside from the propagandic manipulation of the groups, Dorians and Ionians had no real presence in fifth-century Greece. More recent historiography has inclined in the other direction, to accept and emphasize solidarity within an ethnic group, at times suggesting that the ancient Greeks were self-aware and unperturbed by rhetorical appropriations of ethnicity, or at other times implying that the sense of solidarity continued unchanged by novel attempts to engage it. It is important to ask then whether negotiable identities can sustain a sense of belonging. Brubaker and other critics have problematized both the methodology and the analytical categories deployed in analysis. Do current theories of dynamic ethnicity satisfactorily explain the deep affective attachment which people evince and have evinced in the past for their ethnic identity? Is the ethnic group the right phenomenon to address affinity? In light of these critiques, this chapter says something in defence of the use of ethnicity for this thesis.

The following discussion is divided into three sections. I begin with a brief review of theories of ethnicity in the twentieth century, when social-constructivist theories have displaced any sense of objective categorization. Despite the prevalence of social constructivism, there is still no consensus about the nature of this construction, nor about ethnicity's position in wider social and cultural systems. This brief history of the theoretical frameworks offers important context to Jonathan Hall's essential contribution to the study of ethnicities in antiquity. In the second section I turn to Hall's methodology and the more general issue of the use of criteria in determining evidence for ethnic identity. Hall has emphasized specific categories of behaviour – in particular, diplomacy between states based on myths of descent – as evidence for historical ethnic identity.

---

[24] Will (1956).

Based on this discussion, I explore traditions of migration and myths of descent in chapters 3 and 5. There remains however substantial disagreement about other evidence, and the relative weighting of different evidence with relation to ethnic criteria. Exploration of the alternatives to myths of descent leads to the third and final section, considering how the side-lined 'genetic, linguistic, religious or common cultural features' of an ethnic identity, as Hall put it, might be incorporated into the study of ethnicity in antiquity without overreliance on the objective judgement of the historian or the reification of social constructs. I find productive grounds for considering the relationship between ethnicity and culture in the performative theories of Pierre Bourdieu and Judith Butler. I suggest that the analysis of the 'ethnicization' of cultural behaviours can be usefully brought to bear on what Hall considered superficial indicia of ethnicity; this forms the methodology of the second half of my thesis, in the analysis of Aiolian music, dialect, and political relationships.

A final preliminary observation on terminology: the English vocabulary relating to ethnicity is a small minefield. 'Ethnicity' may be used as a synonym of 'ethnic group' ('an ethnicity'), or as the abstract noun relating to a group ('British ethnicity'), or as the phenomenon of ethnic groups and thinking (cf. 'racial thinking'). Ethnicity is difficult to analyse in part because it has a multiplicity of overlapping uses, and many who use it do not worry about its definition. In everyday language, 'ethnicity' is often used without distinction from 'race' or 'nationality', perhaps euphemistically, as well as in reference to non-dominant groups. In these popular senses, ethnicity has a strong association not with history, but with cultural identifiers such as behavioural norms and values, language, religious practice, foodways (etc.), as well as status and social power structures which may affect such cultural identifiers (e.g. through acculturation). Emotional investment in the sources of collective identity is therefore key to the popular idea. As an academic

term, however, ethnicity refers to a pervasive form of ascriptive (inherited) social organization, which cultural identifiers may only bolster. Dominant groups may, like minority groups, be ethnic in nature, but clearly not every social group is ethnic. Some scholars feel that ethnicity is a universal principle of organization; others suggest that its relevance is limited to certain types of group interaction. In this thesis, I will reserve the use of 'ethnicity' for the phenomenon of ethnic systems, including the various mechanisms discussed in this chapter by which a collection of ethnic groups differentiates one from another, and use 'ethnic identity' for the relations of members within a specific ethnic category.

1.1 Ethnicity and society

Attention to ethnicity in historical studies has generally been considered a recent development, associated with the cultural turn in the second half of the twentieth century. The study of ethnic subjectivity fit well into the new histories of social systems which used intersections of sociological, anthropological, literary, psychological, and philosophical discourses to examine the past. The twentieth-century history of horrific racial and ethnic violence and the major social changes which that violence produced prompted a rejection of 'race' for a more sophisticated and structurally disruptive understanding of social categories. Historians of antiquity have considered the context in which such new social histories were produced as important as the historiographical movement away from positivism. It is worth however looking again at the historiographical developments with particular attention to the question of what historians have accepted and rejected as evidence of ethnic identity. Here there is much variation and contention. Long before the cultural turn, ethnicity had already been recognized as a contested concept even by those who had done much to foment its

adoption as a scholarly tool. I begin with the pioneering German sociologist Max Weber, who was well ahead of his time in recognizing that ethnic groups were not objective categories but constructed groups of people.

A draft paper, *Ethnische Gemeinschaften*, to which the translators of Weber's collected works gave the title 'Ethnic Groups', constitutes one of the earliest attempts to formulate a social theory of ethnicity.[25] Although Weber's discussion is not essential to what has come after, his problems with the concept of ethnicity usefully exemplify two related themes which are essential to my study of Aiolian ethnicity: the conceptual and evidential slipperiness of the criteria on which identity could be based, and the question of whether identity, once developed, was a tool for other purposes, particularly political ones, or an end in its own right. In his analysis, Weber clearly demonstrates an understanding that the ethnic group produced a belief in common origins, rather than taking their identity in recognition of objective shared origins or other criteria. Ideas of descent, in particular, expressed putative shared origins, arising from contemporary perceptions:

> We shall call "ethnic groups" those human groups that entertain a subjective belief in their common descent because of similarities of physical type or of customs or both, or because of memories of colonization and migration; this belief must be important for the propagation of group formation; conversely, it does not matter whether or not an objective blood relationship exists.[26]

This basic emphasis on the subjective social construction of the group was a premonition of later 'social constructivist' approaches, firmly denying any biological basis for racial

---

25 Weber ([1922] 1968) 1:385-398.
26 Weber ([1922] 1968) 1:389.

categorizations against the prevailing view of the early twentieth century.[27] More explicitly than many recent theories, Weber's discussion incorporates both the historical aspects (memories of colonization, migration and descent) and the present sociocultural (i.e. customary) or physiological signs which shape ethnicity, although he makes no attempt to address the relative importance of the influence of social memory or social present.[28]

Despite his cogent discussion, Weber himself was not convinced of the utility of ethnicity as a heuristic, and suggested that demonstrating ethnic 'community action' (*das Gemeinschaftshandeln*) as a product of such identities relied upon too complex a concept to sustain serious examination.[29] At issue was whether ethnic identity could be considered a rational motivation based on the promotion of one's interests within a society, labelled 'social', or constituted an irrational preference for belonging against self-interest, labelled 'communal'. His frustrations apparently led him to put aside his incomplete draft in 1911.[30] It was incorporated without revision into *Economy and Society* (1922) after his death, although Weber's views on rational social and irrational communal actions shifts in several ways between 1911 and his death in 1920. A difficulty arises, then, in understanding what importance and motivation Weber attributed to 'community action'. Michael Banton argues that ultimately for Weber would settle on a less schematized idea of action, without distinctions of rational and affective action:

---

27 For recent reconsideration of race as a socially constructed sub-type of ethnicity relevant to the study of racism, see Isaac (2004). A few Classical scholars continued to use 'race' and related terms for ethnic groups, *faute de mieux*, well into the 1990s: e.g. Hornblower, *CT* 2:61–63.

28 Hutchinson and Smith (1996) 32.

29 Weber ([1922] 1968) 1:395.

30 On the composition history and legacy of Weber's 'Ethnic Groups' chapter, see Banton (2007). Weber's dismissal of ethnicity at the end of the third section formed the conclusion of the original draft; the posthumous edition of *Economy and Society* obscured this by attaching a later piece as a fourth section ('Nationality and Cultural Prestige') to the chapter: Banton (2007) 29.

'Theorising is easier if action is seen as oriented to the maximisation of net benefit, and benefit is the satisfactions of immaterial or psychic gains, including those associated with the comforts of custom or routine.'[31] Weber's definition of ethnicity was precocious, but tended to see ethnic identity as overly complex in its flexibility and difficult to demonstrate in terms of action: one had to assume that the 'psychic gains' of belonging to a group and possessing a social script were their acceptable ends.[32]

Weber's criticisms of the conceptual complexity of ethnicity and the uncertain links between identity and its expression in action have only been compounded in the century since his death. The anthropologist Fredrik Barth's introduction to *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries*, published the year after *Economy and Society* first appeared in English, represents the beginning of modern approaches to ethnicity.[33] Barth rejected the view that the characteristics of ethnic identities develop in isolation, and thus could be subject to studies of their distinctive 'cultural stuff',[34] and then become significant when two already distinct groups come into contact (e.g. a colonial setting).[35] Instead, Barth argued, the persistence of the group is maintained at the boundaries in a constant process of self-identification and external recognition (i.e. ascription). Symbolic cultural markers are created and performed because of this interface, leading to the production of distinctive groups, and used to signal one's group membership. Those who have come after Barth are even more emphatic about the social construction of ethnic groups; almost all scholars would now recognize that it is the produced and 'ethnicized' markers of difference which

---

31 Banton (2007) 21.

32 For an articulation of 'mutual belonging' in terms of network theory, see Brubaker (2004) 46–48.

33 Barth (1969). For overviews of theories of ethnicity, see Hall (1997) 17–33; Jenkins (2008); see also chapter 4 on 'culture history' in twentieth-century archaeology and anthropology.

34 On the contrast with Boasian cultural anthropology, see Jones (1997) 46–51.

35 Barth (1969) 17.

are the basis for ethnic identity, not any objective difference.[36] Studies which reify inflexible and non-negotiable characterizations of ethnicity are criticized as 'essentialist', i.e. ignoring the potential agency of individuals.

Barth's theory affirmed that ethnic groups have continuity even though individual members may move in and out of the group. Furthermore, the adaptation of symbolic markers to changing circumstances did not necessarily entail changes in the group identity. Such an argument demonstrated that the symbols of ethnic identity were historically contingent and situationally defined, but suggested that ethnicity in general was a principal of human social organization (which 'perennialist' view was more often associated with those who accepted the essential nature of ethnic identities themselves). In arguing, however, that the ethnic boundary persisted despite such changes, Barth opened himself to a critical charge: ahistoricism.[37] It is clear that ethnic groups themselves have changed in the course of history, and Barth's model initially left very little space to understand why some ethnic groups succeeded or failed over time.

Barth's work has been fundamental to the study of ethnicity over the last fifty years. Approaches nevertheless vary widely, and do not generally form precise schools of scholarly practice but rather varied perspectives on ethnicity. Often these perspectives have acquired labels such as 'instrumentalism' and 'primordialism' after the fact by those who wish to critique them. Barth's concept of boundary construction inspired the 'instrumentalist' approach, which was less inclined to see pure social organization and

---

[36] On the commercial and ideological exploitation of recent advances in phenotyping through both modern and ancient DNA analysis, on the pretence that they allow a direct identification of historical ethnic affiliation, see Abu El-Haj (2012); Brubaker (2015) 48–84.

[37] For a summary and response to criticisms, see Barth (1994); Luraghi (2008) 11 argues that Barth's focus on social practice delayed essential consideration of historical memory.

the maintenance of ethnic identities as sufficient explanation for ethnicity arising.[38] They instead treated ethnic markers and identities as resources used by ethnic groups to pursue other political and economic interests. Instrumentalist analysis offers a clearer understanding of why and how ethnic groups and their markers may change, but it is not the only possible explanatory model, and it has significant flaws. What instrumentalist analysis affords to groups and individuals in terms of agency, it diminishes in a reductive focus on self-interest and materialism.[39] It does not incorporate power structures external to the ethnic group particularly well, although it gave some sense of the normative power of group identity on its members. For example, Abner Cohen states: 'Norms and beliefs and values are effective and have their own constraining power only because they are the collective representations of a group and are backed by the pressure of that group.'[40] As Jonathan Hall points out, instrumentalist analysis often failed to distinguish what was ethnic about ethnic groups, such that any self-interested social group (e.g. football teams, Oxbridge colleges) might be called an ethnic group.[41] Rational self-interest is assumed, probably quite wrongly, to overpower any historical or personal momentum which an ethnic group has obtained. Instead members of an ethnic group select from a range of identities and presentations as appropriate to the situation. As Homi Bhabha has suggested, this diversity of self-ideation can approach infinity.[42] Perhaps most importantly instrumental analyses neglect the resonance of ethnic identity.[43] 'Hybridity', which Bhabha has promoted as a theoretical model of the ways in which identities can

---

38 Hall (1997) 17–18.
39 Jones (1997) 76–77.
40 Cohen (1974) xiii; cf. Jones (1997) 79.
41 Hall (1997) 25.
42 Bhabha (1990).
43 Hutchinson and Smith (1996) 9.

be reclaimed, combined and recombined into new individual identities, should demonstrate the possibility of personal agency in working with identity (but against normativity); hybrid identities, however, are equally open to the charge of neglecting what is ethnic while reifying the constitutive elements of identity.[44]

The resonance of ethnicity can however be overinterpreted. 'Primordialism', the earlier view that ethnicity is an inevitable and unchanging aspect of human nature, was widely rejected by instrumentalist thought.[45] Its romantic abstraction of ethnicity as an external force, e.g. a social expression of biological relationships or territorial borders, reflects the solidarity felt within many ethnic groups.[46] The strength of attachment conceived by primordialist studies, however, left little room for the changes in identity which instrumentalism highlighted, and after the Second World War and in the age of ethnic conflict many scholars were reluctant to affirm an objective basis for nationalist excesses. Some recognition, however, should be given to the work of Clifford Geertz on 'participants' primordialism'.[47] Geertz was more cautiously interested in the lived experience of ethnicity as a persuasive force of attachment, and thus explored the importance of an attributed *perception* of primordiality of ethnicity: humans (apart from historians) think of ethnicity as an external and 'given' tie. Geertz thus attempts to account for some of the power which ethnicity and its symbols have by recourse to the psychological dimension of ethnicity.[48]

---

44 For criticisms of hybridity's reliance on conventional notions of monolithic identity, see Anthias (2001); Malkin (2011) 47.

45 On the opposition, see Malkin (2001b) 15–19.

46 Shils (1957); Hutchinson and Smith (1996) 8.

47 Geertz (1963).

48 Jones (1997) 65.

An orientation towards the distant past is one way in which a constructed identity obtains legitimacy. Attempts to navigate between the primordial attachment felt by members of an ethnic group and the strategic self-centred use of attachments have turned to the construction of boundary symbols in *la longue durée* (i.e. within *Annales* school's interest in slowly evolving structures). John Armstrong returned to Barth's model of interactive boundary formation and initiated a focus on myths, traditions and symbols as durable mechanisms of exclusion.[49] Anthony D. Smith, the scholar of nationalism, applied this myth-symbol complex in particular to the foundations of modern nations in order to argue that nationalism was not *only* the identity politics of the modern Western nation-state, but an elaboration of ethnic components (*ethnies*) which had existed long before the rise of such nations.[50] Armstrong and Smith's approaches have come to be known as 'ethnosymbolism', which remains the most successful modern theory of ethnicity.[51]

Both Armstrong and Smith identified the ethnic myth of origins as the most potent influence on identity. Both scholars characterized the myth-symbol complex as a '*mythomoteur*':

> convictions of common origins and the political mythology which emanates from them endow the movement with shape and direction, defining the nature of the unit for which its members are striving and guiding them towards prescribed goals and ideas.[52]

The myth of origin is legitimating but dynamic. Such myths were by no means fixed; one of the attractions of myth as a key constitutive element of ethnic identity is its shock-

---

49 Armstrong (1982).
50 Smith (1986).
51 Conversi (1995).
52 Smith (1986) 57–58.

absorbing capacity: myths neatly balance continuity and negotiation by assimilating new directives with existing mythical components. What is generally called 'myth' here is in fact often the creation of secular history, and this may explain why the ethnosymbolic approach has been so attractive to modern-day historians.

Although scholars who can be called ethnosymbolists tend to accept the reality of the contingent adaptations which instrumentalists found (and so instrumentalist and ethnosymbolist perspectives are sometimes classed together as 'situationalist'), they have tended to reject an assumption of élite control over the development of meaningful identity. For example, the concept of what Reinhard Wenskus called the 'kernel of tradition' (*Traditionskern*) was central to his study of Germanic 'ethnogenesis'.[53] This was the élite within a tribe who carried the traditions (i.e. intentional history) for the larger tribal organism, and creatively negotiated the affiliation of ordinary members of the group. The role of such groups has been much contested. Their interactions with the wider ethnic group, and thus their general existence, are often only indirectly visible through fragmentary tradition. The question of the wider group's recognition of tradition is an issue which deserves much more attention. Attempts to identify such *Traditionskerne*, as well as the promotion of (often obscurely attested) groups into this powerful role, is still recognizable in much scholarship on ancient Greece. The ethnosymbolist approach, however, emphasizes the constant reinterpretations of the character of ethnic identity within a framework of two-way communication between élites at the centre and the masses at the periphery.[54]

---

[53] Wenskus (1961); on Wenskus' intellectual context, see Filotico (2011); Kasperski (2015); for criticisms, Murray (2002) and other essays in Gillett (2002); for a comparison of Wenskus and Barth, see Luraghi (2008) 8–9.

[54] On Smith's more recent retraction from 'mass consciousness' of nationalism, see Guibernau (2004) 127–28.

We may be concerned too about the historical fallacy inherent in the concept of the *mythomoteur*. Walter Pohl criticized the misleading sense of established group unity implicit in the direction supposedly given by the myth of origins.[55] Nationalism may demand such purposive traditions to unify the political community, but it is not clear that ethnicity does. It seems, thus, that ethnosymbolism in general and particularly Smith's approach is not addressed to the study of ethnic groups *per se* but perhaps only those *ethnies* which became nations. Smith's emphasis on cultural similarity arises not from empirical analysis of ethnicity itself, but from a contrast between the aspirational homogeneity of the modern nation-state and the cultural pluralism possible in pre-modern empires.[56] It is important to recognize that cultural homogeneity in modern nation states is the result of both active central policy and modernizing forces.[57]

Though ethnic studies at the end of the twentieth century and in the early twenty-first have accepted the constructed nature of ethnicity and show much more concern for the emotive and irrational ties inherent in ethnicity, the complexity of 'ethnic community action' as a category remains at issue. Such difficulties are in part determined by the characteristics, such as origin myths, which are used as 'criteria' for the group, and so it is to the definition of ethnicity itself that we must now turn.

1.2 Ethnic criteria and ethnic indicia

Every theory of ethnicity struggles to articulate a useful definition of ethnicity itself. The attempted definitions – of which there have been many – tend to incorporate a range of

---

55 Pohl (1998) 67.

56 Eriksen (2004) 52.

57 The situation of Welsh, as a classic example of an imperilled language, is instructive; see Davies (2014): the Welsh language was stigmatized through state education policy in the mid-nineteenth century, but is now reinvigorated by engagement with the symbolic power of a minority language.

characteristics, the specific expression of which offers the content to a particular ethnic identity and defines the terms of a system of ethnicity. These aspects of ethnicity, once identified, become the fields in which historians look for the expression of ethnic boundaries; there is, however, a greater diversity of approach than often appreciated. A number of typical characteristics seemingly reoccur from definition to definition, but often characteristics are expressed as such broad categories that in reality similar-sounding rubrics encompass quite different forms of ethnic expression. It is therefore important to consider what exactly is at stake.

It is helpful to rank the definitions from the simplest to the most complex. The most basic definition of ethnicity is that it is a process by which self-identification and external recognition creates a group identity. Importantly, this definition recognizes the complementary process of inclusion and exclusion which is necessary to form a group. There are however three objections to the basic definition. First, it may already assume too much about the voluntary nature of this process, which issue I discuss in the following subsection. Second, it is not really a definition of ethnicity but of all social categorization. Many other constructed groups would meet such a definition although we would not call their identity ethnic. Thus, third, a minimal definition gives us no idea of how such a group would come to exist. The definition of an ethnic group is reduced to 'us' vs. 'the world' rather than the result of a specific historical process of differentiation. This may return the ethnic group to the status of a primordial given. The latter criticism can also be applied to a slightly more complex definition. If ethnicity is defined above all by the existence of a belief in common descent or kinship, why do only some descent groups obtain ethnic status?

We are forced then to consider a polythetic definition of ethnicity, of which kinship and self-identification are necessary but not sufficient aspects. We have already

seen that Max Weber's definition identified two or three characteristics which are often included in more recent definitions: perceived similarity of somatic features, common customs, and shared memory of past mobility. These, in Weber's view, were the basis of a belief in the common descent of the ethnic group's members. At the end of the long debate over primordial and instrumental views, Anthony D. Smith turned to ethnic groups' self-presentation. In order to explore the internal process of construction, he developed a more complex set of characteristics for the *ethnie* in *The Ethnic Origins of Nations*, including the putative sense of common descent as a myth of origins:

> 1. a common *proper name*, to identify and express the 'essence' of the community;
>
> 2. a myth of *common ancestry*, a myth rather than a fact, a myth that includes the idea of a common origin in time and place and that gives an *ethnie* a sense of 'active kinship';
>
> 3. shared *historical memories*, or better, shared memories of a common past or pasts, including heroes, events, and their commemoration;
>
> 4. one or more *elements of common culture*, which need not be specified but normally include religion, customs, or language;
>
> 5. a *link* with a *homeland*, not necessarily its physical occupation by the *ethnie*, only its symbolic attachment to the ancestral land, as with diaspora peoples;
>
> 6. a *sense of solidarity* on the part of at least some sections of the *ethnie's* population.[58]

This list of characteristics has received general acceptance from ancient historians, to the extent that it is sometimes reproduced without any particular reference to Smith, although

[58] Hutchinson and Smith (1996) 6–7 (emphasis original), summarizing Smith (1986) 21–46.

as Eriksen points out anthropology and sociology nevertheless still tend to use a shorter set of characteristics, 'which tend to emphasise formal elements, notably the relationship with outsiders, as key factors creating both group boundedness and an awareness of cultural difference'.[59] Some of this mimetic success must be attributed to the deployment of this list in Jonathan Hall's *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity*, which has become a standard reference for the study of ancient ethnicity and the intra-Hellenic identities in particular. Likewise, there is general acceptance of Hall's view that ethnic identity is discursively constructed, without much reconsideration of the categories of 'literary evidence' with which Hall immediately equates ethnic discourse.[60]

Each chapter of this thesis involves at least one of Smith's aspects. Not every scholar has approached the list identically, however, and some characteristics are particularly open to interpretation.[61] Such a multifaceted definition for ethnicity needs some consideration of the relationship between what are presented as discrete criteria; in reality, there is substantial empirical overlap between categories of expression. There has been a tendency also to see some categories, particularly ancestry and homeland, as more important than the others; Hall has argued specifically that these are the most important criteria. In the following discussion, I begin by discussing Smith's first three features (name, descent myth, and memory), and then the relationship to the land (point 5, territory), before turning in the second subsection to the two features which have an existence outside of and prior to the formation of the group itself – the miscellaneous characteristics lumped together as 'elements of common culture' and the sense of solidarity.

---

59 Eriksen (2004) 52.
60 Hall (1997) 34–66.
61 For refinements, see e.g. Tullio-Altan (1995) 19–32; Eriksen (2004).

Names, shared myths and canonized histories, and territorial attachments may all be seen as elements which are produced specifically as a result of ethnic cohesion. For all but the most transient of groups a name is essential. There has likely never been an ethnic group without a name, or 'ethnonym', by which it described itself,[62] although if such a group ever did exist it would be quite difficult to identify in the historical record. (One thinks here of preliterate archaeological cultures, the 'peoples' who are identified by their pot styles.[63]) Ideally, an ethnonym will express a distinctive characteristic or something about the origins of the group, such as a geographic unit. Of course, not all named groups are ethnic – and some are initially externally imposed or defined, as famously the Hutu and Tutsi in Belgian-controlled Rwanda and Burundi. Ethnonyms are symbolic products themselves and tend to attract etymological interpretations which reflect current ideas about the group, as we shall see in chapter 2.

One interpretative method applied to ethnonyms is the eponymous ancestor, who may serve both as source of name and as source of descent. Not all mythical ancestors were eponymous; a 'myth of common ancestry' is how Smith incorporates the putative descent grouping into his ethnic schema, but as we shall see in chapter 5 kinship myths were of quite diverse types. In particular, descent is not only fictive in the sense that it is not an objective biological relationship, but also in the sense that it often derives from a group of ancestors who shared common experience rather than a kinship of their own. This often relates to territory or migration. Ancient historians have been particularly attentive to the structured relationships conveyed by myths' representations of kinship groups themselves, but Greek migration stories, which I will discuss in chapter 3,

---

62 Smith (1986) 22.

63 On ethnicity and material culture, see section 4.1.

demonstrate more than just the overlap of shared past and myths of descent. Smith affirms a dubious distinction between shared myth and shared history – i.e. unreal and real events. 'Myth' and 'history' are, however, both *usually* believed to be true and indeed overlap in their narrative forms too. Myths codify stories of migration, relationships with territory, group victories and failures.[64] It is clear enough then that 'shared origins' is a more accurate label than strictly 'myths of kinship'.

Territory is one of those concepts which has often overpowered scholarly attempts to deconstruct it. Although there are several well-known case studies and thematic analyses which demonstrate the discursive construction of territory even beyond the legal frameworks of property, ancient historians still tend to take territory and regions as givens. Kostas Vlassopoulos has recently argued that Jonathan Hall's model of ethnicity is deficient because it assumes a parallel between the possession of territory by regional ethnic groups (in which he includes the larger poleis like Athens) and the dispersed regions which made up the intra-Hellenic (trans-regional, as Vlassopoulos underscores) groups.[65] Vlassopoulos seems dismissive of the relevance of primordial territory, which he acknowledges as the migratory origin of some poleis and ἔθνος-states, e.g. 'the polis of Sparta believed that Doris was its primordial territory'.[66] As the name of the territory suggests, this was understood as the original territory of the Dorians as a whole and was the Spartan homeland because they were Dorian. This story was likely already established in Tyrtaeus' day. In particular, it is worth thinking about the territorial relationship of the Archaic or Classical region: in what way do the Boiotians, split up into separate poleis with their own juridically defined territories, relate to the territory of

---

64 As Smith (1986) 24–25 acknowledges.

65 For an argument that territory was not so relevant to Hellenicity, see Malkin (2001a) 13–14.

66 Vlassopoulos (2015) 7.

Boiotia as a whole? Does the creation of the federal state in Boiotia entail a radical renewal of the Boiotians' relationship with their territory? In fact the vagueness of 'a link with a homeland' conveys a number of possible relationships – full legal occupation (which, we should remember, was the right of only a small and carefully controlled portion of the population of most poleis), acquired rights due to federal institutions or personal honours, regional orientations such as local sanctuaries, and the more extended concepts such as Solon's reference to Attika as 'a land of Ionia'. There is often a more powerful connection when the group is separated from its territory – and separation comes in many forms, including diaspora and irredentism, as well as migration in general. Vlassopoulos neglects the variety of relationships which a population might enjoy with its imagined territory.

'Common cultural features' is a loose moniker for forms of cultural expression which do not seem to regulate the interactions between members of the ethnic group as the ethnonym and myths do, but simply offer patterns of similarity and dissimilarity.[67] The category, as many definitions present it, is wide open: *anything* might be selected as a token of differentiation from others in a particular historical context. Almost all cultures have forms of dance or foodways, written and oral forms of communication, and so on: some of these may be held in common between one ethnic group and the next, while others become distinctive. This argument tends to deliberately downplay those features which are very often seen as markers: language and religion. Those who suggest that ethnic groups are primarily defined by a sense of kinship sometimes suggest that all the cultural indicia of ethnic identity, including myth and territory, are simply elaborations of the sense of kinship which serve to underscore and naturalize the common descent of

---

[67] Smith (1986) 26.

an ethnic group's members. This emphasis on kinship can sometimes relate to an oversimplification of the processes of inclusion and exclusion which are of course the hallmark of ethnicity. Hall follows Donald Horowitz in dividing features of ethnicity into 'criteria' and 'indicia'.[68] 'Indicia' are distinguishing attributes such as somatic features, language, religion, and other cultural traits which members and non-members associate with an ethnic identity, whereas 'criteria' are the elements which determine ethnic membership. The former may be used as evidence of identity, but they cannot serve as a solid basis for determining ethnic identity. Hall rightly points out that many such cultural features do not precisely coincide with the boundaries of an ethnic group – one may change one's language or religion without acquiring the associated ethnic identity, for example, though outright conversions are hardly usual. Hall takes the view that only wholly ascriptive features (descent and territorial associations), even though they are still subjective, can be used to make firm judgments about ethnic identity. This is where the distinction between criteria and indicia encounters some difficulty.

Barth pushed attention towards the interactional boundary-forming processes of ethnicity because, although the group defined by the boundary seemed perennial, the boundaries themselves were not consistent *or* strictly defined. The indefiniteness of such boundaries has often been underappreciated. Hall's disapprobation about the use of cultural features is directed most clearly at scholars who attempt to use language or material culture as evidence for ethnic identity, noting the lack of evidence for the ethnic valuation of such behaviour; Hall always encourages us to look to explicit discursive statements of ethnic identity for evidence of self-presentation. But Hall also usually denies that cultural material could receive an ethnic valuation in antiquity. At times it

---

[68] Horowitz (1975) 119–21; Hall (1997) 20–25.

seems that Hall persistently envisions ethnicity through the lens of a momentary encounter, in which one needs to determine a stranger's identity before deciding on a course of action: 'The boundary is set by the criteria of ethnicity which are phrased in the form of a yes or no question – normally, "can you, or can you not, claim descent from *x*?"'[69] This comes close to assuming pervasive uncertainty about ethnic identity, rather than a participant's primordialism in which one is confident of one's own identity and that of others. Hall generally seeks to distance himself from purely material instrumentalism, but in identifying 'social closure' as the mechanism which determines ethnic contrasts, he returns to the view that culture is manipulated in relation to the control of resources and power.[70]

Most historians have wholeheartedly accepted Hall's assertion of the constructed yet ascriptive nature of Greek ethnic identity; his emphasis on kinship above any other aspect of ethnic discourse has nevertheless received criticism. A collection of essays edited by Irad Malkin, *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity*, focused less on the ways scholars have used ethnic criteria and more on the way the Greeks themselves related to perceptions.[71] Underscoring the complexities and instabilities involved in the idea of the self, many of the contributors (including Hall himself) noted the varied and contradictory views of ethnicity produced by the ancient sources. Malkin's introduction generally rejects schematic treatment of ethnic phenomena; in particular he takes issue with Hall's focus on the explicitly elaborated genealogies which appear in some texts: sometimes, he argues, only a *sense* of relatedness was developed.[72] David Konstan, tracking the

---

69 Hall (1997) 24–25.
70 Hall (1997) 26–27.
71 Malkin (2001b).
72 Malkin (2001a).

changing salience of Greek ethnic identity across three 'moments', argued that the contrastive model of Greek identity previously identified by Edith Hall and Jonathan Hall was a product of Athenian imperialism in the second half of the fifth century.[73] Catherine Morgan, Carla Antonaccio, and Beth Cohen pushed an approach to material culture not as the passive reflections of ancient identity but as something which itself could have symbolic significance and therefore contribute to the discursive construction of identity.[74] Morgan in particular argues that there is value in studying patterns of attitude towards artefacts, e.g. as demonstrated by placement, rather than the simple presence or absence of certain types in an area. Rosalind Thomas suggested that Herodotus' polemical treatment of apparently widely held ethnic views, particularly his attack on the Ionian sense of superiority, expressed a tension in fifth century thinking between kinship and culture as the key criterion of ethnicity.[75] Thomas' chapter is a useful reminder for historians that the distinction of 'emic' and 'etic' perspectives (i.e. the knowledge and interpretation within a group vs. the observations of the external ethnographer) are entangled and both can occur in our sources as much as in modern ethnography and historiography. Heleen Sancisi-Weerdenburg's chapter likewise explores a case of entangled identity.[76] Though imperial strategies encouraged some understanding of their subjects' self-identification, Persian administrators could not grasp the internal differentiations amongst *Yauna* (not Ionians but all Greeks). But they did try: for example, although we cannot trust what Greeks say that Persians say about Greeks as an accurate reflection of Persian thought, the mythical association of Persians with the

---

73 Konstan (2001).
74 Antonaccio (2001); Cohen (2001).
75 Thomas (2001).
76 Sancisi-Weerdenberg (2001).

Greek hero Perseus may well represent a Persian attempt to negotiate Greek ethnic thinking which has worked its way back into Greek knowledge. This case, in particular, is an instructive example of the interactional process of ethnicity formation, because it highlights the asymmetries which can occur between the self-identification by members and the external recognition by non-members. We must be careful not to assume the unfailing complementarity of identification and ascription.

Greek historians have produced a swathe of regional studies over the last quarter-century that distinguish themselves from earlier studies in their critical stance towards the regions in question. Rather than exploring regions as objectively determined pieces of geography, they have turned to ethnological methods in order to explore how and why the human population of an area coalesced. The examples are too many to explore in full: here I focus on two prominent studies which otherwise fall outside the scope of this thesis. Many studies have included kinship myth within the more general category of collective memory. Nino Luraghi, for example, argues that the kinship structures of Messenia manifest a tension between Dorian and Herakleid identities not only in contrast with Spartan (and Argive) myths of descent but also as part of the wholesale production of the region as a unit and its archaic history, dating to the revolt of 460s BCE.[77] In emphasizing that invented traditions demand plausibility, Luraghi suggests the relevance of wider patterns of ethnic thinking.[78] Jeremy McInerney's work, however, suggests that demands for kinship mythology did not inspire every Greek region – Phokians seem to have misplaced their mythological ethnonym Phokos and developed a second of the same name in order to fill the gap.[79] Despite cooperating in various ways, and in general

[77] Luraghi (2008) 48–61.
[78] Luraghi (2008) 13.
[79] McInerney (1999) 127–49.

meeting criteria for ethnicity, McInerney seems hesitant to attribute much actual sense of identity to the ancient Phokians.[80] Catherine Morgan's *Early Greek States Beyond the* Polis (2003) studies several regions, including those considered in this thesis. Morgan probes the physicality of contact in the material evidence of archaic Greek regions which have been seen to lack polis structures, in line with the ethnoarchaeological method which she championed in *Ancient Perceptions*. Sanctuaries and waterways, for example, prompt 'communities of place':[81] an extremely interesting series of discussions notes that kinship was not simply a belief, but a practice played out in the cults of heroes and ancestors: myths of descent also lay on the land.[82] The complexity of ethnic expression is reaffirmed when it is teased out into distinct strands by the polythetic definition of ethnicity.

Even the sense of solidarity which is the core of the most basic definition of ethnicity is a problematic concept. We now return to the tension inherent in the practical application of ethnicity which I raised at the beginning of this chapter. 'Seeing oneself as culturally distinctive, collectively and individually, from other groups, and acting accordingly',[83] as Eriksen puts it, suggests that there are in fact two facets to it: the sense and the action. Barth posited that ethnic identity was the 'basic, most general identity', overpowering other social identities such as class or gender.[84] Rogers Brubaker has firmly enjoined scholars of ethnicity to be more alive to the process which endows a sense of solidarity, and to resist 'groupism', or a tendency to employ ethnic groups

---

80 McInerney (1999) 133–34.
81 Morgan (2003) 213–22.
82 Morgan (2003) 187–95.
83 Eriksen (2004) 52.
84 Barth (1969) 17.

uncritically as 'fundamental units of analysis'.[85] Ethnic groups are often presented as 'internally homogeneous, externally bounded groups, even unitary collective actors with common purposes.'[86] Brubaker, as a sociologist, wishes to turn towards cognitive psychology for a better understanding of processes of group formation. Sociology as a discipline is ahistorical, but two essential points of Brubaker's critique can be isolated from the solution he offers. First, not all groups are ethnic, and it is important that we not assume ethnicity is at play simply because we see a collective doing something.[87] As Brubaker observes, ethnic thinking 'is a key part of what we want to explain, not what we want to explain things *with*'.[88] Other forms of social category may not be immediately distinguishable from ethnic groups on the basis of the criteria discussed. We may take as an example a kinship group such as the Gephyraioi of Athens, the γένος (clan) from which the 'tyrant-slayers' Harmodios and Aristogeiton came. They had a name, kinship links, association both with a specific region in Attica and with more distant homelands – and like many ethnic groups there are multiple versions of their origin story (Hdt. 5.55–61). They even have a distinct cult of Achaian Demeter, 'which the rest of the Athenians have nothing to do with' (τῶν οὐδὲν μέτα τοῖσι λοιποῖσι Ἀθηναίοισι, 5.61.2). We should note that many Athenian aristocratic families had such tales of origin.[89] A real sense of solidarity is perhaps the most important thing lacking, and sometimes it will be appropriate to speak not of ethnic *groups* but of ethnic *categories*.[90]

---

85 Brubaker (2004) 7–27.
86 Brubaker (2004) 8.
87 Cf. Mac Sweeney (2009).
88 Brubaker (2004) 9.
89 On the ethnic contexts of the fall of tyranny at Athens, see Gray (2007).
90 Brubaker (2004) 28–63; Jenkins (2008) 22–25; and cf. Vlassopoulos (2015), without reference to sociological discussions.

Second, and more importantly, Brubaker argues that care must be taken not to conflate an individual actor or actors with the group to which they belong, nor vice versa is *a* group always *an* actor. Ethnosymbolists and ancient historians alike can be guilty of assuming heterogeneity and ignoring normative processes. Conflations are produced both by normal historical practice and the evidence which is available to us. It would be impossible to write this thesis, or indeed almost any history, without using 'groupist' terminology. This would surely be *reductio ad absurdum*. Moreover, there is a social bias towards seeing and accepting groups which affects our sources too. Ancient texts abound in collectives – in plural nouns, particularly substantive adjectives such as οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι – which Brubaker would cautiously call 'categories' rather than 'groups'. We should note also that documentary evidence is attributed in the same way. We must take at face value decrees of the Athenians or rolls of a particular tribe as the group actions they claim to be (unless there is clear evidence otherwise). The internal heterogeneity of the collective at hand is suppressed, and the cohesion of the group is assumed. The significance of this is of course not solely evidentiary. This is not only the case when the modern reader then accepts the asserted reality of Athenian cohesion. The use of collective terminology, attached to actions, created, and reinforced the sense of solidarity.

Polythetic definitions of ethnic characteristics go some way to incorporating the past and the present, but they do not always offer particularly clear ways forward in terms of which of the many characteristics invoked were more important, or how characteristics were related to each other. Part of the issue is that situations of ethnic determination as Hall envisions do not actually occur very much in ancient sources (although we can and do infer them), which leaves the scholar to reconstruct the ethnic logic. It has become normal to see ethnic thinking as primarily worked out by the codification of stories about the past, although there is some recognition now that invented histories must navigate

both momentum and plausibility. I do not deny the value of elucidating the ethnic significance of intentional histories, but the 'felt reality' of cultural expressions, much of which are trivial everyday experiences, deserve more serious consideration for what they contribute to ethnicity. Indicia, it is often simply said, are superficial signals. In the following section I wish to draw on the scholarship of a similar social constructed identity, gender, in order to suggest a model for including indicia within our understanding of the ethnic sense of self.

1.3 Performative identities

'Performativity' is an approach to explaining the production of individual identification with groups, within a constructivist paradigm, as part of the formation of the self. As initiated by the feminist philosopher and gender theorist Judith Butler, performative studies explore identity expressed 'through language, gesture, and all manner of symbolic social sign';[91] a typical summary of the performative approach refers to *doing* (not *being*) an identity, emphasizing that the categorization of gender and its associated traits are defined not by biology but by social discourse which reflects on the actions one takes, consciously or not, which express and confirm gender categories.[92] Performative approaches to gender construction are now very common, emphasizing that gender and sex have no stable bodily basis from which gender *expression* can be built; the expression of gender in various social 'technologies' (dress and posture to name just two) is a way of constituting the identity.

---

91 Butler (1988) 270.

92 Butler (1990) 25; cf. West and Zimmerman (1987). The parenthesis here, '(not *being*)', emphasizes the process, not the identity which results: in the linguistic theory of speech–acts formulated by Austin and Derrida, 'performative' utterances enact and produce what they name. Butler's interpretation of speech-act theory for identity studies: Salih (2002) 62–64; Butler (1993) 12–16.

The performative approach is less often directly applied to ethnicities, modern or ancient, although it has much to offer here.[93] It incorporates a more structured approach to exploration within norms, and – importantly – a way of addressing individuals' expression within a wider system. Exploration and individual identity are too often downplayed or even dismissed in ancient social history. Importantly, a flexible determination of identities in contrast with one another is inherent in the performative model of gender, as it is in established approaches to ethnic studies. I thus suggest that the existing analysis of the proximity between theatrical (and linguistic) performance and performative identity provides a good model for studying the contribution of 'common cultural features' such as music, dialect and religion to identity in ancient Greece.

Performativity has largely been extrapolated from the theory of practice derived from the sociologist and anthropologist Pierre Bourdieu's articulation of the concept of *habitus*, or the product of the adaptive myths, archetypes and rituals which operate at a subconscious level of socialization.[94] As defined by Bourdieu, the *habitus* is:

> Structured structures predisposed to function as structuring structures, that is as principles which generate and organize practices and representations that can be objectively adapted to their outcomes without presupposing a conscious aiming at ends or an express mastery of the operations necessary in order to attain them.[95]

Bourdieu's own studies focused on social class and masculinity. G. Carter Bentley argued for the application of *habitus* to ethnicity as a way to move beyond the stagnant debate over primordial and instrumentalized ethnic motivations: while allowing for an emotion

---

93 Clammer (2015); Hofmann and Mueller (2016) collect essays on the conjoint performance of gender and ethnicity.

94 Bentley (1987); Yelvington (1991); Jones (1997) 87–92.

95 Bourdieu (1990) 53.

attachment to culture, *habitus* can also be instrumentally adapted. Bentley sets out the example of a Maranao woman from the Philippines who negotiated between the traditionally prescribed role for women of the community and her more liberal education, using – in some instances bending – traditional cultural forms (marriage contracts) to do so. The unwritten guidelines of the Maranao familial relationships and communications complicated the woman's sense of solidarity with her ethnic group. One's feelings about a sense of belonging are, like the Maranao women's, not often straightforward.

In addition to creating a flexible and non-prescriptive social script upon which individuals could draw, the 'structuring structures' in Bourdieu's *habitus* seek to assure their own reproduction in future generations (and other new subjects). The methods of reproduction, and the capacity for variation, are important. Bentley and Bourdieu both neglected how *habitus* may rely upon the body as a storehouse of cultural practice. Judith Butler's theory of the production of the self, an expansion of Michel Foucault's concept of the production of categories by juridical systems,[96] engaged more directly not only with discourse, but with physical practice, and has been particularly influential on studies of identity ever since.[97] Butler argues that gender identity is not only a social construction, but a production of the individual self within a socially defined 'script':

> Gender is the repeated stylization of the body, a set of repeated acts within a highly rigid regulatory frame that congeal over time to produce the appearance of substance, of a natural sort of being.[98]

---

[96] On Butler and Foucault, see Butler (1993) 107–9; McNay (2000) 31–73; on Foucault and identity more broadly, see S. Hall (1996) 10–14.

[97] Butler (1990); (1988); (1993).

[98] Butler (1990) 43–44.

Butler considers here gestures, dress and other acts which might be considered cultural and individual as discursive elements, in addition to linguistic discourse. It is important to note the 'regulatory frame' to which Butler refers; individuals are responsible for their own dress and posture (etc.), but perform such stylizations of the body with an awareness of how they may be received.[99] Near-stereotypical interpretations should not be taken simply as coded messages, but as a personal aesthetic practice with an ambiguous but not wholly absent significance, and so they (even unconsciously) mark an identity which might wrongly or rightly be construed: for example, in a telling episode in the *Anabasis*, at the beginning of the Ten Thousand's attempt to return to Greece. Xenophon and his colleagues attended to Apollonides' use of Boiotian dialect, the mercenary Agasias interpreted Apollonides' pierced ears as evidence of Lydian ethnicity.[100] Though Xenophon as the author gives only a brief endorsement of that interpretation, the more familiar idea of dialect as a reflection of identity is largely swept away for an apparently unnoticed cosmetic detail which gains significance and attention because Apollonides begins to argue against the Greek cause.

More explicit, prescriptive social evaluations of personal stylizations are sometimes developed. Power structures are fundamental to Butler's critical approach, but we might note that parts of the regulatory framework reproduce themselves without active intervention. Performative engagement with that framework produces identity. It is essential for the historicization of gender performance that it is set within a social discourse; clarifying her position in later discussions, Butler notes that gender expression

---

[99] Butler (1993) 1–55; cf. Clammer (2015) 2163: 'Race and ethnicity are (along with gender) the most embodied of all possible states of being.'

[100] Xen. *Anab.* 3.1.26–32; see section 7.2 for further discussion. On Xenophon's ambiguity, see Ma (2004); on visual identification in the *Anabasis*, see Harman (2013).

has most often *not* been a radical choice, but an attempt to imitate socially normalized ideals of a gender system.[101] Clearly, expressions of ethnic identity likewise should not be addressed purely as the results of pre-existing identity.

Butler does introduce race (not ethnicity *per se*) in *Bodies That Matter* as part of the imbrication of identity formation, without clearly positioning it in her performative model – she does not substantiate references to 'racializing norms'.[102] Importantly, Butler noted that the 'natural' concept of sex is no less socially construed than gender, but in adding 'natural' race to the framework, the suggestive parallels between the social construction of ethnicity and gender go unexplored. Writing before Butler, however, Joshua Fishman more clearly suggests that ethnicity 'creates expressive obligations and opportunities for *behaving* as the ancestors behaved and preserving their great heritage by transmitting it' (emphasis mine).[103] Though his presumption of a patrimony of ethnic culture gives a less theorized view of what *doing* ethnicity achieves, Fishman acknowledges here the *doing* (and *knowing*) of ethnicity; there is a sense of conservation and (fictive) continuity of practice.

'Performativity' is not the same as 'performance'. Butler has highlighted practices, most notably drag, which actively 'dramatize' the performer's gender, and in her political stance endorsed ways of 'troubling' gender.[104] Her view, however, is that performativity involves the construction of the self; the social system develops the 'script' for expressions of identity which are intelligible to both self and all others: 'the mundane social audience, including the actors themselves come to believe [the identity]

---

[101] Butler (1994). Note Benhabib (1995); Butler (1995) for useful criticisms on the question of agency in performance and a partial rebuttal.

[102] Salih (2002) 64, quoting Butler (1993) 17–18.

[103] Fishman (1980).

[104] Butler (1990) 134–41.

and to perform in the mode of belief'.[105] One of my chapters on culture and ethnicity explores musical performance, which has an audience more aware of spectating, and a performer or performers more deliberately representing themselves and others. But if Greek poets were able to imbue ethnic significance into their music, then the musical audience was also a 'mundane' social audience, and the lines between performance and performativity could be blurred. The even more mundane experience of language forms the focus of the second chapter on culture.

Some scholars have felt that performative models seek to undermine genuine identity.[106] The mimesis of the social and cultural expectations surrounding a category can allow for individual experimentation; it can also devolve into mime, which does not have a strong basis in the identity, and thus achieves limited social acceptance. In the tradition of continental philosophy and its potential for political agitation, Butler openly espouses 'troubling' gender roles. Such an approach is largely concerned with exploring individual identity, and how it is fulfilled, while undermining oppressive social systems. There are ongoing controversies in the relevance of performative identity to race and ethnicity: for example, the case of Rachel Dolezal in the United States, who was an instructor in Africana Studies and civil rights activist and performed her identity as a 'black woman' while being European in ancestry. The revelation of Dolezal's ancestry in 2015 in conflict with her social performance provoked criticism, and Dolezal stood aside from much of her work. A provocative article by Rebecca Tuvel in *Hypatia*, 'In Defence of Transracialism', explored the ethics of supporting transgender individuals in the performance of their own identity while denying the same support to individuals like

---

105 Butler (1988) 520.
106 Benhabib (1995).

Dolezal.[107] Tuvel's piece reflects and draws upon similar debate between feminist schools on the inclusion and exclusion of transsexual women, and the controversial history of white actors performing offensive stereotypes in 'blackface'.[108] However Tuvel's discussion received a serious backlash,[109] particularly noting a failure to engage with existing scholarship from trans and non-white scholars. The controversy within feminist philosophy received substantial coverage in the popular press, some in defence of Tuvel. The challenge of exploring the different forms of identity through borrowed analytical frameworks should be acknowledged. Butler herself, writing in the preface to the tenth-anniversary reedition of *Gender Trouble*, was cautious about how to approach race and performativity with due acknowledgement of racial identity.[110] It is not my intention in this thesis to import the question of social hegemonies which are fundamental to the modern study of gender and race. It is clear that performative approaches have often arisen from and engage with problems of systematic violence which are not *generally* appropriate when talking about ancient Greek ethnicities. For example, music has particularly been studied as a form of expression available to those of African origin who were denied other such tools. What we must take from Black Studies' approaches to music is the insight that performance can be a marker of identity, and methods for investigating the use of music.

Jonathan Hall retrenched his position against using material culture and other products of *habitus* in the study of ethnicity in the way advocated by Bentley and Siân

---

107 Tuvel (2017)

108 Cf. Brubaker (2016) 15–69.

109 For an overview of the controversy and responses, see the symposium in *Philosophy Today* 68.1 (2018).

110 Butler (1999) xv–xvi. Butler was one of the signatories of an open letter condemning Tuvel's essay.

Jones, because such symbols do not refer to a sense of ethnic solidarity.[111] The issue is perhaps one of an overly strict idea of what signals a historian may appreciate in cultural material, as opposed to what a contemporary might appreciate. He does nevertheless allow that *habitus* can sometimes be useful. Music and dance, language, *etc.*, are nevertheless very different areas of evidence than that generally pursued by Hall and other Greek cultural historians for ethnicity. Some space has been given to religious practices, for which we often have better evidence. The issue with other fields of action is not one of evidence but of a methodological rejection of cultural practices' ability to inform ethnicity. Hall has focused overwhelmingly on a clear sense of belonging, both self-identification and ascription of others by criteria which are superficially static. Dialect and other cultural elements do not bear up well as criteria or evidence of identity because they are too easily adopted and appropriated, particularly for political purposes. As we have seen, this prioritizes criteria of ethnicity, and more broadly an oppositional construction of identity, while neglecting the place of indicia within that discourse. A performative approach to non-material culture enables the examination of another aspect of ethnicity, rather than replacing Hall's investigations of definitions. One of Hall's objections to the study of ethnicized culture is that it treats ethnicity as a deterministic force:

> [Parsons or Geertz] think in terms of social "actors", behaving according to a pre-determined script and driven by unseen sociocultural forces, instead of according recognition to active, knowing individuals, who "possess subjectivity, a sense of self, and biographical uniqueness."[112]

---

[111] Hall (2002) 21–22, cf. Jones (1997) 26–27.

[112] Hall (1997) 30.

We have already considered the problems of élites as unseen drivers of ethnic forces. Hall pays close attention to the capacity of individual agents, e.g. noting that individuals are quite capable of adopting different dialects or even codeswitching between two in different contexts,[113] but his work nevertheless often has to look to the group as a whole, without full exploration of the dialectic between individual and collective.

It is admittedly seldom easy to pursue the social definition of historical individuals from ancient Greece, but performative identity gives us a better understanding of how identity might be constituted and expressed individually as well as in groups by proposing a view of ethnicity in which the cultural 'script' is visible to the actors. One particularly useful feature of performative theory is the attention to the production of a natural sense of identity.[114] Culture-focused studies of ethnic identities have often stumbled on objections such as Hall's to the easy adaptation of the social conceptualization of cultural elements. Studying the production of a sense of naturalness is essential when approaching the ethnic conceptualization of cultural material, for it seems troublingly 'essentialist' otherwise to accept, e.g., that a particular form of music demonstrates the ἦθος of an ancient ethnic group, which as we shall see was the apparent argument of Plato and Heraclides of Pontus in particular.[115]

Finally, it is important to note that a performative approach to identity in the Greek world is not entirely an imposition of modern scholarly theory onto ancient evidence. Greek is endowed with extensive vocabulary which expresses performance in terms of ethnic group, and which unites various forms of action within a single stylization, expressed as a verb. There are over two thousand verbs, from some seven

---

113 Hall (1997) 141–81.
114 Butler (1990) 33.
115 See section 6.5.

hundred roots, which derive a characteristic action from nouns by means of the suffix -ιζ(ω) or -αζ(ω).[116] For example, the verb ἀγοράζω (e.g.) denotes any action typical of the ἀγορά, not only to shop, but also to assemble in the *agora*.[117] From the late sixth or early fifth century we begin to see this derivation used with ethnonyms, most famously μηδίζω from Μῆδος, and ἀττικίζω from Ἀττικός.[118] Both of these are generally taken to mean 'take the side of' the Persians or Athenians; however more clearly performative references are also to be found: βοιωτιάζω τῇ φωνῇ (Xen. *Anab.* 3.1.26, of Apollonides, mentioned above for his Lydian ear-piercings) – the same verb is also used by Xenophon in the political sense (*Hell.* 5.4.34). As we shall see in chapters 6 and 7, the one verb αἰολίζω can be used to denote dialect and musical modes. These verbs are presumably intertwined with the adverbs in -στι, e.g. δωριστί, αἰολιστί, much used by ancient lexicographers and grammarians to discuss dialect; the same adverbs are frequently used in the musical sphere as well.[119] We might note how little differentiation is made in the construction of these expressions: while Xenophon in the *Anabasis* felt it necessary to specify the instrument of Boiotian performance, in other cases context alone demonstrates a political, musical or linguistic interpretation of the verb. Expressing stylization through a verb derived from an ethnonym underlines the performative nature

---

[116] Greppin (1997); not every verb in -ζω has this semantic tone; the suffix arises from reanalysis of the common present-stem suffix -*y*- after velar and dental roots, and some such verbs are not denominal but morphologically levelled forms (e.g. δαμάζω/δαμάω; see Chantraine (1991) secs267, 269, 271; Sihler (1995) sec.465.2-3).

[117] See e.g. Σ Ar. *Ach.* 720, which claims that this meaning is specifically Attic, and that Corinna (fr. 688) thus censured her fellow Boiotian Pindar for using it in his *Parthenia*. Chadwick (1996) 34–39 argues, against most earlier interpretation, especially of the abstruse use at Thuc. 6.51, that ἀγοράζω has the very specific meaning 'to shop' in almost all cases, but *SEG* 3 115.18 (the Athenian tribe Antiochis to vote ὅταν ἀγοράζει) is certainly not so limited and would be a strange extension from 'shopping'.

[118] E.g. Hdt. 4.144, Thuc. 3.62; Casevitz (1991).

[119] Anderson (1994) 49 notes that the earlier uses of these adverbs are slightly more likely to be musical, although he does not link adverbs to performative verbs in -ζω.

of dialect and music, and also places an emphasis on the subject's identity as an agent in the performance.

1.4 Conclusions

The resonance of ethnic feeling has long been a serious concern for historians of ancient Greek: Édouard Will struggled to identify serious ethnic sentiment in Greek antiquity, noting that there was no genuine distinction to be made between Dorians and Ionians in political, social, or material practice or thought.[120] Thucydides' depiction of Sicilian affairs, he suggested, contrasted the purported ethnic solidarity in practice on each side with the extreme diversity of the forces in practice. John Alty in response pointed to the elite bias of our sources and characterized Herodotus and especially Thucydides as members of a sceptical intelligentsia who sought to problematize the ethnic motivations of the masses.[121] I will return to the scepticism of historians in my final chapters. What Alty's discussion shows most clearly is that ethnic thinking was itself a major aspect of late fifth century discourse, but this does not precisely suggest where this discourse was taking place if other Greeks were not so sceptical as the historians. An ethnosymbolic approach to identity in general relies on the recognition of the *symbolic*, and identifies a dialectical construction of the symbolism. As historians reliant above all on the textual remains of antiquity, particularly when we are enjoined to find evidence for discursive practices rather than assume them, we are reliant on the result of the discourses which we wish to study. It is here that the established methodology for studying Greek ethnicity makes its most obvious leap. If we acknowledge that ethnic discourses were lively and

120 Will (1956).
121 Alty (1982).

could have prompted action, we should be more sensitive to performance contexts and social considerations for the myths and history we analyse.

One of the goals of this thesis is to treat the common cultural features which are often lumped together as indicia of ethnic characteristics not as objective categories of human behaviour but as social constructions of their own. Dialects and artistic styles (*inter alia*) can be subject to fictive processes similar to those which give social value to kinship and territory. It is important to emphasize that my interest in the cultural elements of ethnicity is on the use of these elements as symbolic markers, and not an attempt to revindicate culture-history from the early twentieth century or to identify an objective block of cultural elements which can be called 'Aiolian culture'. Criticisms of these approaches constitute (generally valid) charges of the imposed perspective of the ethnographer or historian. My focus is not then on the content of Aiolian music or Aiolian dialect features (both of which have serious reconstructive issues), but on the ethnicized discourse which surrounded them. This leads to an analysis which is at times more focused on the representations of identity within the Aiolian group than in Aiolians' interactions with other ethnic groups. This should not be taken as an argument that interactions with other groups were not significant, or as an invalidation of the general interest in ethnic boundaries which Barth initiated. In keeping with the methodological rigour urged by Hall, I shall restrict myself to aspects of culture which were specifically referred to as 'Aiolian'. In order to relate the cultural discourse to a population group, I must however first set out what the name 'Aiolian' means.

2. Defining the Aiolians

As we have seen, there is strong indication in ancient sources that the Aiolians were a major ethnic group in the Archaic and Classical Periods, on par with Dorians and Ionians. The latter were undisputedly large groups which encompassed not only multiple settlements but multiple large regions. Evidence for which settlements and regions 'Dorian' and 'Ionian' names belonged to is not lacking. The evidence for the Aiolian ethnonym, however, is somewhat less forthcoming. The absence of straightforward evidence for the use of the term Aiolian independently of the other intra-Hellenic groups has given rise to peremptory dismissals in some recent scholarship of a substantial Aiolian identity. Scholars such as Parker and Beck have been attracted to the suggestion that 'Aiolian' was not an independent, internally constructed category but a default term available to 'various peoples who were seen to be either Dorians nor Ionians'.[122]

We must remember that our sources do not offer a strong definition of *any* ethnic groups. There is however substantially more evidence in Greek literature for connection between the regions of Boiotia, Thessaly, Lesbos and Aiolis, some of which is explicit in its ethnic character, and otherwise often not very different from evidence for other ethnic associations in the ancient world. In this chapter I examine the use of the name 'Aiolian' and related terms. We must first consider, without begging the question, *which* peoples could be called Aiolian. It is clear that it applied specifically; many places which might have been eager to latch on to a prestigious Hellenic group were neither Dorian, Ionian, nor Aiolian. Ancient scholarship already formulated arguments about Aiolian involvement at two cities on the Corinthian Gulf – Kalydon and Pleuron in Aitolia –

[122] Parker (2008) 460.

which incidentally demonstrate that not that not every unassigned place could be Aiolian. There is however also an ancient etymological argument about the meaning of 'Aiolian'; this needs to be considered in the historiographical context from which it arises. Lastly, I observe that the regions considered within this thesis have more general evidential issues in the Archaic and Classical periods than the difficulties of ethnic associations; one of the most important of these is that although each region was clearly considered a geographical unit by the end of the Archaic period, if not earlier, this did not necessarily entail political or ethnic unity.

The scope of each intra-Hellenic ethnic group is not set out in its entirety by any surviving list of relevant poleis and regions. The terms Δωριεῖς and Ἴωνες appear in local and pan-Hellenic poetry, in the rhetoric of international relations (both speeches and explanations in historiography, and the epigraphically preserved records of diplomatic exchanges), in ancient scholarship, and in onomastics, as the names of both regions and of individuals. Beyond references to the people themselves as 'Dorian' (etc.), the application of ethnic labels to foundation practices, kinship mythology, the veneration of particular aspects of god or celebration of particular festivals, civic divisions and calendars have all been suggested as forms of ethnic differentiation, which I discuss later in this thesis through the paradigm of 'ethnicization'. Studying the ethnonym and the identity which lay behind it thus demands a polythetic definition constructed with these disparate pieces of evidence. Some caution is necessary in the process: it is now acknowledged, for example, that belonging to a wider ethnic group does not mean that a polis or region will have uniformity of practice with other members of the ethnic group. At the upper level of Greek ethnicity, it is blindingly clear that formulations about shared language and institutions (Hdt. 8.144) were abstractions. At the intra-Hellenic level, for example, the three Dorian tribes (Hylleis, Dymanes and Pamphyloi) are found in many

Dorian cities, but some cities have extra, or fewer, tribes.[123] More importantly, the evidence that these things were found from city to city is not evidence of *why* they were shared – the assumption that a Dorian or Aiolian culture and civic structure was imported wholesale at the time of foundation or demographic change gets the causal relationship between the shared institutions and the (narrative of) migration backwards. One of the most common of these shared indications has been the epichoric dialect. Dialects however must be considered in terms of dialectical *groups*, as there was substantial local variation.

Two related explanations for the comparative obscurity of Aiolians as an ethnic group have been tendered recently. The first, promoted by Holt Parker and extended by Hans Beck, relies on a narrow definition of the term 'Aiolian' in Classical and Hellenistic evidence (particularly inscriptions); that it was applied exclusively to the small area in the north-western Aegean, but seized upon by scholars of antiquity who applied it much too broadly. This assertion is not based on a thorough examination of the evidence for the name Aiolian but follows Eduard Meyer's article on the Aiolians for the *Realencyclopädie*. Meyer noted firstly that the name Αἰολεῖς was only used in north-western Asia Minor, which is true in epigraphy but rather more complicated in literary texts.[124] Chancellery practices in Boiotia and Thessaly, and the varying levels of epigraphic evidence available, make for dubious grounds to argue that a Boiotian would not have recognized him- or herself as Aiolian; the Aiolians of Asia Minor had no choice, and the Lesbians *did* have the choice but did not often use the term Aiolian in epigraphy.[125] Turning to literary evidence, Meyer takes several references to the Aiolians

---

123 Hall (1997) 9–10.
124 Meyer (1893).
125 See Ellis-Evans (2019) 262, with prior bibliography (n. 40).

as simple reflections of putative Thessalian origins, and with an outdated overview of eponymous ancestors asserts that all tribes with eponymous heroes descended from the eponymous Aiolos 'zu den Aiolern gerechnet, vor allem die Aitoler und Eleer'. He recites Strabo's dialectical geography. 'So ist man schliesslich dazu gekommen, alle griechischen Stämme, die nicht dorisch oder ionisch sind, als Aioler zu bezeichnen.' This is a fairly typical example of polythetic definition, but we might note that Meyer's ultimate criterion is the sharing of eponymous ancestors, which he implies is universally recognized and unchanging. Meyer allows no sense of historical development, although his main authority is Augustan, nor why all Greek 'tribes' (*Stämme*) from outside the Isthmus and Athens would want to use the label which was occupied foremost by that small group of residents of Lesbos and Aiolis.

The earliest written evidence for the Aiolians may come from Bronze Age Knossos, where a single word *a₃-wo-le-u-si* on a seal suggests the dative plural of the ethnonym (i.e. Αἰολεῦσι).[126] This surely represents a group which was granted or given something by the palace functionaries, but the context is so disjointed that it is not worth entertaining a Late-Bronze-Age antecedent of the Aiolians.[127] Later tradition very rarely connects Aiolians with Crete at all.[128] Excluding this, the first reference is in the feminine

---

126 KN Ws 1707.α.1–2; the reading of the first sign is not certain. See Olivier (1968); *DM* s.v. *a₃-wo-re-u-si*. The other faces read *do-ke* and *[.]-ja-wo-ne*, suggestive but not substantive.

127 *Contra* Duhoux (1972). The name *I-ja-wo-ne* (Ion?) can be read, more clearly, on another tablet of Knossos (KN X 146,4). There is no consensus whether this is evidence, however scant, for the use of the ethnonym in Bronze Age: Ruijgh (1991) 268.

128 Diodorus (4.60.2) includes Aiolians and Pelasgians amongst Teutamas son of Doros' followers to Crete; the connection could have arisen from the association of Teutamas' father-in-law, the eponymous hero Kretheus (elsewhere Krēteus) with the Aiolid Krētheus; see van Binsbergen and Woudhuizen (2011) 275. Strabo, citing Andron (10.4.6 = *FGrH* 10 F 16a) places associates the Dorian Cretans with Histiaiotis in Thessaly, based in part on a fanciful etymology of the famous Homeric epithet τριχάϊκες (*Od.* 19.177) as a reference to a tripartite Dorian homeland in that region (perhaps quite ancient, cf. [Hes.] fr. 233 M–W; see further Toye on *BNJ* 10 F 16a). In Herodotus the early Dorians clash, likely as part of the same story, with Kadmeians in north-eastern Thessaly (1.56), while Strabo places them nearer the Pindos.

adjective which Hesiod applies to his father's hometown Kyme.[129] This may be a purely geographical designation, to distinguish Kyme in Asia Minor from others. The intended contrast was perhaps with the Euboian colony in Campania which we tend to refer to by its Latin name, Cumae, although this was surely quite a new foundation in Hesiod's time.[130] There is also the small Euboian town of Kyme, claimed to be the namesake of the Italian colony.[131] These small Kymai were of dubious status in the early Archaic period; it is not out of the question that Hesiod was drawing on the significance of Aiolian connections rather than geographic import.

It should perhaps be noted that there is no reference to Aiolian people between the possible Bronze Age testimonium and Hesiod. It has gone unobserved that where there are passing references to Dorians and Ionian groups in Homer,[132] the evidence for Aiolians draws only on the mythical figures immediately related to the eponymous ancestor Aiolos. The Dorians and Ionians are curiously minor, not the major groups of Archaic and Classical history, but they are unequivocally population groups. The Aiolid figures are many and varied, even at this early stage of literary expression, but they have very little to do with the idea of Greek peoples, and indeed only one figure, Sisyphos, is explicitly related to Aiolos at all, as part of the genealogy of Bellerophon:

> ἔστι πόλις Ἐφύρη μυχῷ Ἄργεος ἱπποβότοιο,
> ἔνθα δὲ Σίσυφος ἔσκεν, ὃ κέρδιστος γένετ᾽ ἀνδρῶν,

---

129 Hes. *W&D* 636; see section 3.3 for discussion of the migration. Aiolis is not necessarily an established region but simply the feminine form of the ethnic adjective (as many regional names in Greece were).

130 See West (1978) *ad W&D* 363, with other references. Herodotus uses the adjective Φρικωνίς when he wishes to make the same distinction, 1.149.1 (but τῆς Αἰολίδος at 7.194.1).

131 Strabo 5.3.4 (but Chalkidian only in Thuc. 6.4, Livy 8.22); for early archaeological evidence for Euboian Kyme, see Sapouna-Sakellaraki (1998).

132 Dorians: *Il.* 2.653–70(? Rhodians), *Od.* 19.172–81, see Finkelberg (2011); Ionians: *Il.* 13.685–722, 20.403–5(? Helikonian Poseidon), see Rutherford (2011); Achaians *passim* in both the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. For some references to the eponymous hero Aiolos and his children, without particular ethnic relevance: see chapter 5.

Σίσυφος Αἰολίδης· ὃ δ᾽ ἄρα Γλαῦκον τέκεθ᾽ υἱόν,
αὐτὰρ Γλαῦκος τίκτεν ἀμύμονα Βελλεροφόντην·
Il. 6.152–55

Ephyra here is pre-Dorian Corinth. There is one later oblique reference to early Aiolians at Corinth (Thuc. 4.42), fighting the Dorian invaders who encamped outside the city. Aiolians at Corinth at the time of the Dorian invasion may be nothing more than a Thucydidean extrapolation from this passage of the *Iliad*; in the *Catalogue of Ships* Corinth is part of Agamemnon's territory (2.570).[133]

The Aiolians are thus the only major intra-Hellenic group which is entirely absent from Homeric epic. The passing references to Dorians and Ionians are extremely difficult both in terms of their relevance to the Homeric world and as evidence for archaic ethnicity. It does not require dedication to any one modern idea of Homeric authorship to aver that a significant contribution was made to the *Iliad* by people who were very familiar with the Aiolian area, likely at a time when Aiolian Greeks probably already dwelt there, if they were not Aiolian Greeks themselves. If the relative neglect of the intra-Hellenic groups represents an assumption that the importance of these ethnic groups arose only after the heroic period,[134] then it seems that the Aiolians were an extreme case. Did the ethnogenesis of the Aiolians occur only once the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* had largely been shaped, or was their association with Trojan territory so strong that they were excised from the heroic period completely?

From the end of the seventh century and beginning of the sixth century, references to Aiolians are more frequent. Alcaeus refers to an apparently Aiolian goddess at Messon on Lesbos (Αἰολήιαν [κ]υδαλίμαν θέον, fr. 129.6); there is some difficulty about the

[133] See section 3.1.1.
[134] Ross (2005).

derivation of the adjective here, which Lobel showed was based on the name Αἴολος rather than the ethnic adjective Αἰολεύς.[135] This must still reflect a degree of ethnic identity. It is noteworthy that the poem refers to the worship of a triad of divinities – Hera, Zeus, and Dionysos – by all Lesbians.[136] There is little sign of similar cult elsewhere in the Greek world.[137] References to Aiolian music appear in the poetry of Lasus of Hermione and Pindar.

The Classical period was a high point of Aiolian ethnic culture and cooperation. Searching for evidence for the kinship that the Aiolians of Lesbos and Kyme recognized with the Boiotians in the fifth century BCE, Parker nevertheless complains that Cook offers no evidence in his chapter on migrations for the *Cambridge Ancient History* for the assertion that the Aiolians and Boiotians were kin.[138] Cook does not give references, but Meyer cites one of an essential set of examples from Thucydides. More than demonstrating kinship between Asiatic Aiolians and Boiotians, Thucydides shows that the term Αἰολεύς had a broader definition. In the full catalogue of allies who came to Syracuse in 413 BCE, a passage which makes much of ethnic feelings during the Peloponnesian War,[139] Thucydides notes that the Aiolians fell on both sides of the conflict:

> πρὸς δ’ αὐτοῖς Αἰολῆς, Μηθυμναῖοι μὲν ναυσὶ καὶ οὐ φόρῳ ὑπήκοοι, Τενέδιοι δὲ καὶ Αἴνιοι ὑποτελεῖς. οὗτοι δὲ

---

135 *P. Oxy.* 18.2165, p. 35. Ellis-Evans (2019) 266–72 posits an unattested myth that Aiolos had founded Lesbos or Mytilene before Aiolis, based on the Mytilenean reinvention of Αἰολήια Hera as Θεὰ Αἴολις Καρπόφορος, whom the first-century CE Mytileneans assimilated to the divinized Agrippina the Elder and Younger. This has the reverse problem, that the goddess associated with Aiolos is now rather associated more generally with Aiolians, and contestation over the mainland territory opposite Lesbos, as well as(!) imperial patronage.

136 Pironti and Pirenne-Delforge (2014).

137 See chapter 8.

138 Parker (2008) 434 (citations n. 17); Cook (1975).

139 Alty (1982); Fragoulaki (2013) 39–57, on emotion and kinship in Thucydides generally.

> Αἰολῆς Αἰολεῦσι τοῖς κτίσασι Βοιωτοῖς ⟨τοῖς⟩ μετὰ Συρακοσίων κατ' ἀνάγκην ἐμάχοντο, Πλαταιῆς δὲ καταντικρὺ Βοιωτοὶ Βοιωτοῖς μόνοι εἰκότως κατὰ τὸ ἔχθος.
>
> Thuc. 7.57.5

The phrase Αἰολῆς Αἰολεῦσι τοῖς κτίσασι, 'Aiolians against Aiolian founders', makes this contrast explicit; it also clearly shows that the Boiotians could be considered not simply the Aiolians' founders, although this would normally be enough to assume kinship, but were also still part of the same ethnic group.[140] Boiotians are also called Aiolians by Theopompus,[141] Pausanias,[142] two scholiasts to Pindar,[143] and an anonymous author in Stephanus of Byzantium.[144] These sources are all evidently post-Classical, and they are not without individual curiosities. The following chapters of this thesis demonstrate that there are many other ties between Boiotians and Asiatic Aiolians. It seems unlikely that the notion of kinship in historical times was just an outgrowth of Hesiod's family relationship with Kyme, as Parker suggests.[145] If the Boiotians were widely acknowledged to be a member of the Aiolian ethnic group, then in many cases the term Βοιωτοί had the virtue of necessary specificity. In the same way that the Spartans are only intermittently called Dorians, Boiotians' Aiolian ethnicity could be acknowledged when it was particularly relevant, as in Thucydides' juxtaposition. At some point the depth of evidence must outweigh special pleadings to dismiss individual sources.

---

140 Hornblower, *CT* 3:663–4, 1042, rejects the deletion of ⟨τοῖς κτίσασι⟩ proposed by Classen and Steup. See also Thuc. 3.2.7, 3.102.5, 4.42.2, 8.100.3.

141 Theopompus, *FGrH* 115 F 212 (= Steph. Byz. s. Χαλία).

142 Paus. 9.22.3, 10.8.4.

143 Σ Pind. *Ol.* 1.162, 164; Pind. *Nem.* 3.136.

144 Steph. Byz. s.v. Ἰωνία.

145 Parker (2008) 434 n. 14; on Beck's expansion of this thesis, see section 3.3.

So much for the Boiotians. The Thessalians are less clearly identified as Aiolians; as we have seen, however, Heraclides of Pontus does clearly associate Thessalians with Aiolian music.[146] More clearly, Herodotus notes that Aiolis was the name for Thessaly (i.e. Thessaliotis?) at the time when the Thessalians arrived.[147] I will discuss the circumstances of this migration in the following chapter, but it is important to acknowledge that stories of population change did not necessarily stop a later population from enjoying the ethnic associations which had already accumulated. Local heroic cults often had reference to the heroes of an earlier population. Parallel cults of Athena Itonia in Thessaly and Boiotia (outside Koroneia) are explained by the Boiotians' migration; at the same time, Denver Graninger has argued that the sanctuary of this ancient cult at Philia in Thessaliotis was promoted as a federal sanctuary of the Thessaloi after 196 because of its proximity to the Thessaloi's mythical migration route from the west into Thessaly.[148]

Herodotus' assertion that Thessaly was previously called Aiolis leads us to a few curiosities. Multiple lands with the same name, particularly over the course of time and in the context of charter myths, is not a particularly exceptional circumstance. There were two regions called Doris, and it is possible that the term Ionia was applied to the mainland at some point as well.[149] The greatest difficulty arises from Thucydides' reference to Kalydon and Pleuron on the Corinthian Gulf (3.102.5); he refers to this area in passing as Aiolis, distinct from the Aitolian territory around it. Kalydon and Pleuron were clearly

---

146 Fr. 163 Wehrli.

147 Hdt. 7.176.4, cf. Diod. Sic. 4.67.2.

148 Graninger (2011) 44; more prosaically, Graninger notes that this territory had also been threatened by Macedon and the Aitolians.

149 Doris in Asia Minor, Hdt. 1.144; in northern Greece, Hdt. 8.31, Thuc. 1.107; mainland Ionia, Solon fr. 4a; Hdt. 7.94.

distinct from their neighbours at the time of the Peloponnesian War, and perhaps down to the 370s.[150] Connection with any Aiolians is hard to substantiate, however. A similar but vague assertion is attributed to Ephorus (by Strabo) and the anonymous author of an *Aiolika*.[151]

> ᾽Εφορος δὲ τοὺς Αἰτωλοὺς εἰπὼν ἔθνος εἶναι μηδεπώποτε γεγενημένον ὑφ᾽ ἑτέροις … ἴσως δή τις ἂν φαίη λέγειν αὐτὸν ἀπόρθητον τὴν Αἰτωλίαν ἀφ᾽ οὗ τοὔνομα τοῦτ᾽ ἔσχε μετὰ τὴν Αἰτωλοῦ παρουσίαν. ἀλλ᾽ ἀφήιρηται καὶ ⟨τούτου⟩ τοῦ νοήματος τὸν λόγον, φήσας ἐν τοῖς ἐφεξῆς τὸ μὲν πλεῖστον τοῦ λαοῦ τοῦ διαμένοντος ἐν τοῖς Αἰτωλοῖς τοῦτο εἶναι τὸ τῶν ᾽Επειῶν †λέγων· συμμιχθέντων δ᾽ αὐτοῖς ὕστερον Αἰολέων τῶν ἅμα Βοιωτοῖς ἐκ Θετταλίας ἀναστάντων, κοινῇ μετὰ τούτων τὴν χώραν κατασχεῖν
>
> Ephorus, *FGrH* 70 F 122a (= Strabo 10.3.2-4)

Strabo unravels a complex polemic against the claimed precision of Ephorus' initial assertion that the Aitolians had never been conquered, the details of which are not wholly relevant; part of his rebuttal is that Ephorus himself reported a movement of Aiolians into Aitolia at the time of the migration of Boiotians from Thessaly – i.e. in the very distant past. Strabo confounds interpretation here by asserting that Aitolians and Aiolians shared this land in common (κοινῇ μετὰ τούτων τὴν χώραν κατασχεῖν), whereas in an earlier but less elaborate explanation of the same story, he refers to the Aiolians expelling Aitolians (οἰκῆσαι τοὺς κατέχοντας βαρβάρους ἐκβαλόντας, 9.3.12). It is thus quite unclear whether Ephorus' mythical history reflected a similar tradition to Thucydides' fifth-century Aiolis of Kalydon and Pleuron (though the *Aiolika* seems to make it clear that the myth did relate to Kalydon, at least); this branch of the Aiolian migration, as we

---

150 Diod. 15.75.1-2.

151 Cf. Σ^{b} *Il.* 2.494, a list of geographic disputes tacitly addressed by or arising from the *Catalogue of Ships*; Wilamowitz attributed them all to Ephorus (see Jacoby on *FGrH* 70 F 28); *Aiolika*, *FGrH* 301 F 1 with Jacoby's introduction.

shall see, is not really discussed elsewhere. We might note in particular Strabo's view that Ephorus was concerned with the peoples involved, and not with the name of that territory.

Sebastiaan Bommeljé tentatively proposed that there was no ethnic reference intended in the name 'Aiolis', but instead it was given to coastal territory at a middle distance from other Greek-inhabited places, across the water, 'a territory within reach, but perhaps originally beyond the horizon of their own known world; in a very literal sense "land across the sea".'[152] Unfortunately, there are fewer distinct instances of places called 'Aiolis' than Bommeljé suggests. The Aiolic islands derive their name directly from the Homeric description of Aiolia, named for their ruler Aiolos, and so should be taken together with them.[153] They are not generally considered Aiolian. Lesbos is called 'Aiolis' on rare occasions, which is fairly simply explained as an ethnic epithet if not *totum pro parte* of the Aiolian area, and so can be taken together with Asiatic Aiolis. The question of what 'Aiolis' on the Corinthian Gulf might have been will return in chapter 3; the evidence is so weak that we should be very careful about interpretation. There are perhaps three areas *called* Aiolis, but conversely so many places in the Aegean qualify for Bommeljé's putative definition that we would expect to see this 'Aiolis' applied much more widely, to the point of uselessness. This does however bring us to the question of whether Αἰολεύς has any indicative etymological content.

There is a notion that aside from the positive definition of Aiolian which has been demonstrated, there was a negative one: Αἰολεῖς was a term for all Greeks who were

---

[152] Bommeljé (1988), quote at 316 (App.).

[153] See *Od.* 10.1. Thucydides calls the fifth-century inhabitants of the Aiolian islands Knidian colonists and Syracusan allies, i.e. Dorians (3.88). Αἰολία was only ever used for the territory of the wind god; the territory of the ethnic group, wherever it is placed, is Αἰολίς.

not Dorian or Ionian. This is usually connected with Strabo's equation of Greek dialect and ethnic identity which I discussed at the beginning of this thesis (8.1.2). I return to the question of ancient dialect maps in chapter 7, but it was clear already to Meyer that Strabo's argument was not grounded in Classical Greek reality. Many of the regions outside the Peloponnese employed dialects which much more closely resembled Doric language than Aiolian; Strabo's argument that the Dorian dialects were isolated from the Aiolian surely does not derive from serious linguistic study. Strabo set out a rough, but deliberately intriguing, sketch of Greek dialects for reasons which had nothing to do with contemporary understanding of dialect groups. It is unlikely that Strabo researched dialects himself, and he does not cite any Greek scholarship on the matter of dialects. So what does his idea of Aiolian as the one of the oldest and widest groups serve?

Felix Jacoby connected Strabo's idea of the Aiolians as a catch-all category with his discussion of Aiolians in Aitolia, discussed above, and thus proposed that Ephorus was responsible for the idea.[154] This is an overextension of anything which can be directly attributed to Ephorus, who in particular seems to have drawn a clear distinction in that story between the Aiolians and other minor ethnic groups of central and northern Greece such as the Aitolians, Epeians and Eleians. We should look elsewhere. It is possible that Strabo has picked up an etymology which was applied to Αἰολεύς, probably by Hellanicus of Mytilene, which gave the ethnonym the meaning 'various'. The evidence comes from Tzetzes' commentary on Lycophron regarding the Aiolian migration to Asia Minor, the first (but irrelevant) part of which matches a comment elsewhere attributed clearly to Hellanicus:[155]

---

[154] Jacoby on *Anonymes über Aioler*, *FGrH* 301.

[155] See Hornblower (2015) 474–476.

> ὁ Ὀρέστης μετὰ τὸ ἀνελεῖν Αἴγισθον χρησμὸν ἔλαβε στέλλεσθαι εἰς ἀποικίαν· ὁ δὲ συντάξας ἐκ διαφόρων ἐθνῶν λαούς, οὓς ἐκάλεσαν Αἰολεῖς διὰ τὸ ἐκ ποικίλων τόπων εἶναι, ἦλθεν εἰς Λέσβον.
>
> Hellanicus, *FGrH* 4 F 32

Similar notes connecting the name of the Aiolians with the variety of their origins, often glossing with the term ποικίλος 'variegated', are found in Menecles of Barca,[156] and Eustathius' commentary on Diogenes Periegetes;[157] all may derive from Hellanicus. The rarity of the root adjective αἰόλος, which is largely poetic, has allowed Hellanicus to be inventive with its meaning. In Homeric language, the primary meaning of αἰόλος is 'swift',[158] or by extension 'of swiftly changing colour'; the latter meaning sees a development in fifth-century poetry towards the meaning 'chequered' or 'variable'. Thus Hellanicus' gloss of Αἰολεῖς as 'people of varied origin' derives from contemporary usage which post-dates the earliest appearance of the term as an ethnonym. Gathering a migratory group from various areas was hardly exceptional, although 'mixed' and 'pure' origins could become a matter of contention. Although Hellanicus was himself Aiolian, it is not necessarily the case that he reflects his compatriots' thinking; he makes fairly frequent use of tenuous etymologies.[159] As I shall show in the following chapter, the Aiolians were not one of the groups which placed great store in which areas they had (or had not) come from. Perhaps this prompted Hellanicus to sketch out something simple, but it is not clearly the case that he was responsible for Strabo's idea of a catch-all category. There are several steps that must be taken from the term Αἰολεῖς to reach this

---

156 Menecles, *FGrH* 270 F 10 (= *Et. Gen.* p. 15 Mi): διὰ τὸ ἐκ πολλῶν ἐθνῶν συνηθροῖσθαι…

157 Eust. Dion. Per. 820: ἐκ ποικίλων τινῶν καὶ μιγάδων ἀνθρώπων…

158 E.g. bees, *Il.* 12.162; horses' feet, *Il.* 19.404; armour, *Il.* 5.295 (LSJ, s.v. αἰόλος A).

159 Fowler, *EGM* 2:298–99. Apostolou (2018) 133, 178, 201–206 discusses the shift in the etymology of 'Aioleis' with reference to other Greek naming strategies (e.g. Pamphylians), assuming that Hellanicus reflects wider views and is not innovating.

conclusion: firstly back to the poetic adjective, then to its fifth-century usage, and then – only at the latest stage – from *varied* to *insignificant* origins. If this etymology lies at the heart of Strabo's catch-all, he has stretched it beyond recognition; neither Hellanicus nor Lycophron really suggests that the Aiolians were the default 'third' group of Greece. For such an argument to hold water, one would like to know why the Aiolians were considered particularly diverse *and nevertheless* a useful unit throughout antiquity, and why 'Greek' would not suffice as a catch-all category for those who were not Dorian or Ionian. The myths and cultural practices associated with Thessaly, Boiotia, Lesbos and Aiolis, which I will explore in the rest of this thesis, would be unexpectedly narrowly applied. It seems more likely that the Aiolians were well-established in Greek ethnic thinking before the category was opened up, perhaps tendentiously, to those who had not typically had kinship links with the Aiolians.[160]

It is worth noting that, although I shall often refer in this thesis simply to the regions and regional ethnonyms, the situation within each one is complex. There is not space for a thorough exegesis of the internal politics of Archaic and Classical Thessaly, Boiotia or the Aiolian area in this introductory section, and regional histories are already available. The historical evidence is patchy; all three regions lie largely outside the spotlight cast by epigraphic material and Attic historiography. It is however worth setting out in brief a few historical problems and details about the ethnic unity and uniformity of these regions which may be relevant to their position within Aiolian identity.

Thessaly was a very large region by Greek standards, although a distinction is normally drawn between the territory on the plains (Thessaly 'proper') and the surrounding hinterlands from the Spercheios Valley in the south-west through Pindus to

---

[160] On the process of opening, see in particular section 8.3.

Pelion on the eastern coast ('wider' Thessaly), which were culturally and perhaps ethnically distinct but dominated by the cities of the plain.[161] Despite the prominence of 'Thessalian myth' in early Greek literature, there is very little which can be said about the history or ethnicity of Thessaly before the fifth century. The two large plains are often called tetradic Thessaly, after the four regions into which the legendary Larissan lawgiver Aleuas divided the plains, perhaps in the sixth century: Phthiotis (south-east), Thessaliotis (south-west), Histiaiotis (north-west), and Pelasgiotis (north-east).[162] The main territory of the Thessalians was thereafter dominated by large aristocratic clans based in the separate settlements, not very different from the southern Greek *poleis*. The land was however tended as at Sparta by a serf population, in Thessaly the *penestai*, who were often considered ethnically distinct from their masters, as were the inhabitants of the peroikic communities in the hinterlands. Opposition to, and control of, these two populations likely helped to shape Thessalian identity.[163] The degree of political unity within Thessaly is difficult to track. Literary sources tell us that Aleuas' descendants in Larisa led the whole of Thessaly to Medism during the Persian Wars, but by the end of the fifth century the region could be very fractious.[164] In the fourth century, powerful leaders from Pherai sought to dominate.[165]

The Boiotians, meanwhile, shared the fertile basins around Lake Kopais, and were notoriously fractious. Stephanie Larson has suggested that early myth, including

---

[161] Both 'Thessaly' and 'Thessalians' (Θεσσαλοί, native Πετθαλοί) can be ambiguous: Decourt et al. (2004) 676–77. There is not enough information about ethnic relations within Thessaly during the Archaic and Classical periods, especially with regard to Aiolian identity, to merit any careful distinction in this thesis between Thessaly 'proper' *vs* 'wider', or the 'Thessalians' *vs* the 'Thessalian state'.

[162] Hellanicus, *FGrH* 601a F 1; Arist. fr. 497 Rose; date, Helly (1995) 170–75.

[163] Graninger (2011) 13.

[164] Hdt. 6.72; 7.6; 9.1, 58; Westlake (1935).

[165] Buckler (2003) 351–84.

the depiction of the Boiotians in the *Iliad*, sought to project a cohesive Boiotian identity.[166] This did not prevent a certain amount of infighting from the seventh century onwards. Political cooperation came at least in the form of a regional magistrate, the Boiotarch, in the first quarter of the fifth century, attested in a dating formula inscribed on a bronze sheet from the Herakleion at Thebes and in Herodotus' explanation (9.15.1) of Mardonios' guided return from Megara into southern Boiotia.[167] This may have extended back to the abortive campaign into Attica with the Chalkidians and Kleomenes in 519/509; the Athenians commemorated their victory over ἔθνεα Βοιωτῶν.[168] The Boiotian League, when not suppressed by external events, was a source of both ethnic cohesion and competition for the hegemony in which the ethnonym was an effective weapon. Thespiai and Plataia both notoriously avoided the Medism which other Boiotian *poleis* committed during the Persian Wars. Plataia's relationship with Athens brought a charge from Thebes that it had rejected τὰ πάτρια, 'ancestral things'. Plataia was occupied and controlled by Thebes from 427 until 387, and although Thebes represented it politically within the Boiotian federal structures (*Hell. Oxy.* 19.3), the population seems to have resided at Athens. Orchomenos evinced more aggressive separatism; in the *Catalogue of Ships* (2.511–16) the northern Boiotian city and its dependent Aspledon are described as a region apart from Boiotia proper, occupied by 'Minyans'. In later texts Orchomenos is general called Boiotian, but it was never overly inclined to follow Thebes' lead.[169]

---

166 Larson (2007).

167 Bronze sheet: see now Aravantinos (2014) 199–202; for the dating by letter forms, see Schachter (2016) 53 n. 8. As Schachter points out, the discovery of the inscription corroborates Herodotus' otherwise unfortunately brief mention.

168 *IG* I^3 501, ML 15.

169 For the early population, Thuc. 4.76.3; later Boiotian: Hdt. 8.34.1, Thuc. 1.113.1, Strabo 9.2.41, Paus. 9.38.9; see Schachter (2014).

Asiatic Aiolis receives a fairly full treatment in Herodotus' description of the Greeks of Asia Minor at the time of the Lydian conquest.[170] His statement that the Troad was in some fashion separate from the rest of Aiolis is curious, but not necessarily indicative of ethnic divisions *per se*. Different authors give very slightly different divisions between the Troad and Aiolis, which suggests that there was a loose regional boundary. Some may acknowledge Persian administrative divisions, whereby the Troad fell under the satrap at Daskyleion and the rest of Aiolis under Sardis. It is worth noting that there are regional ethnonyms for the Troad and Lesbos, but Αἰολεύς is used for all. Lene Rubenstein does however note that it is difficult to prove that much of Aiolis was strongly Hellenized, and there were few powerful cities in the region.[171] The island of Lesbos meanwhile was divided between five separate *poleis*: Mytilene (the largest and most powerful), Methymna, Antissa, Eressos and Pyrrha; Arisbe was absorbed by Methymna before Herodotus' time (1.151). These were all originally non-tributary Athenian allies (Thuc. 2.9) but, with the possible exception of Methymna, subject to oligarchic rule. Mytilene took the leading role from an early period, opposed by Methymna. The latter alone refused to revolt from Athens in 428–7, and was thus spared punishment when the revolt failed; the other cities lost the possession of their territory to Athenian cleruchs, from whom they rented the land, and Mytilene lost its mainland possessions (Thuc. 3.50). There was another abortive revolt late in the Peloponnesian War (Thuc. 8.5, 22–23), for which the Lesbians tried to cooperate (8.32). The history of Lesbos thereafter is more or less that of all Athenian possessions, although very little clear evidence is available.

---

170 Hdt. 1.149–51.

171 Rubenstein (2004) 1033–34.

It is clear then that Boiotia and Thessaly were to some degree acknowledged as Aiolian by the Classical Period. This should not really surprise us, for aside from the consistent comparison of Aiolians with Dorians and Ionians, a minimalist definition of the Aiolians would prompt other anomalies. Most of central Greece, north of the Gulf of Corinth and west of Euboia, would be excluded from Archaic and Classical Hellenic genealogies – without any ancient notice of such a problem. The three Greek peoples of Asia Minor in our period are generally referred to as Dorians, Ionians, and Aiolians, and in modern scholarship the first two need to be qualified as Asiatic Dorians, Asiatic Ionians to differentiate them from the wider scopes of those terms. It is not impossible that the Asiatic Aiolians somehow acquired a high status, but we would need a good explanation for the asymmetries particularly regarding the migration stories, to which I now come.

3. Aiolian Migrations in Tradition

In fifth-century sources, the Thessalians, Boiotians and Aiolians did not exist until the moment of their migration into the regions which were their homes in the historical period. The Archaic sources, above all Homer, are somewhat more complicated, but only in the fourth century was some elaboration really made of the earliest days of these peoples, before the time when they relocated. These elaborations still related directly to the change of region. The traditions about migration are therefore a good place to start the discussion of Aiolian ethnic identity. The question in this chapter is whether the migratory traditions, as alluded to in literary texts and presumably often told aloud in public and private settings, represent any idea of an Aiolian migration or Aiolian identity. At a superficial level, I will show, it seems that the migratory traditions of these three groups were somewhat entangled, but the traditions intentionally depict Thessalians, Boiotians and Aiolians as three separate groups without a common origin. Romantic representations about who led and how the migration occur particularly in fourth-century versions, which were derived from local historians. This development suggest attempts to further distinguish these three groups.

What I address here as migration stories are very often framed instead as 'foundation myths', following the Greek term κτίσεις which describes both the founding of a new settlement and the genre of stories about such foundations. This vocabulary acknowledges the *ex post facto* nature of such 'just so' narratives, developed with the aim of justifying and explaining what already existed.[172] The focus on foundation, however, can lead us to see these stories purely in terms of their ends, and through the

[172] See Apostolou (2019) 33–41 for precautions on the kernel of historic truth in Aiolian migration stories.

narrow perspective of the citizens of individual poleis. Poleis were surely actively engaged in formulating specific traditions of their own pasts. In the case of the Aiolians, however, the traditions always have a wider scope than foundation.[173] The course of the narrative and who it included matters too. It may be helpful, following the lightly theorized network approach developed by Malkin, to consider the locations involved in the migratory tradition as points in a highly decentralized network. The constructed memories of movement form the connections between these points.[174] Migration stories are particularly dense with opportunities to explore ethnic identity. Migratory activity was usually ethnicized along the lines of large ethnic groups, i.e. it was the Dorians, Ionians, Achaians and Aiolians who migrated in the unsettled period directly after the Trojan War, while in later 'colonial' foundations the settlers came from specific (if multiple) poleis but brought their ethnic identities with them. The creation of the new settlement is rarely the primary focus of the narrative in any Aiolian story.

An initial comparison with the migration traditions of the other sub-Hellenic identities is instructive. The Dorian and Ionian migrations were similarly the earliest moment of their existence in Greek consciousness. The narratives however could be direct; Herodotus' description of the descent of the Dorians from the north suggests four stages of migration, stopping in different regions along the way, from Pthiotis to Histiaiotis within Thessaly, then to 'Makednon', then Dryopis, then the Peloponnese:

> ἐπὶ μὲν γὰρ Δευκαλίωνος βασιλέος οἴκεε γῆν τὴν Φθιῶτιν, ἐπὶ δὲ Δώρου τοῦ Ἕλληνος τὴν ὑπὸ τὴν Ὄσσαν τε καὶ τὸν Ὄλυμπον χώρην, καλεομένην δὲ Ἱστιαιῶτιν· ἐκ δὲ τῆς Ἱστιαιώτιδος ὡς ἐξανέστη ὑπὸ Καδμείων, οἴκεε ἐν Πίνδῳ Μακεδνὸν καλεόμενον· ἐνθεῦτεν δὲ αὖτις ἐς τὴν

[173] For an interesting discussion of 'Aiolis without migration', see Apostolou (2018)
[174] Malkin (2011).

> Δρυοπίδα μετέβη καὶ ἐκ τῆς Δρυοπίδος οὕτω ἐς Πελοπόννησον ἐλθὸν Δωρικὸν ἐκλήθη.
>
> Hdt. 1.56.3

The final naming of the Dorians, introduced before this passage as a 'Greek race', implies that though apparently unified in their wanderings, they did not consolidate into a named people until they left Dryopis, which in the historical period bore the name Doris, and arrived in the Peloponnese. Herodotus breaks off the story of Dorian (Spartan) origins there. The final part of the migration, from 'windy Erineos' in Doris, already had currency in archaic Sparta. Herodotus however was also aware of the messy process of occupying the Peloponnese after arrival which divided the Dorians into distinct regional sub-groups, raised by the Athenians in debate after Salamis (9.27). Herodotus gives somewhat shorter shrift to the Ionian migration from the Peloponnese to Asia Minor, woven with some disrespect for his native region's northern neighbours, particularly towards their overweening claims to ethnic purity (1.145-6). There are many other tellings, specifically local variants which do (for example) offer a more complex vision of different peoples coming together in the Ionian cities of Asia Minor, but the core of these stories consistently offers a way to understand and communicate the ethnic identity of Dorian and Ionian places. Robert Fowler expresses a contrast between Dorian and Ionian narratives in terms of simplex and multiplex: 'the amazing variety of peoples who joined them symbolizes their progression from multiplex to simplex (to the extent that they were ever simplex) at this stage in the history, if not before'.[175] The Dorian people on the other hand was 'already indisputably formed'.[176]

---

[175] Fowler (2018) 46.
[176] Fowler (2018) 48.

The Aiolian migrations were rarely narrated together, or at length. The core of the myth is expressed as three somewhat linked migrations. Thucydides states that the Thessalians entered north-eastern Greece from the west after the Trojan War, pushing out the Boiotians from the area known in Thucydides' lifetime as Thessaly; the Boiotians then went south: Βοιωτοί τε γὰρ οἱ νῦν ἑξηκοστῷ ἔτει μετὰ Ἰλίου ἅλωσιν ἐξ Ἄρνης ἀναστάντες ὑπὸ Θεσσαλῶν τὴν νῦν μὲν Βοιωτίαν, πρότερον δὲ Καδμηίδα γῆν καλουμένην ᾤκισαν (1.12.3). At about the same time as the Boiotians' arrival in central Greece (according to Ephorus), the expedition to Aiolis set out under Agamemnon's son Orestes: Ἀμύκλαθεν γὰρ ἔβα σὺν Ὀρέστᾳ, Αἰολέων στρατιὰν χαλκεντέα δεῦρ' ἀνάγων (Pind. *Pyth.* 11.34-5). From these brief mentions we would be justified in considering the Thessalians, Boiotians and Aiolians as separate, simplex groups.

Each tradition seems to have used the leadership of the migrant group especially as a way of asserting independence, and over time these figures become central in different ways to the telling of origins. A geographical element, addressing and codifying the size and history of the area controlled, is often present too. Aside from leadership and geography, we may observe in what follows the way in which authors generally wrote about *simplex* Aiolian subgroups, and contrast this with sometimes hesitant approaches to complexities of changing geographic and demographic vocabulary. There is also much evidence of substantial reorientations of migration traditions, in some obscure texts, and so it will be interesting to explore the different versions in some detail as well as the entanglement of the origins of these three peoples. We may begin with one substantial shift, which caused some difficulty in antiquity, arising from the earliest extant form of Greek geographic ethnography, in the Homeric *Catalogue of Ships*. This relates to the location of the Boiotians, and may suggest a time before the Boiotians gave voice to links with Thessaly (and the Thessalians?). I will address Boiotian and Thessalian migrations

together, as Thucydides did, because in most accounts they are entwined, usually causally linked. They are much related to other migrations, too, which fall beyond the scope of this chapter, but I will come after this to the Aiolian migration and its use of the family of Agamemnon and Orestes. Did leadership in this tradition arise from aristocratic rivalries in archaic Lesbos, or broader regional issues?

3.1 Thessalian and Boiotian migrations

3.1.1 Boiotia in the *Iliad* and the migration tradition

The earliest description of Boiotia, in Homer's *Catalogue of Ships*, already depicts the Boiotians in the territory which was later called Boiotia, although Thucydides dated the complete expulsion of Boiotians from their homeland in Thessaly to sixty years *after* the fall of Troy. Thucydides and other sources are plainly aware of Homer's Boiotia, and yet they are unanimous in a post-Trojan War migration. The description of the cities however makes it all but certain that the *Iliad* did describe Boiotia, and not their pre-migratory homeland:

> Βοιωτῶν μὲν Πηνέλεως καὶ Λήϊτος ἦρχον
> Ἀρκεσίλαός τε Προθοήνωρ τε Κλονίος τε,
> οἵ θ' Ὑρίην ἐνέμοντο καὶ Αὐλίδα πετρήεσσαν
> Σχοῖνόν τε Σκῶλόν τε πολύκνημόν τ' Ἐτεωνόν,
> Θέσπειαν Γραῖάν τε καὶ εὐρύχορον Μυκαλησσόν,
> οἵ τ' ἀμφ' Ἅρμ' ἐνέμοντο καὶ Εἰλέσιον καὶ Ἐρυθράς,
> οἵ τ' Ἐλεῶν' εἶχον ἠδ' Ὕλην καὶ Πετεῶνα,
> Ὠκαλέην Μεδεῶνά τ' ἐϋκτίμενον πτολίεθρον,
> Κώπας Εὔτρησίν τε πολυτρήρωνά τε Θίσβην,
> οἵ τε Κορώνειαν καὶ ποιήενθ' Ἁλίαρτον,
> οἵ τε Πλάταιαν ἔχον ἠδ' οἳ Γλισᾶντ' ἐνέμοντο,
> οἵ θ' Ὑποθήβας εἶχον ἐϋκτίμενον πτολίεθρον,
> Ὀγχηστόν θ' ἱερὸν Ποσιδήϊον ἀγλαὸν ἄλσος,
> οἵ τε πολυστάφυλον Ἄρνην ἔχον, οἵ τε Μίδειαν
> Νῖσάν τε ζαθέην Ἀνθηδόνα τ' ἐσχατόωσαν·

τῶν μὲν πεντήκοντα νέες κίον, ἐν δὲ ἑκάστῃ
κοῦροι Βοιωτῶν ἑκατὸν καὶ εἴκοσι βαῖνον.

Il. 2.494–510

Of the 29 places mentioned here, scholars have connected almost all with known sites in Boiotia. Conversely, there are several important historical *poleis* which do not have an apparent counterpart in the *Catalogue*, most notably Chaironeia, Lebadeia, and Tanagra.[177] The unusual byform Hypothebai is widely understood as a reference to the destruction of Kadmeian Thebes by the Epigonoi in the generation before the Trojan War.[178] The succession of regions after the Boiotians – Minyans of northern Boiotia, Phokians and Lokrians… – also firmly suggests that the *Catalogue* starts in south-central Greece. This may represent Boiotians' own description of their central Greek region at the time of the Trojan War. The extensive detail, and the prominent position of the Boiotian entry at the beginning of the *Catalogue*, has led to the suggestion that the *Catalogue* as a whole may preserve a Boiotian outlook, perhaps as a representative of a particularly Boiotian genre of catalogue-poetry.[179] This is certainly not the only possible explanation, nor is it certainly solely a question of this section of the text, which may be an ill-adapted inclusion from another story or time. Though the Boiotians are less significant in the *Iliad* than their position in the *Catalogue* might incline us to think, there are several references to Boiotians in other parts of the epic. Where these contain geographic details, the Boiotians consistently live in Boiotia. One Boiotian warrior lives in a place named in the *Catalogue*, which is situated 'by the Kephisian lake', i.e. the Kopaïs (2.500). the Boiotians fight alongside other central Greek contingents in the *Little*

---

177 Chaironeia was later identified with Arne (Paus. 9.40.5; Steph. Byz. s.v.); Lebadeia may have been Mideia, and Tanagra, Graia (Strabo 9.2.10; Paus. 9.20.1–2).

178 Kirk, *Comm on Il.* 1:196.

179 Kirk, *Comm on Il.* 1:178–79; Anderson (1998).

Catalogue (13.686–700); they are paired with the Ionians, and Lokrians, Phthians and Epeians accompany.[180] This is less decisive, but the forces here cover a contiguous strand of Homeric Greece from perhaps southern Thessaly to Athens – Boiotia would otherwise constitute a gap.[181]

Ancient authors thus had good reason to believe that there was a disjunction between the *Iliad*'s placement of Boiotians and the migratory tradition with which they were familiar. The story of the Boiotian migration seems to have been particularly prevalent in Boiotia during the Archidamian War,[182] but Thucydides himself could not neglect the authority of the *Iliad*. Thucydides reconciled the issue by dividing the Boiotians between Thessaly and Boiotia at the time of the Trojan War.[183]

This is an awkward patch-up. Thucydides interprets the end of the Boiotian catalogue entry as an indication of the largest contingent at Troy; ἀποδασμός is an unlikely term for such a large group. There is no explanation either, for the absence of Boiotians from the Thessalian section which ends the *Catalogue of Ships* (or indeed Thessalian Boiotians anywhere else in the poem). It is likely, based on the date of sixty years Thucydides gives for the interval between the capture of Troy and the Boiotian migration, that this part of Thucydides' information about distant history derived from Hellanicus; perhaps the idea of the ἀποδασμός did too.[184] A related solution is somewhat obscure in our sources but it seems that Herodotus and Ephorus both were aware of it.

---

[180] Φθῖοι occurs only here in the *Iliad* (Janko, *Comm. on Il.* 4:133); the inhabitants of Phthia are Myrmidons (and Hellenes and Achaeans, 2.684).

[181] There is, it seems a quite serious hole in the *Catalogue*'s description of Thessaly (2.681–756): the poem describes only the marginal areas and not the central plains. The divisions are not related to the historical regions of Thessaly, and although several of the leaders are important in the *Iliad* or other myths, they too were not strongly linked to Archaic or Classical Thessaly; see Helly (2007).

[182] Thuc. 3.61–67, 4.97–99; perhaps also reflected in Herodotus' sketch of Theban and Plataian relations in the late sixth century (6.108.1–6).

[183] Hornblower, *CT ad* 1.12.3; Sakellariou (2009) 267–84.

[184] Cf. Hellanicus, *FGrH* 4 F 14 = Steph. Byz. s.v. Φημίαι, with Fowler, *EGM* 2:186.

Herodotus, as we have seen, refers to Kadmeians resident in Thessalian Histiaiotis who prompted the Dorians to relocate to the Pindos (1.56.3); these should be the residents of mythical Thebes expelled by the Epigonoi not long before the Trojan War.[185] Ephorus, as preserved by Strabo, spelt out the situation, including a group of Boiotians who could then make a return from Thessaly to Boiotia with the Kadmeians.

> εἶτα Φοίνικες ἔσχον οἱ μετὰ Κάδμου, ὃς τήν τε Καδμείαν ἐτείχισε καὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν τοῖς ἐκγόνοις ἀπέλιπεν. ἐκεῖνοι δὲ τὰς Θήβας τῇ Καδμείᾳ προσέκτισαν, καὶ συνεφύλαξαν τὴν ἀρχὴν ἡγούμενοι τῶν πλείστων Βοιωτῶν ἕως τῆς τῶν Ἐπιγόνων στρατείας. κατὰ δὲ τούτους ὀλίγον χρόνον ἐκλιπόντες τὰς Θήβας ἐπανῆλθον πάλιν· ὡς δ᾽ αὖτως ὑπὸ Θρᾳκῶν καὶ Πελασγῶν ἐκπεσόντες ἐν Θετταλίᾳ συνεστήσαντο τὴν ἀρχὴν μετὰ Ἀρναίων ἐπὶ πολὺν χρόνον, ὥστε καὶ Βοιωτοὺς κληθῆναι πάντας. εἶτ᾽ ἀνέστρεψαν εἰς τὴν οἰκείαν, ἤδη τοῦ Αἰολικοῦ στόλου παρεσκευασμένου περὶ Αὐλίδα τῆς Βοιωτίας, ὃν ἔστελλον εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν οἱ Ὀρέστου παῖδες. προσθέντες δὲ τῇ Βοιωτίᾳ τὴν Ὀρχομενίαν (οὐ γὰρ ἦσαν κοινῇ πρότερον, οὐδ᾽ Ὅμηρος μετὰ Βοιωτῶν αὐτοὺς κατέλεξεν ἀλλ᾽ ἰδίᾳ, Μινύας προσαγορεύσας) μετ᾽ ἐκείνων ἐξέβαλον τοὺς μὲν Πελασγοὺς εἰς Ἀθήνας, ἀφ᾽ ὧν ἐκλήθη μέρος τι τῆς πόλεως Πελασγικόν (ᾤκησαν δὲ ὑπὸ τῷ Ὑμηττῷ), τοὺς δὲ Θρᾷκας ἐπὶ τὸν Παρνασσόν. Ὕαντες δὲ τῆς Φωκίδος Ὕαν πόλιν ᾤκισαν.
>
> Ephorus, *FGrH* 70 F 119 (= Strabo 9.2.2–5)

Ephorus' account depicts the Boiotians as originally resident in central Greece, and (apparently) synonymous with the Kadmeians. After an expulsion they settled briefly in Thessaly alongside Arnaioi (note Thucydides' Arne, the Boiotian homeland, though this is also a Boiotian place in the *Catalogue of Ships*).[186] This was not an exile but a rule (ἀρχή), and they absorbed the Arnaians before returning to Boiotia at the time of the

[185] Cf. Diod. 4.67.1.

[186] Thuc. 1.12.3; *Il.* 2.506.

Aiolian migration to Asia (see below). There are no Thessalians in Ephorus and Strabo's account, but a host of other peoples, mostly obscure mythical groups. Like Thucydides, Ephorus was aware of the *Iliad*'s Boiotians; he invents an invasion of Thracians and Pelasgians to drive the Boiotians north, implicitly after the Trojan War, and gives no reason for their return.

There is an element of imitation of the return of the Herakleidai here, but in other ways it is as unsatisfactory as Thucydides' accommodation. Herodotus was also aware, it seems, of a Thessalian invasion into their historical territory; he notes that the land in question was 'Aiolis' - but he does not mention the migration caused by Thessalian invasion, and the story relates to Phokians rather than Boiotians. We shall return to this issue, but it is uncertain whether Herodotus drew on a similar migration tradition to Thucydides, with a different handling of the conflict of Homer and tradition. These attempts indicate the strength of the Boiotian migration story alongside the authority of Homeric texts; what was important was not a coherent rationalization, but that both could be 'true'.

Perhaps Boiotians of the early Archaic period did not consider themselves immigrants, or at least not strongly enough so that this tradition was reflected in the *Iliad*. Although there was certainly disruption in Boiotia as elsewhere in Greece at the end of the Bronze Age, there is no archaeological evidence to suggest that a migration took place to be remembered in tradition. Nor is this solely a question of a Homeric idea, perhaps a Bronze Age tradition, which Greeks from the Archaic period otherwise rejected. Aside from the ethnonym Βοιωτοί, a geographical term seems to appear first in a small fragment from Stesichorus' poem about the heroes of the Kalydonian boar hunt:

ἔνθεν μὲν Λοκρ[οὶ — ⏑⏑ — ⏑⏑
ιζάνον αἰχματαὶ [⏑⏑ — ⏑⏑

τέκνα φιλα[⏑⏑ — ⏑⏑ — ἐρί-
ηρες Ἀχαιοὶ [
καὶ ὑπερθύμοι [⏑̆ — ⏑⏑ —
θ’ ἱαρὰν Βοιωτίδ[α ν]αίον
χθόνα πυροφόρ[ον.
ἔνθεν δ’ αὖ Δρύοπ[ές] τε κα[ὶ Αἰτω
λοι μενεχάρμα[ι ⏑̆ — ⏑⏑ — ⏑⏑

Stes. fr. 222 *PMGF*, col. ii

As Patrick Finglass notes, Boiotian identity was ‘not especially apparent in other poetry of the early to mid sixth century’.[187] The collocation of peoples who joined the boar hunt would, like the *Little Catalogue*, seem to point towards a collective around the Corinthian Gulf. The Hesiodic *Shield of Herakles* has Boiotians, Lokrians and Phokians support Amphitryon’s campaign from Thebes against the Taphians. This indicates nothing much about the Boiotian migration tradition, but the presence of Achaians for Stesichorus in relation to (Ozolian) Lokrians, Boiotians, Dryopes, and Aitolians suggests ignorance of their supposed expulsion from other areas of the Peloponnese thanks to the Dorian migration. We may conclude that the Boiotian migration tradition began to be promulgated in the late sixth century, roughly.[188]

Why did the Boiotians seek to associate themselves with Thessaly at this point? Perhaps because it was the homeland of Hellen and his sons, and thus provided the Boiotians with Hellenic credentials. This gave them a migration story parallel to the by now long-standing Dorian one. However we have seen that the Boiotians did not clearly name themselves Aiolians as part of the migration, and the migrations are apparently leaderless – it might perhaps have been possible for Boiotians to refer to Aiolidai as the

---

[187] Finglass (2012) 40. He notes in particular Boiotian locations named in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* and Hesiodic *Shield*, but no use of the term ‘Boiotian’ for the region.

[188] Finglass (2012) 42–43; for a complex reconstruction of cultic reenactments of migration, connecting Boiotians and Thesprotia (Dodona, not Ephyra), see Kowalzig (2007) 328–52.

leaders of their return, in an inversion of the Herakleidai leading the ethnically unrelated Dorians on their 'return' to the Herakleidai's rightful territory, but this was not done.[189]

3.1.2 Boiotian and Thessalian conflict and tradition

It is clearest to see the development of the Boiotian migration tradition in three stages. In the eighth and seventh centuries, as suggested by most of the early Greek poetry surveyed above, there was no migration, and the Boiotians were perhaps not even really distinguished from the 'Kadmeians' of the Theban epic cycle. In the sixth century, as the migration tradition developed, the Boiotians became migrants from Thessaly, but most sources for this come from the third stage, which attempted rationalization of the first two stages. We have not, however, addressed the reason for any change of tradition. An internal impetus – the development of Boiotian ethnic consciousness *per se* – has been explored by Stephanie Larson. There is also a clear external impetus in the growth of migration traditions elsewhere in the Aegean, which would likely have been shared in the course of trade and religious interaction at festivals, *inter alia*. I would like however to speculate about an international political context, largely obscured by the difficulties of Archaic Greek history, but strongly enough attested to have been identified as a significant historical moment for the identities not only of the Boiotians, but also for the Phokians and eastern Lokrians. This was Thessaly's long running conflict with its southern neighbours in the sixth century, which was likely a constituitive moment for the Thessalians themselves.

---

[189] Both Herodotus and Thucydides sometimes avoid naming figures of the mythical period, particularly the sons and descendants of Hellen, though Herodotus names Ion (father of the original eponymous heroes, 5.66.2; eponym of the Ionians, 7.94, 8.44).

The earliest reference to the Thessalians' origins in Thesprotia may be found in a song for the young victor of the *diaulodromos*, Hippokleas of Pelinna (Pind. *Pyth.* 10). This poem is a curiosity for several reasons: it is the earliest of Pindar's extant works (498 BCE),[190] and the only victory ode which was commissioned neither by the victor nor his family, but by a third party, Thorax of Larissa.[191] It also offers a rare contemporary insight into early Thessaly,[192] and the policy of Thorax's family, the Aleuadai, who played perhaps the most significant role in Thessalian politics from the sixth to the fourth centuries alongside other powerful families. It was Aleuas, probably Thorax's father, who organized the political structure of the Thessalian tetrads and, more than a decade after Hippokleas' victory, Thorax and his brothers would instigate the Thessalians' cooperation with the Persians (Hdt. 7.6, 485 BCE).[193] Maria Stamatopoulou has tentatively suggested that the Aleuadai commissioned the tenth *Pythian* for a young man from another city 'to stress their *charisma* and the legitimacy of their rule to their neighbouring communities, where other elite groups might also be interested in exercising power'.[194] This perhaps goes beyond the reintegration of the patron into the community, as Leslie Kurke suggested, and towards the integration of a rising family into another established community.[195]

The political unity of Thessaly is emphasized in the first lines, Ὀλβία Λακεδαίμων, μάκαιρα Θεσσαλία. From there Pindar turns from the broadly patriotic to

---

190 According to the scholia.

191 Kurke (1991) 21.

192 The only epinician for a Thessalian victor, though cf. fr. 107a (*hyporchemata*); Stamatopoulou (2007) attempts to explain the lack of later epinicians and Thessalian dedications at pan-Hellenic sanctuaries in the historical context of a loss of influence after the Persian Wars. Archaic Thessaly: Morgan (2003) 120–31; Hall (2002) 141–51.

193 Aleuas 'the Red': Arist. frr. 497–8; Helly (1995) 150–91, 287–315; Sprawski (1999) 15–25. On the Aleuadai and Medism: Keaveney (1995).

194 Stamatopoulou (2007) 310.

195 Kurke (1991) 163–224.

the specific glories of Hippokleas' family and the Aleuadai (4–7). We have very little information about Pelinna until the fourth century, and thus no particular idea of this family or their role within the city, but Thorax's desire to glorify them and their involvement in the culture of the games suggests a powerful clan. After a discussion of Hippokleas' athletic pedigree (10–26) – his father Phrikias had been victorious at crown games three times – the song turns to the mythological narrative of the deeds of Perseus among the Hypoboreans (27–). It is likely that the choice of Perseus reflects his genealogical connection with Herakles, from whom the Aleuadai claimed descent. This connection, and its importance to Thessalian prosperity, was already set up by the opening lines, which connected Sparta and Thessaly through common rule by Herakleidai (πατρὸς δ' ἀμφοτέραις ἐξ ἑνός ἀριστομάχου γένος Ἡρακλέος βασιλεύει, 2–3). The Hyperboreans although standing outside of the normal human sphere of experience surely stand in for Thessalians; Pindar exalts their feasts and music, their carefree life free from Nemesis (φυγόντες ὑπέρδικον Νέμεσιν, 43–44), picking up the hope that Hippokleas and Phrikias will be spared envious reversals from the gods (φθονεραῖς ἐκ θεῶν μετατροπίαις, 20–21).[196] After praising Thorax's commission in particular, Pindar concludes the poem with more general praise of the just rule of the Aleuadai. Although as Stamatopoulou emphasizes we lack good sources to give historical context to the relations set out in the poem, I would suggest that the poem goes a little beyond simple praise of aristocratic families and demonstrates a particular attention to the formulation of Thessalian identity.

[196] Brown (1992).

It is in this context, I suggest, that Pindar makes a brief reference to the migratory history of the performers of this song. In the fourth and final strophe, Pindar refers to the singers as Ephyraioi by the River Peneios:

> ἔλπομαι δ᾽ Ἐφυραίων
> ὅπ᾽ ἀμφὶ Πηνεϊὸν γλυκεῖαν προχεόντων ἐμάν
> τὸν Ἱπποκλέαν ἔτι καὶ μᾶλλον σὺν ἀοιδαῖς
> ἕκατι στεφάνων θαητὸν ἐν ἅλιξι θησέμεν ἐν καὶ
> παλαιτέροις,
> νέαισίν τε παρθένοισι μέλημα.
>
> *Pyth.* 10.55–59

This fairly obscure name elicited confusion from antiquity onwards, and a possible connection with the migration story seems to have been largely neglected. The scholiasts on the poem offer four possible explanations (Σ Pind. *Pyth.* 10.85a Drachmann II:249–51), firstly noting the ancient name of Corinth, but cannot make it relevant. The second possibility is the people of Ephyra in Thesprotia, for whom the scholiast cites only the *Odyssey*. The commentary thus concludes that the reference is to the ancient name of Krannon, citing the Thessalian historian Cineas.[197] A separate scholion raises the possibility that the Ephyraioi were a Thessalian phratry (85c Drachmann II:251), which is intriguing but distinctly difficult to confirm.[198] The connection with Krannon has been the most popular in modern scholarship. This has raised the spectre of the involvement in Pindar's ode of a third family, the Skopadai of Krannon.[199] The unusual involvement of the Aleuadai as patrons here has already introduced such a possibility. It is entirely

---

[197] = *FGrH* 301 F 1a, though the text is somewhat corrupt: ἔστι καὶ ἄλλη Εφύρη Κράννους(?) λεγομένη, ὥς φησι Κινέας.

[198] Helly (1995) 317–24. Equally, the similarity of the term Ephyraioi with the name of the well-known Athenian *genos*, the Gephyraioi, might be responsible for some confusion or speculation.

[199] For evidence and prior bibliography on the Skopadai of Krannon, see Stamatopoulou (2007) 317 and n. 52.

possible that the context was one of mutual acknowledgement between Thessalian families, each with their own domain, rather than any aristocratic conflict. A brief reference to the people of Krannon celebrating Hippokleas does nevertheless seem outweighed by the fulsome praise for Thorax. The evocation of Pelinna and the nearby Peneios, moreover, seem to put the performance far from Krannon. Ephyra is one of the evocative names of Greek myth. There is a Homeric reference to Ephyroi somewhere in northern Greece (*Il.* 13.301), and multiple mentions of Ephyra. Strabo identifies four places called Ephyra: in Elis, Thesprotia, Thessaly and Corinth (8.3.5); Stephanus of Byzantium (s.v.) notes not only these four (citing Cineas), and observing that Ephyra in Elis is close to the Peloponnesian Peneios; he adds a 'second' in Thessaly and a 'third' called Oinoe. Felix Jacoby, surveying the highly complex traditions, was inclined to take Krannon's claim to the name Ephyra as a claim to be *Tochterstadt* of the city in Thesprotia.[200] We may appreciate that Pindar was not afraid of obscurity or polysemy, but it is certainly possible to take Ephyraioi as a poetic name for the Thessalians as a whole, and all three explanations which the first scholion offers as reflections of the migratory connection of the Thessalians with Ephyra in Thesprotia. It is interesting that both Elis and Corinth could have Aiolian associations, through the Aiolid family stemma. The Thessalian migration from Thesprotia which Pindar is drawing on here, however, seems to involve a distinct story which separates Thessalians from Aiolians, one which I shall speculate now was promoted by the Aleuadai as part of their organization of Thessaly.

The fuller story of Thessalian migration, as Herodotus describes it, is entangled not with the Boiotians but with the people who dwelled between them, the Phokians, and

---

[200] Jacoby, *ad FGrH* 244 F 179-181.

the culmination in the Persian Wars of a long-running conflict between the Thessalians and Phokians. Herodotus explains that the wall at Thermopylai which was key to Greek defence in 490 BCE dated to the original invasion of the Thessalians from the western Balkans into Greece. It had fallen into disuse and disrepair in the intervening centuries. (Herodotus gives only very vague chronological references in this narrative; scholars have in general assumed that he was working here with the same tradition of post-Trojan War migration as Thucydides.)

> ἔδειμαν δὲ Φωκέες τὸ τεῖχος δείσαντες, ἐπεὶ Θεσσαλοὶ ἦλθον ἐκ Θεσπρωτῶν οἰκήσοντες γῆν τὴν Αἰολίδα τήν νῦν ἐκτέαται. ἅτε δὴ πειρωμένων τῶν Θεσσαλῶν καταστρέφεσθαι σφέας, τοῦτο προεφυλάξαντο οἱ Φωκέες, καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ τὸ θερμὸν τότε ἐπῆκαν ἐπὶ τὴν ἔσοδον, ὡς ἂν χαραδρωθείη ὁ χῶρος, πᾶν μηχανώμενοι ὅκως μή σφι ἐσβάλοιεν οἱ Θεσσαλοὶ ἐπὶ τὴν χώρην. τὸ μέν νυν τεῖχος τὸ ἀρχαῖον ἐκ παλαιοῦ τε ἐδέδμητο καὶ τὸ πλέον αὐτοῦ ἤδη ὑπὸ χρόνου ἔκειτο· τοῖσι δὲ αὖτις ὀρθώσασι ἔδοξε ταύτῃ ἀπαμύνειν ἀπὸ τῆς Ἑλλάδος τὸν βάρβαρον.
>
> Hdt. 7.176.4–5

There is a hint here that the Thessalian migration was a messier and more complicated affair than other sources allow, involving conflict all over central Greece. The Epiknemidian Lokrians, in whose territory Thermopylai lay by the fifth century, do not appear. The archaeological evidence from Thermopylai, however, does not suggest that this complexity, or unbounded expansion, was based in historical truth. The remains of the wall at Thermopylai which Marinatos excavated do not plainly match with any part of the tradition: most importantly, the wall seems to have been constructed facing southward, at least in its final phase, not against forces from the north as the traditions would lead us to expect, though the date for these remains is far from certain.

Scholars have reconstructed indications of a wide-ranging policy of aggressive expansionism on the part of sixth-century Thessaly.[201] The evidence is fragmentary: Herodotus gives a particularly lucid account of the Thessalian invasion of Phokis and the clever stratagems devised by the seer Tellias of Elis, which allowed the Phokians to overcome their more powerful enemy in two separate skirmishes. Herodotus places these 'shortly before' the Persian Wars, likely after the Thessalians supporting Hippias of Athens were defeated by Kleomenes and the Spartans (Hdt. 5.63–64). Plutarch, however, indicates that the invasion was probably in response to Phokian rebellion, when the Phokians killed all of the Thessalian governors. Elsewhere Plutarch refers to a battle at Keressos in Boiotia, either two hundred years before Leuktra (i.e. 570, Plut. *Cim.* 19), or shortly before Thermopylai (*Mor.* 866e–f). The traditions of the First Sacred War and even supposed Pharsalian involvement in the Lelantine War may also be part of this phenomenon.[202]

Thessaly was probably never totally unified under the Aleuads at any point; the leader of Thessalian troops in 510 BCE is named King Kineas of Kondaios.[203] The kingship here is a matter of some debate. Bruno Helly has argued that the formal title of the Thessalian leader was from an early point *archon* or *(tetr)archos*, while the title *basileus* was simply an aristocratic honour. The Thessalians' 'common decision' (κοινῇ γνώμῃ, Hdt. 5.63.2) of 510 need not thus be seen as independent of Aleuad policy, although their immediate departure after their defeat (5.64.2) and the subsequent offer of Iolkos to the exiled Hippias (5.94.1) have both been interpreted as cracks in the coherence

---

201 Lehmann (1983).

202 Plut. *Mor.* 760e–61b; Davies (1994); Helly (1995) 39–40, 136–40.

203 The MSS read Κονιαῖον; this is sometimes amended to Γόνναιον but Helly (and Rhodes) accept Kip's Κονδαῖον: see Helly (1995) 103–4, 220–22; Rhodes (2019) *ad loc.*

of Thessalian support.[204] This moment of Thessalian organization, although it faltered somewhat in the fifth century, was likely the context which instigated the Boiotians own formulations of identity. The migration tradition may perhaps be one part of that, separating themselves explicitly from those who sought to dominate them.

The Boiotians do not directly apply for Aiolian status through the migration tradition, nor distinct association with Thessaly. The place of origin is called Aiolis by Herodotus and Diodorus, but Arne in all the other sources. This name, as noted above, is used by both Thucydides and Ephorus for the Thessalian home of the Boiotians; in Homer, it is perhaps made a place of significance, despite the generic epithet πολυστάφυλος, by its position in the line after the central Boiotian sanctuary of Poseidon at Onchestos. There was no place known by that name, in Thessaly or Boiotia, outside of mythology. The late geographers suggest some identifications: Kierion laid claim to the title, and so did Chaironeia and Akraiphion.[205] These may be nothing more than small towns' attempts to borrow a little prestige, all notably without any presence in Homeric epic. The confusion has led scholars, ancient and modern, to try to clarify the issue by suggesting that there were homonymous places in both regions.[206] This is an easy rationalization, but early sources do not have any suggestion at all of multiple places called Arne – and the multiple claimants even in the Roman period may suggest that Arne was more of a putative and abstract origin than a concrete locale. This perhaps explains why there is little interest in the time before the Boiotians migrated, or the process of

---

[204] Rhodes (2019) *ad* 5.64.2; Hornblower (2013) *ad* 5.94.1.

[205] Strabo 9.413; Paus. 9.40.5; Steph. Byz. s.v. Ἄρνη.

[206] E.g. Strabo and Stephanus (see n. above) suggest that Thessalian Arne was a foundation of Boiotian exiles (an ἀποικία Βοιωτίας, Steph.) rather than the Boiotian one.

their migration, until an unlikely story conveyed in the work of a fourth-century local historian, Archemachus of Euboia.

Archemachus adds a new detail to Thessalian invasion unknown to anyone prior: not all Boiotians did depart on the Thessalian invasion; some remained out of love for their homeland and became quite willingly the Thessalian serfs known as *penestai*:

> «Βοιωτῶν» φησίν «τῶν τὴν Ἀρναίαν κατοικησάντων οἱ μὴ ἀπάραντες εἰς τὴν Βοιωτίαν ἀλλ᾽ ἐμφιλοχωρήσαντες παρέδωκαν ἑαυτοὺς τοῖς Θεσσαλοῖς δουλεύειν καθ᾽ ὁμολογίας, ἐφ᾽ ᾧι οὔτε ἐξάξουσιν αὐτοὺς ἐκ τῆς χώρας οὔτε ἀποκτενοῦσιν, αὐτοὶ δὲ τὴν χώραν αὐτοῖς ἐργαζόμενοι τὰς συντάξεις ἀποδώσουσιν.
>
> Archemachus, *FGrH* 424 F 1 (= Ath. 6.85, 264a–b)

It is not really clear why Archemachus addressed this story, apparently in his *Euboïka*. The story concludes with a folk etymology of πενέσται from μενέσται (‘remainers’, *vel sim*.). Archemachus was obviously well aware that this interpretation was tendentious: he carries on to argue that some of the *penestai* were richer than their masters, i.e. that the far more likely etymology from πένης (poor men) was misguided. This story in particular gives an aetiological tone to the migratory tradition, one which seeks to justify the Thessalian practice of serfdom and perhaps the Thessalian domination of the various groups which sat at the margins of Thessaly. Fourth-century sources indicate that the πενέσται were certainly not such willing servants of their Thessalian masters as this story suggests;[207] such uprisings may have encouraged the development of the migration of the Thessaloi as a charter myth. It bears the hallmarks of local history, and not necessarily that of Boiotians – but it does indicate yet another division of the Boiotian population.

---

[207] Xen. *Hell.* 2.3.36; Arist. *Pol.* 1264a 35.

3.1.3 Boiotian leadership

It is in the fourth century that we begin to find evidence of traditions which included leaders for the Boiotian migration. Thucydides has a Theban speaker link Theban hegemony over Boiotia – and thus its ongoing aggression against the recalcitrant Plataians – with the migration and Boiotian ancestral customs (πάτρια; Thuc. 3.61.3). This should not be taken too readily as a clear indication of Theban, let alone Boiotian, thinking: as Paula Debnar argues, the speech seems designed to paint an ironic picture of the Thebans by fulfilling with the anonymous speech precisely the reputation for κακία which the Thebans sought to refute.[208] Thucydides' presentation of Thebes' claimed right to hegemony is not necessarily solely a matter of Athens' often chauvinistic apathy towards Thebes, or generic Greek hostility to Medizers (although the Thebans also ineffectively dismiss that charge in the speech). It is clear enough from less rhetorical sources that Thebes dominated other Boiotian poleis whether or not it claimed historical justification for doing so.

Perhaps not long after the Peloponnesian War, however, there is evidence from Thebes which suggests a tendency to claim hegemony in the migration tradition. A small limestone block found in reused in a Byzantine church wall at Thebes bears a few lines of a text probably relating to the cult of the ancestral spirits, the Tritopatreis:[209]

> Τριτοπατ<ρ>εες Ἀρνειον[. $^{1–2}$.]
> τοῦ Περιπονταίο παιδ[ός]
>
> *SEG* 49 532

---

208 Debnar (1996).

209 Kalliontzis and Papazarkadas (2013); date by letter forms before the 370s.

The interpretation of such a difficult text, mostly of proper nouns, dismembered and on a large stone of uncertain purpose and unknown context, can hardly be conclusive. Kalliontzis and Papazarkadas are willing to connect both of the names with the Boiotian migration. The supplement of Ἀρνειον(-?) is less than certain; Kalliontzis and Papazarkadas are inclined to favour a personal name, but one which was based on the demonym Arne, followed by a patronymic adjective (typical of Boiotian dialect), e.g. Arneion son of Peripontas. For discussion of the later name they turn to Plutarch, briefly in the mode of a local Chaironeian historian, who offers tantalizing context for the named figures at the beginning of the paired *Kimon–Lucullus*:

> Περιπόλτας ὁ μάντις ἐκ Θετταλίας εἰς Βοιωτίαν Ὀφέλταν τὸν βασιλέα καὶ τοὺς ὑπ᾽ αὐτῷ λαοὺς καταγαγὼν γένος εὐδοκιμῆσαν ἐπὶ πολλοὺς χρόνους κατέλιπεν, οὗ τὸ πλεῖστον ἐν Χαιρωνείᾳ κατῴκησεν, ἣν πρώτην πόλιν ἔσχον ἐξελάσαντες τοὺς βαρβάρους.
>
> Plut. *Cim.* 1.1

The name of the seer who led a Boiotian king into the territory needs amending to match the text from Thebes, but the spelling with λ has no great authority; it is otherwise unattested and makes a somewhat non-sensical name. Plutarch carries on to tell of a physically beautiful but morally corrupted young man from Chaironeia, apparently a descendant of Peripontas (παρωνύμιον δὲ Περιπόλτας), who caused much trouble at Chaironeia around the time of the Mithridatic War (ending c. 86 BCE; Plut. *Cim.* 1.1–2.2).[210] The story is a vividly drawn acknowledgement of Chaironeia's debt to Lucullus for his intervention, and clearly draws on traditions associated with local buildings and monuments from Chaironeia rather than textual information about Boiotian history.

[210] For context and discussion, see Mackay (2000).

Nevertheless there are signs of more established local history about the migration here too which may reflect on the figure involved at the Tritopatreis. Plutarch is careful to note that *most* of the family settled in Chaironeia (τὸ πλεῖστον) – clearly not all – and that the violent young man's family moved to Stiris in Phokis, αἰολίζοντες, which seems to mean that they preserved their dialect or manners in their exile. The story of a seer who brought the Boiotians into Thessaly may well have been the tradition of a family priesthood in Boiotia, surely propagated well before its use in the names of the Theban inscription.

The name Arneion indicates not simply prestige drawn from antiquity but an ongoing focus on the question of origins. It might equally suggest a particular association with Chaironeia, referring to Chaironeia's local ambitions to be recognized as the place called (Boiotian) Arne in the *Catalogue of Ships*.[211] The idea seems to have been to connect the original, Thessalian Arne of other traditions with Chaironeia's position as the access point from the north into Boiotia ('which city they first captured after they drove out the barbarians', as Plutarch puts it), with the bonus of Homeric prestige. This may however draw too much on Plutarch's local pride; it is clear that there should be more to the story of Opheltas and Peripontas than Plutarch relates. Thucydides' Thebans seem to have envisioned a long and complicated process of invasion southwards in several stages (directed teleologically on Plataia, although Thucydides must surely have been aware of Athenian traditions about the Apatouria, including a duel by which Melanthos stopped the progression of the Boiotians under Xanthias);[212] Ephorus makes brief reference to several subsequent campaigns, the expulsion of the Minyai from

[211] See p. 95, above.
[212] Harding (2008) 80–81.

Orchomenos and the Pelasgians ‘with them’, and a campaign against Attica. Pausanias connects the threads of Theban kingship and the Epigonoi, Homeric Boiotians, and a story in which the Boiotian migration is not an exile from Thessaly but the reclamation of Thebes in particular:

> τελευτήσαντος δὲ Θερσάνδρου καὶ δεύτερα ἐπί τε Ἀλέξανδρον καὶ ἐς Ἴλιον ἀθροιζομένου στόλου Πηνέλεων ἄρχοντα εἵλοντο, ὅτι οὐκ ἐν ἡλικίᾳ πω Τισαμενὸς ἦν ὁ Θερσάνδρου· Πηνέλεω δὲ ἀποθανόντος ὑπὸ Εὐρυπύλου τοῦ Τηλέφου Τισαμενὸν βασιλέα αἱροῦνται, Θερσάνδρου τε ὄντα καὶ Δημωνάσσης τῆς Ἀμφιαράου. τῶν δὲ Ἐρινύων τῶν Λαΐου καὶ Οἰδίποδος Τισαμενῷ μὲν οὐκ ἐγένετο μήνιμα, Αὐτεσίωνι δὲ τῷ Τισαμενοῦ, ὥστε καὶ παρὰ τοὺς Δωριέας μετῴκησε τοῦ θεοῦ χρήσαντος. Αὐτεσίωνος δὲ ἀπελθόντος, οὕτω βασιλέα εἵλοντο Δαμασίχθονα Ὀφέλτου τοῦ Πηνέλεω. τούτου δὲ ἦν τοῦ Δαμασίχθονος Πτολεμαῖος, τοῦ δὲ Ξάνθος, ὃν Ἀνδρόπομπος μονομαχήσαντά οἱ δόλῳ καὶ οὐ σὺν τῷ δικαίῳ κτείνει. τὸ δὲ ἐντεῦθεν διὰ πλειόνων πολιτεύεσθαι μηδὲ ἀπ᾽ ἀνδρὸς ἑνὸς ἠρτῆσθαι τὰ πάντα ἄμεινον ἐφαίνετο τοῖς Θηβαίοις.
>
> Paus. 9.5.15–16

The line of kings (Thersandros, Tisamenos, and Autesion) which had ruled Thebes after the wars of the Seven against Thebes and the Epigonoi is here sidelined, through Peneleos’ regency and the exile of Autesion to Thessaly (i.e. παρὰ τοὺς Δωριέας). The line which replaces them is a Boiotian pedigree but clearly depicted as Theban kings. Opheltas reappears only here as the middle figure between the Homeric Boiotians – who are led to Thessaly by Teisamenos – and the figure who captured Thebes.[213] Damasichthon occupies the second generation after the Trojan War, clearly aligned with the Hellanican generations in Thucydides, and his name indicates that he was the

[213] Plut. *Mor.* 558a refers to Opheltadai; Plutarch perhaps claims descent from Opheltas himself, but this has been rejected: Einarson (1952).

figurehead *par excellence* for Boiotian *invasion*. Robert Buck has argued that the capture of Thebes was presented in Boiotian historiography as the climax of the migration tradition – we might suspect to the benefit of Theban power within the Boiotian League, and in conflict with the other major powers of central Greece in the sixth and fifth centuries. The Boiotians took note of their way-stops: Chaironeia was invaded first;[214] Koroneia and Orchomenos taken together and the important sanctuary of Athena Itonia established nearby.[215] After a generation, the Boiotians reached Anthedon,[216] Thebes, and Thespiai.[217] The Asopus valley was not acquired for another two generations; Thucydides' Theban speaker carefully remembers that the Plataians were last to be settled, supposedly only partially.[218] Each stage has its leader; the enemy forces are a roll-call of the elusive tribes of prehistorical Greece.[219] Some of this likely reflects the piecemeal of local foundation traditions. It also demonstrates a careful mythical examination of territory and the Boiotians' right to control it. It is clear that the ideas of Boiotian invasion which ejected some native populations under Theban leadership is key to Thucydides' presentation of the politics of Boiotia during the Peloponnesian War. The evidence that parts of the myth were acknowledged by priestly families in Boiotia in the early fourth century means that Opheltas and Damasichthon were much older than the attestations.

---

214 Plut. *Cim.* 1; Hecataeus, *FGrH* 1 F 116 (= Steph. Byz. s.v. Χαιρώνεια).
215 Strabo 9.2.29.
216 Lyc. *Alex.* 754.
217 Paus. 9.5.15.
218 Thuc. 3.61.
219 For a thorough examination of sources, see Buck (1979) 78–80.

3.1.4 Thessalian leadership

We turn now from Boiotian leaders and politics to Thessalians. There is very little indication of Thessalian versions of this tradition, with the exception of Archemachus' somewhat confusing anecdote, until the end of the Classical Period. This may simply be the effect of a region which had little apparent literary tradition or local historiography; it may also be the case here that the rivalries of Thessalian noble *genē* such as the Aleuadai and Echekratidai – for which evidence is tantalizing but elusive – obscured more traditional forms of ethnic myth-making. The fourth-century Thessalian league may have prompted a new appetite for heroic leaders. The post-Classical, apparently Thessalian, tradition borrows an established character. An Aristotelian catalogue of heroes mentions the tomb of two Koan heroes of the Trojan War, Antiphos and Pheidippos: Φείδιππον Τροίην πέρσαντ' ἠδ' Ἄντιφον ἥρω / γαῖα πατρὶς Κῴων ἥδ' Ἐφύρα κατέχει.[220] In the *Catalogue of Ships* these are the sons of Thessalos of Kos (*Il.* 2.676–80),[221] a product of Herakles' adventure in the Dodecanese after his sack of Troy.[222] The tomb in Kos or Ephyra (in Thesprotia) represents a somewhat new connection of these two heroes with northern Greece;[223] Thessaly is not yet involved. The tradition with respect to Thessalos himself does not become clear until Strabo, in a story from anonymous sources (τινὲς [sc. φασι]) about anonymous descendants of Antiphos and

---

220 Arist. fr. 640.39 Rose; cf. Vell. Pat. 1.1.1.

221 The Koan entry in the *Catalogue* is the last of the southern Aegean island groups (Cretans, Rhodians, Symeans, Koans); the poem then crosses with a firm break (νῦν) to northern Greece. Thessalos has no explicit link with Thessaly; the jump is likely related to an evocation of the name for the region, which Homer does not use, but does not tell us much. The Koans, like many of the Thessalian contingents thereafter, have no ethnonym.

222 Hom. *Il.* 15.24–8; Pherecydes, fr. 78 *EGM*; cf. Fowler, *EGM* 2:314-5.

223 Pheidippos has perhaps been conflated with Pheidon, king of Thesprotian Ephyra in the *Odyssey* (14.316–20, 19.287).

Pheidippos, who arriving from Ephyra renamed what was then called Haimonia after their ancestor Thessalos:

> ἔνιοι δὲ διελόντες δίχα τὴν μὲν πρὸς νότον λαχεῖν φασι Δευκαλίωνι καὶ καλέσαι Πανδώραν ἀπὸ τῆς μητρός, τὴν δ' ἑτέραν Αἵμονι, ἀφ' οὗ Αἱμονίαν λεχθῆναι· μετωνομάσθαι δὲ τὴν μὲν Ἑλλάδα ἀπὸ Ἕλληνος τοῦ Δευκαλίωνος, τὴν δὲ Θετταλίαν ἀπὸ τοῦ υἱοῦ Αἵμονος· τινὲς δὲ ἀπὸ Ἐφύρας τῆς Θεσπρωτίδος ἀπογόνους Ἀντίφου καὶ Φειδίππου, τῶν Θετταλοῦ τοῦ Ἡρακλέους, ἐπελθόντας ἀπὸ Θετταλοῦ τοῦ ἑαυτῶν προγόνου τὴν χώραν ὀνομάσαι.
>
> Strabo 9.5.23

Strabo's source is not definitely dated, but this story may go back to the fourth century.[224] The Hellenistic poet Rhianus, who often drew on fourth-century historiography for his ethnographic poems, apparently referred to a Thessalos, son of Haimon;[225] the cover text, Stephanus, was apparently referring to the legendary name Haimonia for Thessalia, and so we can assume that Thessalos too was referenced as an eponym.

Much later, Polyaenus records two stories in the *Strategemata* which do not appear in any earlier sources (and Polyaenus does not include source attestations generally), both of which include vividly imagined stories apparently related to Thessalos, Pheidippos and Antiphos. One features the Herakleidai Aiatos and Polykleia, children of Pheidippos, before they attempt to invade Boiotian-occupied Thessaly. Polykleia tricks her brother into carrying her across the River Acheloos in order to fulfil the oracle that the first Herakleid foot on Thessaly would rule. They marry and have a son Thessalos, for whom the region is named:

---

[224] *Pace* Mili (2015) 222–23, who infers more from the Aristotelian fragment discussed above than can be supported in that brief reference.

[225] Rhianus, *FGrH* 265 F 30a–b (= Σ Ap. Rh. 3.1090b, Steph. Byz. s.v. Αἰμονία).

> Ἐπὶ Βοιωτοὺς, οἳ πάλαι Θεσσαλίαν ᾤκουν, ἐστράτευσεν Αἴατος ὁ Φειδίππου[226] Πολύκλειαν ἀδελφὴν ἔχων, Ἡρακλεῖδαι τὸ γένος ἄμφω. χρησμὸς ἦν ἄρξειν, ὃς ἂν ἐκ τοῦ γένους πρῶτος διαβὰς τὸν Ἀχελῷον ἐπιβῇ τῆς πολεμίας. ἡ μὲν στρατιὰ τὸν ποταμὸν διαβαίνειν ἔμελλε, Πολύκλεια δὲ τὸν πόδα ἐπιδησαμένη φάσκουσα τετρῶσθαι τὸ σφυρὸν παρακαλεῖ τὸν ἀδελφὸν Αἴατον διενεγκεῖν αὐτὴν ὑπὲρ τὸν ποταμόν. ὁ δὲ μηδὲν ὑποπτεύσας, ἀλλ' ὡς ἀδελφῇ βουλόμενος ὑπουργῆσαι τὴν μὲν ἀσπίδα ἐπέδωκε τοῖς ὁπλοφόροις, τὴν δὲ Πολύκλειαν ἀράμενος ἐβάδιζε διὰ τοῦ ποταμοῦ προθύμως. ἡ δὲ γενομένου πλησίον τῆς ὄχθης φθάσασα ἐξήλατο καὶ μεταστραφεῖσα πρὸς τὸν ἀδελφὸν ἔφη· 'ἐμὸν γέρας ἡ βασιλεία κατὰ τὸν τοῦ θεοῦ χρησμόν· πρώτη γὰρ ἁπάντων τῆς χώρας ἐπέβην.' Αἴατος αἰσθόμενος τῆς ἀπάτης οὐκ ἐχαλέπηνεν, τὸ δὲ φρόνημα τῆς κόρης ἀγάμενος αὐτὴν ἔγημε· καὶ ὁμοῦ βασιλεύοντες παῖδα Θεσσαλὸν ἐποιήσαντο, ἀφ' οὗ καὶ τὴν πόλιν Θεσσαλίαν προσηγόρευσαν.
>
> Polyaen. *Strat.* 8.44

In another story in Polyaenus, Thessalos himself was the victor over the Boiotians, perhaps the final stage of conflict with the Boiotians,[227] or simply another version altogether:[228]

> Θεσσαλὸς Βοιωτῶν τῶν Ἄρνην οἰκούντων Θεσσαλοῖς πολεμούντων τέχνῃ ἐκράτησεν ἄνευ μάχης. νύκτα παραφυλάξας ἀσέληνον καὶ σκοτεινὴν ἐκέλευσε τοὺς στρατιώτας διασπαρέντας ἀνὰ τὸ πεδίον ἄλλον ἀλλαχοῦ κατὰ κορυφὰς τῶν ὀρῶν δᾷδας καὶ λυχνούχους ἀνάπτειν καὶ μετεωρίζειν καὶ πάλιν αὖ καθαιρεῖν. οἱ Βοιωτοὶ τὴν ὄψιν τοῦ πυρὸς ὥσπερ ἀστραπὰς κυκλουμένας ἰδόντες ἐδεδίξαντο καὶ πρὸς ἱκεσίαν τῶν Θεσσαλῶν ἐτράποντο.
>
> Polyaen. *Strat*. 1.12

---

[226] MS Φιλίππου : Φειδίππου corr. Roth.

[227] Sordi (1958) 8.

[228] Cf. Vell. Pat. 1.3.1, Charax, *FGrH* 103 F 6.

Thessalos appears as a non-Herakleid eponym, linked purely with the region in northern Greece, in a few minor sources: as father of a Minyan eponym,[229] or as son of Jason and Medea reclaiming Iolkos.[230] In Pseudo-Apollodorus, Antiphos conquers Pelasgian territory immediately after Troy, straight from the sea, renaming it Thessaly.[231] This story is included in a summary collection of return stories, perhaps drawn from the *Nostoi*: it is a straightforward aetiology of how Thessaly received its name, based on the only appropriate eponym in early sources, and there are no Boiotians or Arnaians apparently to be seen. It is worth noting that Pelasgians were certainly associated with Thessaly (i.e. Pelasgiotis) in other earlier sources (although with very many other places too).[232] Thus Charax of Pergamon (early second c. CE) apparently mixed the Herakleid and Pelasgian traditions, identifying Thessalos, son of Aiatos, son of Pelasgos (cf. Polyaen. 8.44) as the Thessalian victor over the Boiotians in Arne:[233] Thessalos did not, according to Charax, rename the territory which had originally been called Doris and then Histiaiotis (cf. Strabo 9.5.17), by which Charax apparently means that it had already received the name Histiaiotis by the time of the Thessalian migration.

Once again the stories are quite varied, and difficult to connect to what we know of Thessalian history; in general it seems that Thessalos served as a minor focus for Thessalian identity without any Aiolian associations until quite late, perhaps due to Aleuad influence on the myth. In the medial stage, Thessalos' descendants are loosely attached to the invasion of the Thessaloi from Thesprotia.

---

229 Σ Pind. *Ol.* 14.5: see Fowler, *EGM* 2:191–2 on attempts to incorporate Minyai into other Greek stemmata.

230 Dionysius Scytobrachium, *FGrH* 32 F 14 (= Diod. Sic. 4.40).

231 [Apoll.] *Epit.* 6.15; cf. Tzetzes *ad* Lycoph. *Alex.* 911.

232 Pelasgian Argos, Hom. *Il.* 2.681; Hecataeus, *FGrH* 1 F 14; Hellanicus, *FGrH* 4 F 4; Fowler, *EGM* 2:84.

233 Charax, *FGrH* 103 F 6 (= Steph. Byz. s.v. Δώριον).

Their father's name and their Homeric fame made Antiphos and Pheidippos good candidates for mythical exploitation, which began in the late fourth century. The Herakleidai, particularly Tlepolemos of Rhodes, had much earlier associations with Thesprotia and Ephyra in particular;[234] this perhaps encouraged the connection of Antiphos and Pheidippos with the Thesprotian origins of the Thessalians apparent in Thucydides. It is important to note that although the Herakleid invasion from the west in Strabo is consistent with the Herodotean account, the name of the invaded territory is different: Aiolis in Herodotus. Even here this version of the eponymy is contrasted with another, apparently non-Herakleid eponymous Thessalos, son of Haimon.

As Maria Mili notes, the unusual incestuous marriage of Aiatos and Polykleia 'is an extreme measure to exclude any trace of foreign blood and validates in the story the Thessalians' righteous exclusive claim to the new land'.[235] It is somewhat more difficult to see this as a reflection of any Thessalian customs concerning intermarriage or children, but we might note the oracle – a unique feature of Polyaenus' account – implies some potential rivalry for territory within the Herakleid clan. The identification of the Acheloos, presumably that in Malis,[236] as the boundary of Thessaly is somewhat curious: it does not fit well with an entry from Thesprotia, which would presumably cross the River Thoas into Thessaliotis.[237]

There is a slight connection to be made between Polyaenus' tale of Thessalus' success in confusing the Boiotians with torches by night here and a story which Strabo reports from Ephorus, of a nighttime attack on the Boiotians by Thracians and Pelasgians

---

234 *Il.* 2.657–67; Pind. *Ol.* 7.23; [Apoll.] *Bibl.* 2.7.6;
235 Mili (2015) 84.
236 Hom. *Il.* 21.194; Strabo 9.5.10.
237 Sordi (1958) 7.

(*not* Thessalians, who as previously discussed are not in Ephorus' account): the details in each story are different, and quite involved.[238] The accounts in Polyaenus, linked with the invasion in Herodotus and Thucydides' versions, have often formed the backbone of modern treatments of the migratory tradition although Polyaenus in particular offers only rather belated testimony for the leaders of the invasion, and does not overtly associate the Thessalians with Thesprotia at all.

3.1.5 Conclusions: Thessalian origins

Marta Sordi made much of the possible Koan origins of the Thessalians, particularly focusing on the elision of Thesprotia in Polyaenus and Pseudo-Apollodorus' versions of the Herakleidai's arrival in Thessaly. She also posited a rearrangement of Thessalian myths by Aleuas the Red and his Larissan family when they came to dominate Thessaly, probably in the late sixth century. The Aleuads were apparently inclined to refer to themselves as descendants of Herakles, as Pindar notes happily in his victory ode for Hippokleas of Pelinna.[239] The leaders of the Thessalian migration and of sixth-century Thessaly may have thus been depicted as ethnically distinct from the rest of the population. As Mili notes, although Aleuas was possibly called a son of Thessalos,[240] references to Herakleid identity amongst the Aleuadai do not necessarily entail any link with Kos: Herakles had his own associations with the Dorians of Histiaiotis, which were perhaps particularly relevant for a victor from an Histiaiotid city.[241]

---

238 Mili (2015) 154 cautiously links the torches with the Thessalian goddess Enodia's associations with panic.

239 Pind. *Pyth.* 10.1–5.

240 Hegemon, *FGrH* 110 F 1 = Ael. *NA* 8.11; see Mili (2015) 224.

241 Diod. Sic. 4.37, 58.6; Mili (2015) 222.

Establishing the origins of the Thessalians was obviously an important task for anyone wishing to develop Thessalian unity, but there was little useful information to draw on in the most important authority, Homer: the gap needed to be filled from elsewhere. It is impossible to confidently reconstruct from our sources what Thessalian mythology looked like before Aleuad influence might have been brought to bear on the tradition, but it is possible that the migration from Thesprotia was created to contend with the Aiolian myth concerning the Boiotoi's origins in Thessaly. Perhaps exploiting the established Herakleid associations with Thesprotia as well as Histiaiotis enabled the Aleuads to affirm the Thessaloi's occupation of Thessaly and to disassociate the Thessalians from the Aiolian associations which had already been established in Boiotian mythology.

On the whole there is no presence for any of these traditions in Thessaly itself until a cult of Thessalos appears at Olympia in the third century BCE, at which time the Koans were interested to engage with their links with Thessaly.[242] Thessalian historians are rare, and the two Aiolian authors involved in the tradition (Hellanicus and Ephorus) tell quite different versions of the story with quite different significances. Some reference to links with Thesprotia is found in two Thessalian historians quoted (with substantial scepticism) by Strabo, referring to the original transfer of the oracle from a Dodona in Thessaly (near Skotoussa?) to the famous site in Thesprotia.[243] These authors probably demonstrate a lively engagement with contemporary literature as well as Thessalian politics.

---

[242] Fowler, *EGM* 2:8.5.3; Helly (2004).

[243] Strabo 7.7.12 = Souidas, *FGrH* 602 F 11a and Cineas, *FGrH* 603 F 2a & b; see further Kowalzig (2007) 341–47 on Thessaly and Dodona.

The narratives of the Classical period all address both Thessaloi and Boiotoi as pre-existing groups at the time of migration; the exception is Strabo's somewhat confused summary of Ephorus. Herodotus describes the Thessalians as coming ἐκ Θεσπροτῶν, which implies that the Thessalians were not merely residents of Thesprotia but a break-away group of Thesprotians; alternatively, the ethnonym may simply reflect that the Thesprotians of myth occupied a larger area than what came to be called Thesprotia. He is however the only source to give clear consideration to the origins of the Thessalians. The Boiotians are treated in several quite distinct ways. For Herodotus and Thucydides alike (Hellanicus?), they seem to be indigenous residents of northern Greece, in which case they are violently expelled by the newcomers. In Ephorus, the transient Boiotoi are bolstered by an indigenous population from Thessaly. Not only were these groups evidently already constituted when they came into contact, but they were also not from a single stock; nor is there any suggestion of ethnic sympathies – though Aiolian ethnicity and the relationship between Thessalians and Boiotians are not Thucydides' or Herodotus' immediate concern. Although Archemachus' account of the origins of the μενέσται must surely have appealed to Thessalian interests in some obscure fashion, it is the latest and cannot be firmly attributed to them. In fact, the early Thessalians seem to have taken little interest in the derivation of the population or how they established themselves in Thessaly itself. This does not seem to have changed until the Hellenistic period.

The antagonistic coming together of Thessaloi and Boiotoi brings into doubt any sense of solidarity between Thessaloi and Boiotoi, and indeed the very idea of their shared origins.

3.2 Aiolian migration

The Aiolian migration to which we now turn was far less concerned with origins, and took a somewhat different tactic in its narrative of expansion across the Aegean. Archaeology and documentary evidence have made it increasingly clear that Greeks were in frequent contact with Asia Minor, and perhaps even resident there, long before the end of the Bronze Age.[244] Greek tradition forgot about such interactions, preserving them – possibly – only in a few exceptional stories such as Herakles' raid on Troy and Pelops' relocation to mainland Greece. Most exceptional, and most controversial as evidence for Bronze Age interactions, is the great heroic expedition against Troy. Without necessarily representing historical figures and actions, these stories characterize early interaction between the Greek mainland and a non-Greek Anatolia as intermittent, aleatory and individual. These heroic stories formed the background to, and indeed sometimes the first episodes of, an extensive set of traditions which assumed that the settled presence of Greeks in Asia Minor and the coastal islands demanded explanation.[245] The great migrations across the Aegean have been set against each other since antiquity, understood as aspects of the same development. Like the Dorian and Ionian migrations across the Aegean, the Asiatic Aiolian story begins in the mainland and moves its population eastwards *en bloc*, culminating in the foundation of cities on Lesbos, Tenedos, and the north-western coast of mainland Asia Minor. Recently scholars have used the framework of Hellenization to investigate any possible shift in material culture in western Anatolia during the Early Iron Age before substantial literary evidence again comes into play in the seventh century. For the Greeks, the historical process was migration (ἀποικία). Three

244 Mee (2008) 373, and see chapter 4.
245 Fowler, *EGM* 2:569–70.

great population movements were consistently envisioned, corresponding to the three regions of Asia Minor described by Herodotus, and thus also to three ethnic groups arrayed from north to south along the eastern seaboard of the Aegean.[246] Some aspects however of the Aiolian migratory tradition are much harder to fix than the Ionian and Dorian. There are designated leaders of the expedition, who stand somewhat apart from the rest of the migrants. The well-known Ionian capture of Aiolian Smyrna at the very southern edge of Aiolis is an interesting exception to the obscurity of early Aiolian settlement.[247]

3.2.1 Tradition and variation: sources

I treat the archaeological evidence in the following chapter; the literary material shall set the scene for the exploration of Aiolian presence on the ground. It is on the other hand important to consider how the very beginning of the tradition relates to the reality. Both Rose and Beck are skeptical of an Early Iron Age date for Aiolian migration; neither one clarifies when exactly he imagines the Greeks came to Asia Minor in substantial numbers. If, as they seem to suggest, the migratory processes occurred much closer to the Archaic period, then we should take into account the limits which that might impose on the invention of the tradition. I therefore preface this discussion with a summary of what comes in the next: I see no solid evidence to disprove a much earlier date for the actual migration, and more positive evidence than Rose and his colleagues have acknowledged.

The Aiolian migration was the earliest, according to Pherecydes, and provoked the most curiosity according to Strabo: because it was early, because it was slower than

---

246 Hdt. 1.142–150.
247 Hdt. 1.150.

the Ionian or Dorian, and because the Asiatic Aiolians spread themselves more widely.[248] Ancient interest has not resulted in a fulsome body of evidence, and in fact the features of the migratory tradition which Strabo emphasized were seldom drawn out so explicitly in earlier accounts. The northward spread from Aiolis and Lesbos into the Troad and Hellespont seems to occur later, and have its own semi-historical tradition:[249] thus in most versions of the story the Aiolians occupy a more delimited territory.

It is worth considering the sources in a more or less chronological order. Strabo has often enjoyed a preference in recent scholarship on the Aiolian migration, because his version is more 'complete'. I have already suggested that Strabo's concerns were not the same as earlier authors'; it will also become clear that there has been an unhelpful blurring of 'complete' and 'detailed' underlying the promotion of Strabo's account. These details do not on their own indicate that Strabo's version was the core version of the tradition: it is unusual in many ways.

The first literary reference to Greek settlement on the eastern shores of the Aegean is found in Hesiod's description of his father's migration from Kyme to small-town Boiotia for economic reasons. He refers to his father's hometown as Aiolian:[250]

> ὥς περ ἐμός τε πατὴρ καὶ σός, μέγα νήπιε Πέρσῃ,
> πλωίζεσκ᾽ ἐν νηυσί, βίου κεχρημένος ἐσθλοῦ·
> ὅς ποτε καὶ τῇδ᾽ ἦλθε, πολὺν διὰ πόντον ἀνύσσας,
> Κύμην Αἰολίδα προλιπών, ἐν νηὶ μελαίνῃ·
> οὐκ ἄφενος φεύγων οὐδὲ πλοῦτόν τε καὶ ὄλβον,
> ἀλλὰ κακὴν πενίην, τὴν Ζεὺς ἄνδρεσσι δίδωσιν·
> νάσσατο δ᾽ ἄγχ᾽ Ἑλικῶνος ὀιζυρῇ ἐνὶ κώμῃ,
> Ἄσκρῃ, χεῖμα κακῇ, θέρει ἀργαλέῃ, οὐδέ ποτ᾽ ἐσθλῇ.
>
> Hes. *W&D* 633–40

---

248 Pherecydes, *FGrH* 3 F 155; Strabo 13.1.3–4; Fowler, *EGM* 2:597–98.

249 Bérard (1959) 15.

250 I.e. not Italian/Opician Cumae: West (1978) *ad* 636.

Ephorus knew a story that Hesiod's father did not leave Kyme of his own will, but was instead exiled for the slaughter of a kinsman; as West notes, this bears the hallmarks of a fanciful biography for an ancient poet rather than local tradition.[251]

Mimnermus of Kolophon, we know, wrote about the Ionian occupation of Aiolian Smyrna, but very little survives.[252] Callinus of Ephesos, writing slightly earlier, seems to be behind an alternative tradition of Smyrna as a partially Ionian colony in the first instance;[253] both may have covered earlier Aiolian history too, but the surviving testimonies refer only to the foundations of Ionian cities by the Kodridai, particularly Neleus (Πύλον Νηλήϊον ἄστυ λιπόντες / ἱμερτὴν Ἀσίην νησὶν ἀφικόμεθα).[254]

The evidence of the Lesbian poets Alcaeus and Sappho, Mimnermus and Callinus' approximate contemporaries, has been insufficiently considered in the reconstruction of the tradition.[255] It is here that the Penthilidai, and their association with mainland Greece, first appear. Alcaeus rebukes his former ally Pittakos in one poem for entering into a marriage alliance with the 'Atreidai': κῆνος δὲ παώθεις Ἀτρεΐδα[.].[/ δαπτέτω πόλιν ὡς καὶ πεδὰ Μυρσί[λ]ῳ; fragmentary references to the Atreidai and Penthilidai are also in Sappho.[256]

The first certain details of the Aiolian migration then come more than a century later, in Pindar's eleventh *Nemean Ode* – not in fact an epinician at all but an encomiastic ode for one Aristagoras' installation as *prytaneus* of Aiolian Tenedos (date unknown).[257]

---

251 Ephorus, *FGrH* 70 F 100; West (1978) ad 638; Kivilo (2010) 8–9.

252 Frr. 9, 13a? Hall (2002) 73; and see now Fowler, *EGM* 2:589–90.

253 Callinus fr. 2; both Mimnermus fr. 9 and Callinus come from Strabo 14.1.4. Smyrna was Ionian by at least c. 688 BCE (Paus. 5.8.7).

254 Mimermnus fr. 9.1–2, cf. fr. 10; Brillante (1993).

255 Vanschoonwinkel (e.g.) asserts that Aiolis is not mentioned in sources between Hesiod and Herodotus.

256 Alc. frr. 70.6–7 (a scholion *ad loc.* likely identified the Atreidai as a reference to the Penthilidai), 75, 302b; Sapph. frr. 17, 71.

257 On dating difficulties, see Henry (2005) *ad loc.*; occasion, Verdenius (1988) *ad Nem.* 11.1.

The story here has very little to do with the Penthilidai or Lesbos. Pindar sets out the strength of Aristagoras' bloodline as a descendant of an otherwise unknown hero, Peisandros of Sparta, who led the Aiolians to Tenedos with Orestes.[258]

> συμβαλεῖν μὰν εὐμαρὲς ἦν τό τε Πεισάνδρου πάλαι
> αἶμ' ἀπὸ Σπάρτας, — Ἀμύκλαθεν γὰρ ἔβα σὺν Ὀρέστᾳ,
> Αἰολέων στρατιὰν χαλκεντέα δεῦρ' ἀνάγων, —
> καὶ παρ' Ἰσμηνοῦ ῥοᾶν κεκραμένον
> ἐκ Μελανίπποιο μάτρωος·
>
> *Nem.* 11.33–37

Pindar's version almost certainly plays up aspects of the migratory tradition more relevant to his honorand.

The scholia point out that Hellanicus of Mytilene also treated the story of Orestes' migration to Aiolis (τῆς Ὀρέστου εἰς τὴν Αἰολίδα ἀποικίας) in the first book of the *Aiolika*.[259] It seems likely that Pindar's was a well-known version of the tradition, but it cannot have originated with Hellanicus. The scholiast may have believed, in line with ancient tradition on Hellanicus' dates, that Pindar had drawn on the *Aiolika*, but it is unlikely that Hellanicus preceded Pindar or formed his approach to the migration. Jacoby suggested that a scholion on Lycophron's *Alexandra* contained the rest of Hellanicus' account: having died early soon after arriving in Lesbos, the settlement was achieved by Orestes' descendant Gras:[260]

> ὁ δὲ συντάξας ἐκ διαφόρων ἐθνῶν λαούς, οὓς ἐκάλεσαν
> Αἰολεῖς διὰ τὸ ἐκ ποικίλων τόπων εἶναι, ἦλθεν εἰς Λέσβον·
> καὶ αὐτὸς μὲν ταχὺ ἀποθανὼν πόλιν κτίσαι οὐκ ἠδυνήθη·

---

[258] Peisandros' name is common in mythology (*Il.* 6.203, 11,122, 13.601, 16.193, *Od.* 18.299; Strabo 12.8.5, 13.4.16; [Apoll.] *Bibl.* 4.7.26, etc.), and attested as a hero at Plataia (Plut. *Arist.* 11.3) and in historical Sparta (Agesilaos' brother-in-law, Xen. *Hell.* 3.4.29), but is above all a good one for the ancestor of a newly appointed magistrate.

[259] Σ Pind. *Nem.* 11.43 = Hellanicus, *FGrH* 4 F 32; see chapter 2 on Hellanicus' treatment.

[260] Jacoby *ad* Hellanicus, *FGrH* 4 F 32; Fowler, *EGM* 2:598.

> ἀπόγονος δὲ τούτου καλούμενος Γρᾶς μετὰ ρ¯ ἔτη ἐκυρίευσε τῆς Λέσβου καὶ πόλιν ἔκτισε. ὁ γὰρ λόγος ἀκουόμενος περὶ του Γρᾶ καλλίων.

The fourth century Atthidographer Demon suggested that both Orestes and Teisamenos' son Kometes failed: Orestes because he died too soon, and Kometes because his followers abandoned the migration. Then, 'according to the prevailing genealogy' (κατὰ τὴν ἐχομένην γενεὰν) the expedition was moved by Penthilos; Jacoby's text follows Schwartz in emending Πενθίλου (MS πλινθίλου corr. Dindorf) to <Γρᾶ τοῦ Ἐχέλα τοῦ> Πενθίλου.[261] This seeks to bring Demon in line with Strabo and Pausanias, based on the dubious assumption that all three authors were using Ephorus' account of the Aiolian migration.

Strabo did expand the story of migration substantially. Rather than a single movement, or a rebuffed first attempt parallel to the return of the Herakleidai,[262] the migration occurred over four generations. The manner of the migration is also entirely realigned: instead of a focus on the islands near Asia Minor, and thus presumably a fleet across the Aegean, the Aiolians progressed over land, first to Thrace, then further east to the Anatolian shore of the Propontis before moving south into the Troad and Lesbos.

> τέτταρσι γὰρ δὴ γενεαῖς πρεσβυτέραν φασὶ τὴν Αἰολικὴν ἀποικίαν τῆς Ἰωνικῆς, διατριβὰς δὲ λαβεῖν καὶ χρόνους μακροτέρους. Ὀρέστην μὲν γὰρ ἄρξαι τοῦ στόλου, τούτου δ' ἐν Ἀρκαδίᾳ τελευτήσαντος τὸν βίον διαδέξασθαι τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ Πενθίλον, καὶ προελθεῖν μέχρι Θρᾴκης ἑξήκοντα ἔτεσι τῶν Τρωικῶν ὕστερον, ὑπ' αὐτὴν τὴν τῶν Ἡρακλειδῶν εἰς Πελοπόννησον κάθοδον· εἶτ' Ἀρχέλαον υἱὸν ἐκείνου περαιῶσαι τὸν Αἰολικὸν στόλον εἰς τὴν νῦν Κυζικηνὴν τὴν περὶ τὸ Δασκύλιον· Γρᾶν δὲ τὸν υἱὸν τούτου τὸν νεώτατον προελθόντα μέχρι τοῦ Γρανίκου

---

261 *FGrH* 327 F 17 (= Σ Eur. *Rhes.* 251).

262 Parallels with the Herakleidai: Fowler, *EGM* 2:598.

ποταμοῦ καὶ παρεσκευασμένον ἄμεινον περαιῶσαι τὸ πλέον τῆς στρατιᾶς εἰς Λέσβον καὶ κατασχεῖν αὐτήν·

Strabo 13.1.3

Jacoby believed that Strabo's account was derived from Ephorus. Strabo does cite Ephorus along with many other authors on Aiolis with regard to its extent,[263] and on the settlement of Boiotia – but not specifically for those pieces where the Aiolian migration is mentioned. There is some disjunction between the account in Book 13 and the earlier reference to Boiotians participating in the expedition to Asia led by Penthilos or 'Orestes' sons':

εἶτ᾽ ἀνέστρεψαν εἰς τὴν οἰκείαν, ἤδη τοῦ Αἰολικοῦ στόλου παρεσκευασμένου περὶ Αὐλίδα τῆς Βοιωτίας, ὃν ἔστελλον εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν οἱ Ὀρέστου παῖδες.

Strabo 9.2.3

τὴν Αἰολικὴν ἀποικίαν συνέπραξαν τοῖς περὶ Πενθίλον πλείστους ἐξ ἑαυτῶν συμπέμψαντες, ὥστε καὶ Βοιωτικὴν προσαγορευθῆναι.

Strabo 9.2.5

Both come from an Ephorean context. Have Penthilos' tribulations simply been delayed until they are relevant, i.e. to the Aiolian section of Strabo's work? There is nevertheless a clear impression of Asia as the intended destination.

Pausanias likewise clearly directs Gras' migration: 'he intended to settle in the land between Ionia and the Mysians, which in the modern day is called Aiolid' (ὁ μὲν τὴν τῆς Ἰωνίας μεταξὺ καὶ Μυσῶν, καλουμένην δὲ Αἰολίδα ἐφ᾽ ἡμῶν, καθέξειν ἔμελλεν, 3.2.1). This migration is dated to the time of Agis son of Eurysthenes, i.e. after the return of the Herakleidai: 'Ionia' was perhaps thus not simply used because it was the name by

[263] Strabo 13.1.4 & 39 = Ephorus, *FGrH* 70 F 163a & b.

which Pausanias and his readers knew the territory, but because in fact Ionia was undergoing settlement at the time of the Aiolian migration in Pausanias' view.[264] Pausanias does use the same genealogy of four Penthilidai as Strabo; however, his version of the story is different again. The Lakedaimonians participated in Gras' migration to Asia, but Penthilos' migration to Lesbos had already succeeded.

Ephorus indubitably did cover the Aiolian migration,[265] but there is very little evidence for what he said. One testimonium regarding a migration of Aiolians to Aitolia,[266] including a rare direct quote, is cited by Strabo in order to cast doubt on it: if the Aiolians invaded Aitolia when they and the Boiotians were driven out by the Thessalians, then Ephorus was wrong to say that Aitolia had never been conquered. Strabo notes as well that according to Apollodorus the Hyantes of Boiotia settled amongst the Aitolians (presumably after being expelled by Boiotians); it is not clear whether this is further evidence against Ephorus' conclusion, or a contradiction of Ephorus' story. It seems clear that Ephorus was well aware of issues with his version, for Strabo quotes his defence directly: 'I am accustomed to treat these things precisely, when some matter is utterly doubtful or has received false explanation' (διακριβοῦν εἰώθαμεν, ὅταν ᾖι τι τῶν πραγμάτων ἢ παντελῶς ἀπορούμενον ἢ ψευδῆ δόξαν ἔχον).[267] This is not an overall methodological assertion, but a defence of his work on this particular point.

---

[264] Cf. Paus. 7.1.9–2.1.

[265] Parmeggiani (2011) 212, assuming that Gras was the major figure in Ephorus' account and contemporary with Neleus, assigns the Aiolian expedition with the Ionian and Dorian expeditions to book 3.

[266] Presumably Kalydon and Pleuron, cf. Thuc. 3.102.5.

[267] Strabo 10.3.2-4, 9.3.12 = Ephorus, *FGrH* 70 F 122a & b.

3.2.2 Aiolian origins

We have seen already that Thessalian and Boiotian traditions involved specific homelands in northern Greece, whereas Aiolian tradition was far from clear. This enabled the Aiolians to present themselves as migrants from all parts of Greece – however, what the stories at the other end of the migration suggest is that Lesbian cities and Kyme took the place of homelands for other Aiolian cities. In the kind of decentralized, temporal network which migration traditions form, it was these central nodes which had links back across the Aegean.

Although historians have largely taken Hesiod's description of his father's emigration from Kyme to be a literal story, Gregory Nagy has posited that the migration from Asiatic Aiolis to Boiotian Askra was a literary inversion of the Ionian [*sic*] migration stories: 'the stationary Helladic past is relocated in the mobile Asiatic present of Ionia in Asia Minor'; Kyme becomes the Aiolian point-of-departure which Boiotia was in the tradition.[268] If so, it is a very early reference to the migratory tradition, and here Hesiod is concerned with his own family and the individual *émigré*. Most importantly, however, Hesiod's father relocates from Aiolis to Askra without any particular reference to past movements; it is not a return. Hesiod's narratorial persona notoriously lived in a small and difficult world, and advocated avoiding sea travel immediately hereafter (note already πολὺν διὰ πόντον).[269] Poverty pushed his father away from Aiolis, but the 'woeful village' (ὀιζυρῇ ἐνὶ κώμῃ) in which he settled was

[268] Nagy (2009) 290, see 290–94 on the aetiology of Ionian and Aiolian epic heritage in biographical tradition.

[269] See Edwards (2004) 45–54 for a critical account of Hesiod's attitudes to Askra's trading relations with the outside world including Aiolis.

surely not an improvement – so if anything the risk-averse Hesiod evinces an ambivalent attitude to mobility and trade *per se* rather than the tradition of the great migrations.[270]

None of these Archaic sources explicitly presents anything about the Aiolian migration as it appears in the later sources.[271] If the shape of the migratory tradition itself remains unclear, it is nevertheless likely that the Lesbians had an idea of themselves as migrants by the beginning of the sixth century, if not earlier.

In Pindar's ode, the Tenedians' ancestors form an undifferentiated mass, already referred to as Aiolians (*Nem.* 11.35). This need not envision an already unified group living or assembling at Amyklai; Pindar may anticipate here the group as they would become known in their new Asiatic residence. It is interesting however that the group is monolithic both at the end and the beginning of the migration. This is quite typical of the internal version of migration and foundation stories, with few exceptions. Any idea of the Aiolians' origins is largely elided: Orestes, not the Aiolians, was strongly associated with Amyklai, which is juxtaposed with Sparta above all.[272]

Herodotus had nothing in particular to say about the Aiolian migration. It has been noted that this is a contrast with the treatment of the Ionian migratory tradition in book 1, which receives substantial deconstruction; he had, it is felt, ample opportunity to discuss migration in his discussion of Aiolis.[273] It may seem by comparison that Herodotus was content with the cohesion of the Aiolian ethnos. Thucydides was similarly quiet on migration, but he refers on several occasions to ethnic sympathies between

---

[270] Interestingly the adjective used by Hesiod to describe Askra, ὀιζυρός, is amplified by Archilochos in his well-known complaint about his own migratory destination Thasos: τρισοιζυρὴν πόλιν (228).

[271] *Pace* Hall (2002) 73.

[272] Huxley (1975) 34.

[273] Hdt. 1.149–51, cf. 1.145–8.

Boiotia and Aiolians from Lesbos, Tenedos and Ainos:[274] most importantly he refers to the Boiotians as the founders (τοῖς κτίσασι) of Asiatic Aiolian cities.[275] In typical Thucydidean fashion, the mythical apparatus including the leaders of the expedition is overlooked.

There is a surprising reluctance in our sources to identify the Aiolian homeland.[276] The origins of the Ionians were somewhat controversial, although the issue was selection between specific rival candidates; the Adriatic Dorians were less clearly located, but the Dorians as an ethnic group were similarly associated with several specific regions, famously the small tetrapolis of central Greece, but also Macedonia. By contrast no cities are identified as the original Aiolian dodecapolis, and only Velleius Paterculus suggested that they were expelled from anywhere; for the latter at least it was perhaps a conflation of the circumstances of the Aiolians and their leaders with those of Orestes' other son Teisamenos and his descendants.[277]

Herodotus is the only author to directly state where the Aiolians were located: he claims that the Aiolians were originally called Pelasgians, and as we saw in the preceding section, he noted that the Thessalians' territory had been called Aiolis before the Thessalian migration.[278] Pelasgians are of course imagined throughout the early Aegean, including in parts of what would become Asiatic Aiolis;[279] the region suggested here is perhaps not strictly later Pelasgiotis or Thessaliotis but broad swathe of northern Greek territory.[280] Some local traditions did likewise place Aiolians in later Thessaly, but

---

274 Thuc. 3.2.3, 7.57.5, 8.100.3

275 Thuc. 7.57.5.

276 As Apostolou (2019) 177 points out, no city ever claimed to be the metropolis of Aiolians, even in the age of kinship claims in epigraphy.

277 Vell. Pat. 1.2.3, 1.4.3–4.

278 Hdt. 7.95, 176.

279 Strabo 13.3.3; Hellanicus, *FGrH* 4 F 80? Steph. Byz. s.v. Ἀντανδρος.

280 Sakellariou (2009) 382–85.

depicted them as a separate group which in fact drove Pelasgians into eastern Thessaly.[281] These are not, however, part of the migratory tradition, and it is not simply the result of the fragmentary nature of the tradition that the Aiolians seem somewhat rootless.

Two rhetorical features appear repeatedly in the actual migration accounts: one, as Sakellariou points out, is that the term 'Aiolians' may be used in anticipation to refer to any group which arrived in Aiolis, or (often) as a convenient name for a number of migrant groups who were simply led by some prominent figure – usually *not* one of the Aiolidai, descendants of the eponymous hero Aiolos.[282] The other is that the narrative of the migration repeatedly elides the location of the Aiolians: their departure from the Greek mainland does not matter. This is so often the case that it is difficult to attribute it simply to the fragmentary nature of many of our sources. Some scholars have avoided the discussion by leaving the question of origins to schematic maps, with arrows giving only the vaguest indication of origins. Others have used the waypoints of the migration to pick up the conceptual homeland of the Aiolians.

The first is Lakedaimon, as the homeland of Orestes and the other leaders of the expedition. The connection of the Penthilidai to Aiolians is quite vague, even awkward, but there is no shortage of clear traditions about the pre-Dorian population of the Peloponnese in which the Aiolians do not feature. Fowler perhaps has it backwards when he asks how Orestes became Aiolian.[283] Why not ask how the Aiolians became Peloponnesian or Atreid? In general, they did not. Sparta appears as a starting point for

---

281 Strabo 5.2.4, Conon fr. 1.41.

282 Sakellariou (2009) 417–20. See chapter 5; people claiming descent from Aiolos are not found in Aiolian territories – but interestingly many Athenians who claimed descent from Pylian Neleus were thus descended from Aiolos through his granddaughter Tyro, Neleus' mother.

283 Fowler, *EGM* 2:598–99.

the migration only in Pindar. As discussed above the origins of the leaders Orestes and Peisandros are the focus there, not the Aiolians themselves.

Vanschoonwinkel, however, does not think that the Aiolians' Lakedaimonian associations were limited to its leaders. He has compiled a set of mythological and cultic connections between the Peloponnese and Aiolis, drawing on sources spread throughout antiquity, in order to demonstrate the likelihood of Lakedaimonian participation in the Aiolian migration:[284]

1. Orestes: his associations were many and mixed. We have seen both Sparta and Arkadia employed in the migratory tradition itself; Vanschoonwinkel notes further an attachment to the Acheloos and Phokis, either by genealogy or his well-known friendship with Pylades.[285] Orestes' wife Anchirrhoe (not the mother of Penthilos!) was Argive;[286] his son Damasias associated with Achaia.[287]

2. Hera: the cult of Hera on Lesbos, I have suggested, had mythical links with the Aiolian migration; the month name Ἥραος was common in Aiolis as well. Vanschoonwinkel sees Aiolian Hera as derived directly from the Argive Heraion, based solely on the Atreid foundation. Argos was certainly not the only city with a major Hera cult.

3. Altar of the Twelve Gods: founded by Agamemnon on Cape Lekton.[288]

4. Poseidon, Aigai: towns named Aigiai with cults of Poseidon found in both Achaia and Aiolis.[289]

---

[284] Vanschoonwinkel (1991) 411–14, and see also Fragoulaki (2013) 102–5. It is unclear whether Vanschoonwinkel envisions a historical Spartan element in Anatolia, which would be somewhat surprising, or simply wishes to excavate a buried aspect of the migratory tradition.

[285] Apoll. 1.52.

[286] Hellanicus, *FGrH* 4 F 125.

[287] Paus. 5.4.3, 7.6.2.

[288] Strabo 13.1.49.

[289] Hom. *Il.* 8.201-204; 13.20-22; *Od.* 5.381; Strabo 8.7.4, 13.3.5.

5. Pelops: a lesser-known version of the chariot race with Oinomaos, the source of the Pelopid curse, was located on Lesbos.[290]

6. Telephos: the son of Herakles and the Arkadian princess Auge spent most of his life in Mysia.

7. Makar(eus): the mythical ruler of Lesbos was associated with several different regions. Originally non-Greek, he was a son of Helios (associated with Rhodes); later he was adopted as an Aiolid.[291] He was an extremely popular figure in Lesbian historiographers, but often provided the primordial element of Lesbian history.[292] A third tradition makes him son of Krinakos, associated with Achaia; a fourth with Lykaon, associated with Arkadia; a fifth with Messenia, a sixth with Amphissa in Lokris.[293] These may not all have been taken as the Lesbian Makar.

8. Malene, Malous, Malia etc.: according to Vanschoonwinkel, these toponyms evoke Malaos 'sans autre precision de relation': the reverse is also possible. N.B. Melia in Ionia – these names are not limited to Aiolian areas.[294]

There is certainly a wealth of potential connections here, but it requires a relaxed distinction between Lakedaimon and the Peloponnese *in toto*: Achaia occurs often, but also Arkadia and Argos and some areas further afield. The Asiatic reflections of these traditions are scattered too; the most widespread element here is the veneration of Hera, which cannot be conclusively linked to the Peloponnese. It will always be difficult to demonstrate that connections in myth between two regions are quantitatively more

---

290 Σ Eur. *Or.* 990.

291 See chapter 5.

292 Thomas (2019) 261–62.

293 Hes. fr. 184 F, Diod. 5.81.4, Σ *Il.* 24.544, Krinakos: Dion. Hal. 1.18; Lykaon: [Apoll.] *Bibl.* 3.8.1-2, Steph. Byz. s.v. Makareai; Paus. 8.3.2-3, Dion. Hal. 1.11, 13; Messenia: Steph. Byz. s.v. Makareai; Amphissa: Paus. 10.38.4.

294 On Carian Melie, see Thomas (2019) 219–21.

substantial than their connections with other regions; the category is so open. It matters, too, that many of these associations are not particularly related to migration or cited in the migration tradition.

The only source which does seem to refer to an Aiolian city on the mainland, however, does place the Aiolians in the Peloponnese. This is found in a brief geographical comment by Thucydides, who as we have already seen acknowledged Boiotian ethnic links with Lesbos and Aiolis. Remarking on a harbour on the coast of Corinthia used by the Athenians in 425 BCE, Thucydides picks out a nearby hill: ὁ Σολύγειος λόφος ἐστίν, ἐφ' ὃν Δωριῆς τὸ πάλαι ἱδρυθέντες τοῖς ἐν τῇ πόλει Κορινθίοις ἐπολέμουν οὖσιν Αἰολεῦσιν.[295] The episode of conflict between Dorians and Aiolians invoked here is otherwise quite unknown; it presumably relates to the Dorian invasion.[296] Far more attention has been paid to the Dorian aspect: Catherine Morgan suggests that this was a key moment in the history of Dorian Corinth.[297] It may well have been local tradition: Morgan suggested that it had been treated by the eighth century Corinthian poet Eumelos. Hornblower notes (following Stroud) that Thucydides likely spent some time with Corinthians during his exile, whether or not he participated in naval campaigns himself.[298] Did the Corinthians then believe that their city had once been Aiolian? Maria Fragoulaki notes that Thucydides does not qualify Aiolians as the *former* residents of Corinth (cf. Αἰγινῆται, οἳ τότε Αἴγιναν εἶχον, 7.57.2), and thus concludes that the contemporary Corinthians were supposed to represent a merged population of Dorians and Aiolians.[299] This is an argument *e silentio*; the Dorians are consistently presented as

---

295 Thuc. 4.42.
296 But n.b. Salmon (1984) 49.
297 Morgan (1994).
298 Hornblower, *CT* 2:21–24.
299 Fragoulaki (2013) 104.

a hostile force who expelled local residents wherever they went.[300] More curious is the suggestion that there were Aiolians in Corinth at all; those living in the Peloponnese expelled by the Dorians are usually described as Achaian. Moreover we have already seen many suggestions that the Aiolian migration preceded the southward invasion of the Dorians. However, the association of Sisyphos, son of Aiolos, with Corinth was a factor here. The earlier name of the city was Ephyra under Sisyphos' rule:[301] was this the echo of Thessalian origins? Sakellariou firmly considers this to be a case where the later association of an Aiolid with a particular area has led to an imaginary Aiolian population; if Morgan is however correct, the story is quite early.

Thucydides does not clearly depict the fate of Corinth's mythical Aiolians. He does seem to suggest that Boiotians made up some part of the Aiolian migration: they were the κτισταί of Aiolian cities, as though the Boiotians and Aiolians were separate groups in the course of the migration. It has often been suggested that the merger of Boiotians and Aiolians before the migration is to be seen in Pindar's connection of Peisandros with the Theban hero Melanippos by marriage, but with closer reading this is less certain: the key phrase is παρ' Ἰσμηνοῦ ῥοᾶν κεκραμένον (*Nem*. 11.36). Often this has been taken (with the MS reading ῥοάν, acc. sg.) as indication that Peisandros went to Thebes, i.e. at the time of the migration, 'mingling his blood by the streams of the Ismenos'. Κεκραμένον however agrees with αἷμα, and the reading ῥοᾶν (gen. pl.), more in line with Pindar's consistent usage of ῥοαί in the plural, does not definitely suggest that the marriage took place in Boiotia: instead, 'blood from Sparta… mingled with

---

[300] Salmon (1984) 38–39 notes that there was a very independent tradition of foundation by Aletes which was attached to the story of the Herakleidai.

[301] Hom. *Il.* 6.152–53, Paus. 2.1.1, [Apoll.] *Bibl.* 1.9.3, and see above, pp. 91–92, on the other Ephyrai.

Melanippos' line, from (by) the streams of the Ismenos.'[302] Melanippos was one of the heroes who defended Thebes against the Seven two generations before Orestes, not one of the Boiotoi;[303] Aristagoras, and not the Aiolians, has mixed Achaian and Boiotian descent. Strabo's depiction of the Aiolian muster at Aulis does suggest that Boiotians thus became involved in the Aiolian migration: τὴν Αἰολικὴν ἀποικίαν συνέπραξαν τοῖς περὶ Πενθίλον πλείστους ἐξ ἑαυτῶν συμπέμψαντες, ὥστε καὶ Βοιωτικὴν προσαγορευθῆναι. It is clear here that the Boiotians, however numerous, were only one part of the expedition alongside the Aiolians, whose origins are not disclosed. Indeed, the careful language (συν- twice; καί, προσ-) may correct an underlying misunderstanding of the 'Βοιωτικὴ ἀποικία' as a purely Boiotian affair.

Recent scholarship on the better-attested Ionian migration has emphasized the diverse origins of the Ionian migrants in many sources, in contrast with the often overemphasized idea of Ionians from the Peloponnese migrating to Anatolia (via Athens or not).[304] Herodotus counted alongside the Ionians from Achaia migrant Abantes, Cadmeans, Dryopians, Phocians, Molossians, Pelasgian Arcadians, Epidaurian Dorians and other Ionians (1.146). Clearly some cities had their own traditions about the particular mix of ethnicities which settled once the migration broke up in Asia Minor, although Herodotus only cites Miletos' in order to mock its pretensions of ethnic purity.

The sources on the Aiolian migration are somewhat blunter. Several explicitly remark that the group lead by Orestes came from various peoples or places.[305] However, this is not necessarily founded on historical fact or even the earlier understanding of the

---

[302] Henry (2005) *ad loc.*; πάλαι may also go with αἶμα, see Verdenius (1988) *ad Nem.* 11.36 with earlier bibliography.

[303] Melannipos was son of Astakos, a descendant of the Spartoi (i.e. Theban autochthons).

[304] Crielaard (2009); Mac Sweeney (2017).

[305] Σ Lyc. *Alex.* 1374c, Σ Dion. Per. 820; Menecles of Barca, *FGrH* 270 F 10.

migration: it is a later folk etymology developed from the obscure meaning of Αἰολεῖς,[306] and the invention of various origins has been inverted to become the origin of the name. We should not underestimate the difference between a long but closed set of ethnic groups, such as were the sources for the Ionian migration, and an open category. The etymological explanation is reasonably assigned to Hellanicus, whose tendency to use and sometime abuse etymological strategies to explain mythology is well known.[307] It is of course never clear whether Hellanicus' etymologies had any currency locally, but the same point appears in a number of accounts from the fourth century BC onwards. This suggests that the Asiatic Aiolians from the fifth century onwards were uncertain about their precise origins.

This uncertainty however also meant that the Aiolians were open to potential connections with a variety of groups through the migratory tradition: Boiotian, Spartan and Corinthian, perhaps also Lokrian. Thessaly was perhaps once called Aiolis, and of course the Boiotian migration from Thessaly is temporally aligned with the Aiolian migration setting out from Boiotia. However direct links between Thessaly and Aiolis are not particularly in evidence in the literary versions. In the mid-second century BCE a certain Bombos, an Aiolian from the young city of Alexandreia in the Troad (Αἰολεὺς [ἀπ᾽ Ἀλεξαν]δρείας, l. 13), gave lectures (ἐπιδείξις, l. 14) in the gymnasium, in which amongst other things he discussed the kinship between Larissaians and Alexandrians:[308]

> […συνεμναμονεύσατο ἔ]ν τε τοῖς πεπραγματευμένοις
> αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀπροάσεσσιν τοῦν γεγενειμένουν ἐνδόξουν
> Λα–
> ρισαίοις, καὶ τάν τε συγγενείαν καὶ φιλίαν ταῖς πολίεσσι
> π[ὸ]-

[306] See chapter 2 on the etymological strategy.
[307] Fowler, *EGM* 2:598–99.
[308] For date, Helly (2006) 191–94.

θ᾽ εὐτὰς ὀνενε[ούσατο] καὶ τὰ φιλάνθρουπα τὰ
ὑπάρχοντα
Αἰολείεσσι πὸτ τὰν πόλιν τὰν Λαρισαίουν

Helly (2006) ll. 15–19

The words ἐπιδείξις and ἔνδοξα both suggest that Bombos was a historian; ἔνδοξος moreover refers to people or events worthy of repute beyond the local setting. Angelos Chaniotis suggested that Bombos' lectures included discussion of Larissa's participation in the Aiolian migration; this presupposes that Thessalians were part of the migration, which we have not seen framed in this way before.[309] Alexandreia was formed in the late fourth century, apparently by the *synoikismos* of various cities in the Troad; in the new Roman province of Asia it may have been able to draw on prestige derived from Rome's supposed mother-city Troy, but its royal foundation left it without a deeper history.[310] It therefore understandably sought to link itself more directly to the Aiolian migration.[311] Bruno Helly suggests that the relationship between Larissa and Alexandreia arose from Thessalian theoric missions to Achilles' tomb in the Troad: the same stele holds a decree honouring Leukios of Alexandreia for hosting Larissans.[312] The text unambiguously refers to συγγενεία between Thessaly and Aiolis, which is a rare piece of evidence for direct connection.

3.2.3 Definition of Aiolis and the role of the Penthilidai

Let us return to Pindar's story, and the question of who led the Aiolians, and where to. The destination, δεῦρ', at *Nemean* 11.35 is of course most reasonably taken as Tenedos,

309 Chaniotis (2009) 261.
310 Helly (2006) 194–96.
311 Note the prominence of the Alexandreian sanctuary of Apollo Smintheus, e.g. Ellis-Evans (2019) 230–231.
312 Helly (2006) 195–96; a later Larissan decree for another, anonymous, Alexandreian is of unclear purpose (*SEG* 35 594).

but it is surely vague enough to encompass all Asiatic Aiolian territory; perhaps the makeup of the audience (some neighbouring élite visitors?) would have suggested a wider interpretation at its début.

Strabo's version entails not only a slower and more complex migration, but a distinctly different hierarchy of settlement; it is hard to reconcile the southward motion with Strabo's own assertion that Kyme and Lesbos were responsible for the foundations elsewhere in Aiolis: μεγίστη δέ ἐστι τῶν Αἰολικῶν καὶ ἀρίστη Κύμη καὶ σχεδὸν μητρόπολις αὕτη τε καὶ ἡ Λέσβος τῶν ἄλλων πόλεων περὶ τριάκοντά που τὸν ἀριθμόν, ὧν ἐκλελοίπασιν οὐκ ὀλίγαι.[313] There is an unnoticed oddity in Strabo's fourth stage of the migration. He notes that Penthilos crossed to Lesbos because he was 'better prepared' (παρεσκευασμένον ἄμεινον) – than whom? Perhaps the reference is to Kleues and Malaos' sojourn in Lokris, which is described as the text continues, but it seems to depict the preceding stages of the migration as failure. This harks back to established versions in which the first migration failed, but the second was successful, unlike the continuous advance over four generations which Strabo attempts to depict.

In contrast with the Ionian migration, specific local traditions of Aiolian migration and the foundation of individual cities are less in evidence. The overall migration of the Aiolian host is almost always kept in view; it is even often made clear that the migration split only once it arrived in Lesbos or Anatolia, though as we have seen the peninsular cities are sometimes described as secondary settlements, founded later by individual Lesbian *poleis*: this seems to be the context for the most striking local evocation of the Aiolian migration, the only example of a narrative episode set during the migration. In essence, the story of Enalos, the maiden, and their miraculous salvation

[313] Strabo 13.3.6.

by a dolphin (and, in some versions, subsequent deification) seems to form an aetiological myth for the cult paraphernalia of a minor maritime deity associated with the temple of Poseidon at Methymna. As Rosalind Thomas points out, however, the story is open to multiple lines of interpretative focus.[314] Here I will focus on just two, the use of the Penthilidai, and the Methymnaean setting of the story.

The story is specifically set in the course of the Aiolian migration. Plutarch's more fulsome version has the tyrant Pittakos, now recognised as one of the seven sages, report an oracle which required the Penthilidai to make sacrifices when they reached a reef called Mesogaion on their voyage to Lesbos: a bull to Poseidon, and a human girl to Amphitrite.[315] There were seven Penthilid kings with daughters, and they drew lots amongst themselves for the duty of sacrifice. The unnamed daughter of king Smintheus was duly cast overboard; a young man, Enalos, followed her into the sea out of love, and they were both spared death. After some period of time in which the city was founded, the story then shifts to Methymna. Enalos emerged from the sea to explain his own survival. With an entourage of octopuses, he offered a rock from the sea to the people of Methymna – Plutarch's text is corrupt at this point, but the conclusion 'and this we call Enalos' is clearest if the story was associated with a particular stone at Methymna.[316]

Enalos is the central character of the story. His name evokes the sea generally and one of Poseidon's titles (Enalios) specifically. The romantic story of the lovers' leap by contrast is quite weakly attached to the migration. The oracle demands a maiden (*parthenos*, or girl, *paidiske* in Antikleides' version): the story immediately moves to the

---

314 Thomas (2019) 85.

315 Plut. *Conv. sept. sap.* 19–20 (*Mor.* 163a–d), cf. *De sollert. anim.* 36 (*Mor.* 984e) = Myrsilus, *FGrH* 459 F 14.

316 Thomas (2019) 86–87.

sacrifice of a king's daughter. Considering the Penthilidai's descent from Agamemnon, the human sacrifice is noteworthy, evocative of the sacrifice of Iphigeneia at Aulis.[317] It may be the case that the muster of Aiolians at Aulis was already current in the third century BC, if in Ephorus, and certainly Demon's oracle already exercised the reputation of the Penthilidai as a return of the Atreidai to the lands conquered in the Trojan War, including Lesbos. The story here too seems to draw on charter myth in which the Aiolian migration rehearses the expedition led by Agamemnon and Menelaos to Anatolia.

The usefulness of the Penthilidai has clearly long outlasted the family which bore that name. The named leader is different in the two versions of the story: Plutarch has Echelas leading, Antikleides, his son Gras. Plutarch's version in other ways seems to preserve the local elements of the story better, and most likely draws on the *Lesbiaka* of the early third century historian Myrsilos of Methymna.[318] Antikleides of Athens, roughly contemporary with Myrsilos, wrote histories of Alexander and of Delos; the Enalos story is attributed to the *Nostoi*, but quite possibly drew on other Lesbian historians (μυθολογοῦσιν τῶν ἐν Μηθύμνῃ τινὲς).[319] It is hard to know what to make of the different leaders in the two versions. As we have seen, in later accounts Echelas or Archelaos is associated with the Propontis (by Strabo; he appears without role in Pausanias), whereas Gras has been associated with with the migration to Lesbos itself. Perhaps there was a chronological issue.

---

[317] Another distinctly local aspect is an interpretation of Dionysos' epithet ὠμηστής at Messon as a reference to human sacrifice: Henrichs (1999) 230; Thomas (2019) 270.

[318] Thomas (2019) 87.

[319] Antikleides' title itself is not significant. Antikleides' *Nostoi* also encompassed Herakles' voyages (Book 2? FF 2–3) and an (early?) war between Chios and Erythrai (F 5): 'Νόστοι kann auch preziöser titel für ein mythologisches handbuch und selbst für eine sammlung im stile der ῎Ερωτες sein' (Jacoby).

The story can be split into two sections: the cultic origins of Enalos and the foundation of Methymna is the second part, but the first, migratory part is similarly relevant to Methymna in particular. One wonders if the reef, Mesogaion, was also prompted by some feature of local geography: in this case, could the name Mesogaion reflect a point between Methymna and the mainland? Most significant is the name Smintheus, which reflects not only the cult of Apollo at Methymna but a common cult on the coast opposite Methymna. The most important (ancient) of these cults was at Chryse near Adramyttion.[320] Once again the Homeric tradition of the Troad seems to be important here: it is possible that a prominent family played a role in the cult,[321] but we note that there was also general Methymnaian interest in this part of the coast. The city of Assos on the coast across from Methymna was claimed by Myrsilos to be a Methymnaian colony, while other sources attributed it to the Mytilenean peraia.[322] Ships from Mytilene towards the Hellespontine colonies must have regularly sailed in plain sight of Methymna through the narrow strait between Lesbos and Lekton. There is perhaps a rivalry to be seen here for domination of the nearby mainland which has been drawn back into the migration story.

Alternatively, and more often, scholars have identified the Enalos story and the migration of Orestes more generally as the family myth of one aristocratic Lesbian clan.[323] The Penthilidai were apparently based at Mytilene. Their namesake was the son of Orestes; at least one member of the family, likely in the seventh century, bore the name

---

320 *Il.* 1.39; Strabo 13.1.48, 64.

321 Thomas (2019) 90.

322 *IACP* no. 769; Lesbians: Hellanicus, *FGrH* 4 F 160; Methyma: Myrsilus, *FGrH* 477 F 17; Mytilene: Alexander Polyhistor, *FGrH* 118 F 96.

323 Fowler, *EGM* 2:254–55; Apostolou (2019) 183–85 focuses on the importance of Penthilos as a migratory leader, avoiding the question of the post-Archaic *Nachleben* of the Penthilid clan's story.

Penthilos (Arist. *Pol.* 1311b 29). Their position at Mytilene is unclear from extant sources; Aristotle refers to Penthilos' predecessors as examples of magistrates or members of a royal dynasty (βασιλικὰς δυναστείας) but suggests that they were eliminated for striking the people with clubs, which suggests tyranny.[324] Thereafter, Aristotle refers to the assassination of Penthilos himself. Other sources affirm the idea of a complicated series of power shifts which did not necessarily eliminate the Penthilidai, but not to any ongoing contestation of Mytilene's past and the involvement of the Penthilidai in it.[325] It does not seem to be the case that they remained important after the Archaic period, when the Persians appointed a tyrant at Mytilene (Hdt. 5.11). Nevertheless, long after this family disappeared from Lesbian politics, members of the Atreid family, Orestes or his descendants, were still consistently presented as the leaders of the migrant expedition. It is clear from Alcaeus and Sappho that in the late seventh century the Penthilidai of Lesbian Mytilene had a well-established claim to descent from Atreus' grandson Orestes.[326] This much has been accepted previously, noting that the Penthilidai most certainly claimed a parallel position to the Kodridai in Ionia.[327] This almost certainly entailed some idea of migration such as was already current in neighbouring Ionia.

The prominence of the Penthilidai in seventh-century Lesbos is affirmed by the tradition that on their way home from Troy the Atreidai instituted a lively festival with beauty contests on Lesbos.[328] The Atreidai were not the only heroes to stop on Lesbos

---

[324] See Apostolou (2019) 191–92 on the Penthilidai as kings and the associations of kingship in Aiolian migration.

[325] Pittakos later married one of the Penthilidai, for which Alcaeus rebukes him (Alc. fr. 70; Diog. L. 1.81).

[326] Page (1955) 149–50; Rose (2008) 408.

[327] Bérard (1959) 6.

[328] Sapph. fr. 17; Theophrastus fr. 112 Wimmer = Ath. 13.610a; Σ *Il.* 9.129.

during their *nostos* (*Od.* 3.141–75), but only the Atreidai were picked up by local tradition, which ignores the separation of Menelaos and Agamemnon before they had even left Troy. Louis Robert identified the sanctuary of Hera, Zeus and Dionysos with the ruins at Messon on the Pyrrhaic Gulf (now intriguingly called the Gulf of Kalloni).[329] The sanctuary was central, on the road which still connects the east and west of the island, and this is reflected in the name of the site. Alcaeus seems to have spent some of his exilic period there; he refers to the sanctuary at Messon as the 'great common sanctuary' (τέμενος μέγα / ξῦνον) of the Lesbians, and gives Hera the epithet 'Aiolian' (Αἰολήιαν).[330] Choruses of Lesbian women and girls sang in the festival.[331] The festival, it seems, was common to all Lesbians too. The sanctuary is thus both connected with Lesbian community and Aiolian identity, and the locus of a contemporary tradition about the Atreidai whom the Penthilidai claimed as ancestors. The image of the Atreidai landing on Lesbos is not merely the corollary of an island cult but also evocative of the colonists' landing. Interestingly, the new 'Brothers Poem' of Sappho refers to Hera and Zeus as βασίλη̃α and βασίλευς.[332] Vincianne Pirenne-Delforge and Gabriella Pironti connect this poem (tentatively) to the cult of Hera at Messon; they emphasize 'la souveraineté divine plurielle et relationnelle' of Hera and Zeus on Lesbos.[333] Might the cult at Messon have also reflected on terrestrial sovereignty, that of the Atreidai and their descendants, if they were in fact kings in Lesbos?

In Pindar, Orestes is given a slightly secondary place in the migration itself: Peisandros 'leading a brazen host', Orestes simply 'with'. Some scholars have observed

---

329 Robert (1960).
330 Alc. fr. 129.2-3, 6; identification of the sanctuary: Robert (1960) 292–315.
331 Alc. fr. 130b.
332 *P. Obbink* ll. 10, 17.
333 Pirenne-Delforge and Pironti (2014).

that Pindar's description does not explicitly have Orestes make it across the Aegean himself, thus allowing Pindar to align with later sources in which Orestes died before the Aiolians departed the mainland. Other later sources also suggested that Orestes was at the head of the Aiolians when they reached Lesbos (see below). The text should not be pushed too far, particularly given Orestes' marginalization in this account. More important is that Aristagoras and the Tenedians wished to associate themselves directly with Orestes.

Orestes' personal role in the Aiolian migration persisted, but there was also a strong tradition that Orestes had died in Arkadia, most famously reflected in Herodotus' story of the Spartan Lichas at Tegea.[334] Mediation between Aiolian and Peloponnesian traditions was required; Orestes' son Penthilos was the colonizer, or perhaps the migration was an extremely slow process. Several versions now suggest that an initial expedition under Orestes failed, and was picked up in a later generation.

The generations of heroes involved in Strabo are noteworthy: Archelaos son of Penthilos is an empty figure with a nice name for a migrant leader. He is called Echelas by Pausanias and Echelaos by Myrsilos, which suggests somewhat unstable associations.[335] Gras has been associated with the Graians, an old-fashioned name for Tanagra in Boiotia. The figure in the Aiolian migration tradition however has little to do with Boiotia; he is more likely an eponym for the Granikos River. The extra generations are not employed as a way of slowing down the migration to a more realistic pace;[336] rather they seek to coordinate the story with others. According to Strabo, southern Aiolis

---

334 Hdt. 1.67–8.

335 Paus. 3.2.1; Myrsilos, Plut. *Conv. sept. sap.* 20.

336 *Pace* Rose (2008).

was supposed to be settled by an entirely separate branch of the same family,[337] Kleues and Malaos leading a group to Phrikonian Kyme via Lokrian Mt Phrikion: the attempt to etymologize a long-standing name by connection with another locale is fairly obvious.[338] Kleues and Malaos' delays in Lokris mean that Kyme (and other Aiolian cities) are not much earlier than their Ionian neighbours.

The leaders of the migration are invariably Orestes and his immediate descendants, most importantly his son Penthilos. There are some parallels with the Herakleidai who led the Dorians into the Peloponnese. The connection of Aiolians with Pelopids may be artificial, but there is somewhat less conflation; Orestes and his kin are never presented as Aiolians *per se*, only as leaders of the group. The prominence of this story is generally connected with the important aristocratic clan at Mytilene.[339] These Penthilidai are called βασιλεῖς in some accounts of the migration itself, and it is often surmised that they became kings of the new settlements in Lesbos.

All the historical evidence for the Penthilidai relates to Mytilene alone; the view often expressed that Penthilidai were to be found elsewhere in Lesbos is based on extrapolations from the migration myth: in particular, a version apparently from Methymna, discussed below, which refers to seven Penthilid kings. This is made to relate to seven cities: Lesbos, according to Herodotus, had six *poleis* until Arisbe in the centre of the island was destroyed by Methymna at some earlier point; a number of other cities of uncertain dates and importance are attested in Pliny the Elder and Stephanos. Hiera is a popular candidate for the seventh city, but this interpretation rests on the somewhat

---

337 See Fowler, *EGM* 2:600 on the difficulties of placing the two leaders in the Pelopid family tree: Strabo describes them as contemporaries of Penthilos and 'also descendants of Agamemnon'; Pausanias (3.2.1) suggests they might be descendants of Teisamenos.

338 Cf. Hdt. 1.149, Hellanicus, *FGrH* 4 F 80.

339 Hall (2002) 72.

dubious supplement of a lacuna in Alkaios: Ἴρ[ας?] ἐς πόλιν, rather than ἴρ[αν] ἐς πόλιν.[340] It is possible that Penthilid leaders were also imagined at Methymna and Kyme (discussed below).

The evidence from Mytilene is very minimal, and often quite hostile to the Penthilidai.[341] It seems likely that all later discussion is ultimately derived, perhaps via local history, from the poetry of Alkaios, who flourished when the Penthilidai at Mytilene had already been thrown over in favour of a series of tyrants.[342] Aristotle reports that the Penthilidai were violent rulers, which resulted in resistance by two aristocrats, Megakles and Smerdes; fr. 70 of Alkaios quoted above demonstrates however that the Penthilidai remained active in Lesbian politics and eventually contracted a marriage alliance with Pittakos of which Alkaios (and perhaps Sappho, and the Penthilidai themselves) did not approve. The historical clan disappears from sight after this, but their reputation as the leaders of the Aiolian migration had an extended afterlife.

Aristocratic prestige is far from the only relevant factor here. I have not discussed any reason for the Aiolian migration, because it is a very minor aspect of the tradition. The first source to offer a cause for the migration is a fragment of the Attidographer Demon, which relates a prophecy given to Orestes that a pestilence after the Trojan War would be resolved.[343] The prophecy, but not its contents, are referred to by Lycophron.[344] The prophecy is quite banal; very similar stories can be found for other colonizations, which may suggest that the story is somewhat generic; it does however appeal quite

---

340 *IACP*, Mitchell et al. (2004) 1020.

341 Alc. fr. 70, 75, 302; Sapph. fr. 70; Aristotle, *Pol.* 5.8.13 (1311b).

342 Thomas (2019) 268.

343 Demon, *FGrH* 327 F 17, see above, n. 257 for text and discussion.

344 Lyc. *Alex.* 1377, with typical obscurity; Hornblower (2015) 476 regards the πολυγλώσσῳ στρατῷ as a reference to the Aiolic dialects' unusual 'fusion of disparate elements', but an army that speaks *various* languages/dialects is quite different from one which speaks an odd language. The mixed nature of Aiolic dialects is a modern charge, not an ancient one; see section 7.4.

specifically to the Penthilid clan, τινες τῶν ἀπὸ Ἀγαμέμνονος ἐχόντων τὸ γένος, and their expedition is framed as the restoration of cities which fell in the Trojan war. Heroic pre-conquest of territory later colonized is a familiar topos. The prophecy suggests an expedition to Troy, but the *poleis* likely referred to the cities conquered by (Achilleus for) Agamemnon on Lesbos and the Adramyttene Gulf (*Il.* 9.128–30);[345] the rites to restore perhaps likewise in northern Aiolis at Chryse, Killa, and the Smintheion in the Troad.

An aristocratic clan's use of purported heroic heritage to accumulate social capital is hardly uncommon in Archaic Greece. Two aspects of archaic Lesbian history, however, suggest that there could also have been an ethnic element to the family history promoted by the Penthilidai. Firstly, the Penthilidai may well have used their family's prestige in order to extend their influence on the mainland. After the settlement of Lesbos and Aiolis seems to have come a secondary migration north of the Eleatic Gulf. Herodotus describes the cities around Mt Ida as separate (κεχωρίδαται) from the Aiolian dodecapolis, before carrying on to the five cities of Lesbos.[346] It seems however that Lesbos and specifically Mytilene was the major power in the settlement of the Troad: Sigeion and Arisbe on the Dardanelles were Mytilenean colonies,[347] Madytos and Sestos on the Chersonese were founded by Lesbians.[348] Most of these foundations seem to date to the seventh century, and by the late fifth century the Mytilenean coastal territories (*peraia*) were said to stretch from Pordoselene in the Adramyttene Gulf to Ophryneion

345 Cf. Strabo 13.1–2, at length.

346 Hdt. 1.151.2.

347 Sigeion: *IACP* no. 791, Hdt. 5.94, Strabo 13.1.38 (cf. 13.1.8); Arisbe: *IACP* no. 768; Hellanicus, *FGrH* 4 F 24b/Ephorus, *FGrH* 70 F 164 (= Steph. Byz. s.v. Ἀρίσβη), but a Milesian colony in Strabo 14.1.4 (= Anaximenes of Lampsakos, *FGrH* 72 F 26).

348 [Scymnus], *FGrH* 2048 709–10.

in the Dardanelles.[349] Miletos' colonial efforts at about the same time extended from the Propontic coast into the Black Sea, but it was Athens with whom Lesbian colonial efforts conflicted, in the form of a long-running conflict over the control of Sigeion.

The Olympian victor Phrynon seized Sigeion for Athens in the late seventh century; both Pittakos and Alkaios fought for the Mytileneans. Although Pittakos is said to have defeated Phrynon in a duel, the conflict was eventually submitted (it is claimed) to Periandros of Corinth for arbitration, who found for the Athenians. The Athenian claim, according to Herodotus, was that the Aiolians had *no more right* to claim Trojan territory than the Athenians or any other city which participated in the expedition to recover Helen:

> ἐπολέμουν γὰρ ἔκ τε Ἀχιλληίου πόλιος ὁρμώμενοι καὶ Σιγείου ἐπὶ χρόνον συχνὸν Μυτιληναῖοί τε καὶ Ἀθηναῖοι, οἱ μὲν ἀπαιτέοντες τὴν χώρην, Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ οὔτε συγγινωσκόμενοι ἀποδεικνύντες τε λόγῳ οὐδὲν μᾶλλον Αἰολεῦσι μετεὸν τῆς Ἰλιάδος χώρης ἢ οὗ καὶ σφίσι καὶ τοῖσι ἄλλοισι ὅσοι Ἑλλήνων συνεπρήξαντο Μενέλεῳ τὰς Ἑλένης ἁρπαγάς.
>
> Hdt. 5.94.1

This is a curiously weak argument, as Page points out: could not any Greek city then claim Troy? Aischylos may have had a better case, claiming that the territory was the spoils of Theseus' sons in the Trojan War. It is clear that the rhetorical debate, like the roughly contemporary situation at Salamis, rested largely on the authority of the Homeric epics: note in particular that the case is made not about Sigeion itself, a later foundation, but Trojan territory (τῆς Ἰλιάδος χώρης). The Athenian case makes far more sense as a response to some Mytilenean claim, although Herodotus does not suggest what it was

---

[349] *IG* I^3 71.III.124-41, 77.IV.14-27.

(ἀπαιτέοντες τὴν χώρην). This must have invoked the Penthilidai as the heirs of Agamemnon, and therefore the rightful claimants to the territory of the Troad altogether; it seems likely that much of the original extension of territory occurred during the rule of the Penthilidai, and this was perhaps their own propaganda, now become official diplomatic material.

Herodotus' chronology of the Sigeian conflict is slightly garbled, such that it is not clear whether the argument he reports was that which Periandros used to decide the case. A counterargument seems to be imbedded in the use of Αἰολεῦσι to describe the Mytileneans: the general Aiolian populace of Mytilene was not descended from Agamemnon, and the claim might also have expired after the apparent expulsion of the Penthilidai from rule by the time of the Sigeian war. In fact it is somewhat surprising for the Athenians to imply that the Aiolians participated in the Trojan War in any case: they did not, as Aiolians, but perhaps Aiolian descent from Boiotians and other groups who fought at Troy was recognized here.

The second, contemporary aspect of Lesbian ethnic history occurs in the long internecine conflict between various aristocratic families and the successive tyrants Melanchros, Myrsilos and Pittakos. This is usually understood in terms of warring aristocratic clans; the exact circumstances are notoriously inscrutable, but Alkaios' poetry suggests that alliances often shifted. Alkaios, whose family was once allied with Pittakos, rebukes him bitterly and repeatedly. It has sometimes been suggested that the invective focused on Pittakos' low-class origins: Alkaios focuses in particular on Pittakos' father, Hyrrhas, and refers to Pittakos himself as κακοπατρίδας on several occasions.[350] He sarcastically asks if Pittakos had such glory as 'free men of noble

[350] See chapter 7 on Hyrrhas' ethnic identity and language.

parentage' (τὰν δόξαν οἵαν ἄνδρες ἐλεύθεροι / ἔσλων ἔοντες ἐκ τοκήων).[351] Diogenes Laertius reports that Pittakos' Penthilid wife was condescending to her husband, 'because she was the sister of Drakon son of Penthilos'. This is gossip, but likely derived from Alkaios once again. Page has argued forcefully that it is extremely unlikely that Pittakos, who joined aristocratic ἑταιρεῖαι and rose to be tyrant, could be a 'plebeian'; indeed a little-noted scholion to Dionysius Thrax reports that Hyrrhas became king of the Mytileneans(!).[352] It is now generally accepted that Alkaios was abusing Pittakos for his father's ethnicity, reported by Diogenes to be a Thracian.[353] It is interesting to note that Alkaios refers to the Penthilidai as 'Atreidai'; their Asiatic associations could have been better underlined by emphasizing their descent from Lydian Pelops,[354] but it seems that Alkaios at least was willing to engage in unfavourable contrast between Greeks and non-Greeks (or 'pure' Greeks, if Pittakos' mother was Greek).

There are other reasons to identify a degree of ethnic conflict in archaic Mytilene. The second of the three tyrants, Myrsilos, bears a non-Greek name; he is notably less present in Alkaios' extant texts but by no means favoured (fr. 70, 332). Ancient tradition seems at times to have connected him, improbably, with the Greek Kleanaktidai.[355] Alexander Dale has argued, however, that Myrsilos represents not a person but a title, reflecting an indigenous royal household on Lesbos. This does not entirely fit the way in which Alkaios refers to Myrsilos and Pittakos, especially in fr. 70, but it may suggest that conflict between Greeks and non-Greeks was not limited to the supposedly Thracian

---

351 Alc. fr. 72.12–13.

352 Σ Dion. Thrac. p. 368.15 Hilg; see Page (1955) 170 n. 8, for historical interpretation.

353 Diog. Laert. 1.74, Suda s.v. Πιττακός.

354 Gagné (2009) notes that 'Atreidai' is not particularly flattering; one does not have to accept the argument about the pollution of inherited guilt passing onto Pittakos to accept that this family may already have had negative associations based in myth. The name Myrtilos is also associated with the Atreid curse: Gagné (2009) 42, esp. n. 21.

355 Dale (2011) 16–17.

Pittakos but a more systematic problem in a hybrid polis. (There are a few other indications that the conflict against Pittakos also involved other non-Greeks.[356])

I have strayed slightly from the Aiolian migration in order to explore what we know of the Mytilenean family which claimed to have led the migration. It is worth noting, however, that this was not limited entirely to Lesbos: there was also a tradition of an Aiolian king at Kyme called Agamemnon, likely drawing on the same idea of Pelopid prestige.[357] Very little context is available, but his marriage to a daughter of Midas of Phrygia suggests a date c. 700.[358]

The Penthilidai were never appreciably integrated into the Aiolians. Jonathan Hall has argued that the awkward connection of Herakleidai and Dorians in the Peloponnese, through the adoption of the Herakleid Hyllos by the Dorian figure Aigimios, represents the merger of a Thessalian tradition with an Argive one.[359] This was just one of several ways in which the Dorian myth was adapted into something more cohesive. No such effort was made by genealogical associations amongst the Aiolians. The Penthilidai were parallel to the Herakleidai, both in connection with a pre-conquest charter myth and in their ties to a local ruling family, but it was the territorial associations in the Peloponnese and the Troad which were perhaps the main factors in their ongoing utility.

3.2.4 Conclusions

The diversity of Aiolian traditions may well suggest a degree of authenticity reflecting a complex set of different (but not overtly competing) traditions, without the supposed

---

356 Alc. fr. 69, cf. *P. Oxy*. 2506 (test. 9 c–e Gerber).
357 Pollux 9.83 (Xenophanes?); West (1985) 158.
358 Arist. fr. 611.17 (*politeia* of Kyme?); Wade-Gery (1952) 7, 65 n. 21; Mellink (1991) 624.
359 Hall (2002) 80–82

external propaganda which influenced the Ionian migration story. Cassola suggests that a range of local variants are to be seen here, but in fact there is very little local flavour to be seen here: all sources agree that the expedition was led by Orestes or his descendants: Orestes himself (Pindar, Lycophron?), his son Penthilos (Demon, Pausanias), his son Echela(o)s or Archelaos (Myrsilos), or ultimately his son Gras (Strabo, Pausanias). Peisandros of Tenedos is the exceptional non-Pelopid who proves the rule. The migration itself is presented largely as a single event in which the Aiolians crossed the sea *en masse*; or as a two-step migration in which Lesbos is the first stage and Aiolis the second. Although Aiolian cities surely had foundation stories like so many other cities both in Asia and the mainland, very few of them are known. On the whole this suggests a tradition which was largely unified. Only in Strabo do we see each of the leading figures connected with a particular region, and the Troad enters the picture of the initial migration for the first time. The varying generations involved in the migration is a matter of chronology. This is not to suggest that the settlement itself was slow, but it is likely relative chronology in comparison with the Ionian migrations and other mythological aspects of the final generations of the age of heroes. Strabo's version is thus more detailed than any other, but not necessarily reflective of the earlier traditions, or in particular the local Aiolian traditions. Strabo's version presents the Aiolians as a well-defined group, to which a substantial Boiotian contingent was added. These maintained their identity over four generations of migration. Aiolian traditions, however, seem to have been less certain about the definition of the group.

The Thessalian and Boiotian migrations are very often connected in the sources. The earliest accounts of the two migrations demonstrate the distinct origins of the Thessaloi and Boiotoi, and codify a conflict between the two populations. Although the

traditions cannot be dated any earlier than the fifth century, it seems very likely that inspiration was found in the conflicts between these two groups in the Archaic Period.

3.3 Aiolian migration: a political context?

Brian Rose highlighted the fifth-century context of the Delian League as essential to the development of the Aiolian migration tradition.[360] It is true that 'such stories acquired considerable momentum following the Persian Wars, when the promotion of these accounts justified the composition of the Delian League and proved mutually beneficial to both sides of the Aegean',[361] although, as we have seen, all of these had much older roots. The explosion of *sources* for ethnic history in the fifth century, in comparison with the fragmentary nature of earlier poetry, may offer a distorted picture of a trend of mythical appropriation by Athens and the Delian League. The absolute absence of Athens from the Aiolian migratory tradition should however speak for itself. Rose cites just two traditions, both relating to the Troad: Athena's claim to the territory of the Troad, given to her favourite city, in Aischylos (see above), and a tradition attributed to Dionysius of Chalkis (fourth or second c. BC) that Theseus' son Akamas had founded cities from Skepsis to Daskyleion.[362] These are not migratory stories, and indeed I have already suggested that they represent not cooperation but competition in the Troad; they will in any case have done little to win the favour of Athens' important allies on Lesbos.

We must note too that many of our sources were themselves Aiolians. By comparison, Alty has suggested that the Athenocentric version of the Ionian migration

---

360 Rose (2008).

361 Rose (2008) 422.

362 *FGrH (cont.)* 1773 F 14 = Σ Eur. *Androm.* 10; see Engels' commentary in *FGrH cont.* ad loc. for a thorough examination of the foundation traditions of each city named by Dionysius.

common in the fifth century was primarily directed at Asiatic Ionians.[363] This does not preclude the use of pro-Athenian myth in Aiolian tradition. The voluntary or involuntary nature of subscription to the League is at stake here: it is entirely possible that members of the League, even as subjects of the ἀρχή, wished at times to encourage Athenian support. On the other hand, the evidence that this was directed at Athens is minimal, and certainly not so clear as Rose suggests.

Following Rose, Hans Beck has posited in a recent article that the tradition of the Aiolian migration was produced in the 8th to 6th centuries as an inversion of a large-scale but unorganized migration of Aiolians from Asia Minor to Boiotia, developing a sense of kinship where there had not previously been any links.[364] The evidence for this is far too minimal: it is based largely on a literal reading of the migration of Hesiod's father as representative of many others. It is true that one migrant often prompts others: thus 'arteries' of migration open up as information about the new region is passed to the home region. It is far from certain whether information flows were the same in antiquity. Secondary migrations in a long-term process of settlement are often suggested for Greek colonizations in about the same period, but more exploration of the mechanisms of communication is still needed. Beck emphasizes 'kinship' lines of communication: modern demography suggests that the resulting flow of migration from one place to another was often quite narrow in range. It seems that Beck is having his cake and eating it too here by leaving undefined the nature of the kinship between Boiotians and Aiolians *before* his putative migration to Boiotia. Albert Schachter suggested that Euboians as major colonizers may have been important vectors of information about free land across

[363] Alty (1982) 9 n. 46.
[364] Beck (2019).

the Aegean, and that the presence of the Samothracian cult of the Kabeiroi outside Thebes is further evidence of migration.[365]

It is in any case pure speculation that a substantial migration occurred into eighth-century Boiotia. The only support Beck offers is a putative migration corridor from the Euripos into Boiotia, roughly in the direction of Askra and even past Delphi to the outer Corinthian Gulf, as described in the Homeric *Hymn to Apollo* (220–30). The context here is essential: this is the divine procession of Apollo through Boiotian terriory, touching on the important Boiotian extra-urban sanctuary of Poseidon at Onchestos. Beck misrepresents this as the end of Apollo's trajectory, while Apollo in fact carries on to Haliartos and Telphoussa. That Alkaios visited some of the same places as Apollo is more evidence of their cultural significance than a migratory path.[366] Beck's explanation seeks in part to offer an explanation for the application of the name Aiolis to the Aitolian *poleis* Kalydon and Pleuron,[367] suggesting that this was the westernmost extent of the migration corridor through south-west Boiotia. This works well in the imagination, but Boiotian communications with the Gulf of Corinth were in reality fairly difficult; a natural migration flow across Boiotia was more likely to stop in the low areas. As we have seen, however, Ephorus connected Aitolian Aiolis directly to Thessaly, by a (small?) migration which branched off from the migration to Boiotia. The weight of ancient tradition thus does not favour an overall Aiolian migration tradition which is focused on explaining ethnic links with Anatolia.

---

365 Schachter (2016) 28–30; but n.b. 39 n. 17 on the very tenuous evidence that the Greeks of Samothrace were Aiolian: one later fragmentary inscription in Aiolian dialect (fourth century BCE).

366 Frr. 425 (Onchestos) and 325 (Koroneia); fr. 306 (Tanagraia) is not so relevant here.

367 Thuc. 3.102: see chapter 2.

Both Schachter and Beck, curiously, seem to think that Hesiod's view of Aiolis was quite positive, considering that Hesiod's father is given the specific motivation of 'escaping poverty'. Some scholars of migration describe resettlement as a way to redress systemic regional inequalities, seeking demographic equilibrium. Yet Beck does not give much weight to these 'push' factors, although he suggests a long-term migration stream into Boiotia. His discussion of Herodotus on the climate of Aiolis is confused, which does not help with clarity. It seems improbable that whatever poverty affected Hesiod's father lasted for perhaps two centuries and did not find other outlets. One implication here is that either the people of Kyme, or a wider group in Aiolis, had a strong enough identity as Aiolians that it needed to be preserved in Boiotia by means of a migratory tradition. But very many of the important aspects of the migration traditon are not particularly relevant to a Boiotian context, in particular the Pelopid leadership, and as we have seen the Boiotians were not always considered involved at all. To some extent the Boiotians and Aiolians are coordinate peoples rather than metropolis and offshoot.

3.4 Conclusions

Why did the Aiolians go to Asia? The migratory tradition does not concern itself with demographic pressures. Instead the Aiolians themselves are often diminished in their own story, detached from their homeland and subordinated to an important mythical clan. We know of the Penthilidai largely as their power was eclipsed, which makes it difficult to determine how they contributed to the production and dissemination of the tradition. Interestingly, it is not the case that there is less violence towards the indigenous population in the Aiolian migratory tradition, but this violence was largely cast back in time to a stage before the migration itself. The association of the Penthilidai with Homeric authority and the success of the Atreidai at Troy is recurrent in our sources; thus

the mythical Penthilidai were used to justify the occupation of north-western Anatolia. The claim to this part of Asia was long-lasting, more so than the power of the Penthilidai themselves; this association however largely relates to Lesbos, which was raided by Achilles, visited by the Atreidai as proto-colonists and formed the powerbase for the historical clan. The original context for the Penthilid tradition however may have been the relationship of Lesbian cities, particularly Mytilene and Methymna, with their mainland territories in the Troad: here the Penthilid claim would have been stronger.

Some scholars (Nagy, Morgan, Beck) have been willing to identify aspects of the Aiolian migration as early as the eighth century BC. I have argued that the tradition is far more relevant to the Asiatic context. Its reflexes in Boiotia, Aitolia and Thessaly are not entirely negligible, but they are not core to the tradition. Beck's argument in particular relies on a suggestion that the pan-Hellenic tribal identities, including Aiolian identity, were first formulated in Anatolia and only later transferred to the Greek mainland. This cannot be demonstrated from the literary tradition itself: we must look instead at the archaeological evidence for western Anatolia in the Early Iron Age.

4. Aiolian Migration in Archaeology

Migration was and is a normal aspect of human behaviour.[368] If migration was common, and well-attested in literary traditions, then it should – reasoning follows – also be identifiable in the archaeological record. Thus archaeologists of the Early Iron Age long took the traditions of migration at their word, as genuine memories of mass migration across the Aegean in the twelfth and eleventh centuries BCE, and exercised the traditions as interpretative resources for what physical evidence they uncovered.[369] Scholars have however noticed more than once the archaeological evidence for Greek settlement on the western shores of the Aegean did not really seem to start until the ninth century BCE or later,[370] which is a century or more later than the date suggested by the literary traditions. Ever-increasing archaeological data have now allowed for a fuller reconsideration of textually focused searches for the Aiolian migration. Troy in particular has received extensive exploration precisely because of its prominence in Greek heroic tradition; the recent work of the Tübingen–Cincinnati team at the site (the Troia Projekt, 1988–2012) has however included an increased focus on the post-Bronze Age situation under the supervision of head excavator C. Brian Rose.[371] The excavators have often suggested that the evidence from EIA Troy provides essential (and rare) evidence for the Early Iron Age Hellenization of the Anatolian coast. It is in this light that Rose et al. have offered the first full reconsideration of an Aiolian presence in the material record in north-western

---

368 Greenblatt (2010); Cabana and Clark (2011); Manning (2013); for a Mediterranean perspective see Horden and Purcell (2000) chapter 9.

369 E.g. Hogarth (1909); Sakellariou (1958); Emlyn-Jones (1980).

370 Cook (1975); Spencer (1995); Kotsonas and Mokrišová (2019).

371 I follow the scholarly consensus that the site on Hisarlık was Troy. The identification with Hittite Wilusa is largely moot for the following discussion, which investigates the material evidence from the site itself; the identification with later Ilion, i.e. the site the Greeks *believed* to be Homeric Troy, is beyond question.

Anatolia, testing it against the traditions discussed in the preceding chapter. The results of such re-examination have not positively reinforced the ideas of the tradition; Rose in particular has suggested that there is not enough evidence to suggest that the traditions were based on a historical 'kernel'.[372]

The traditions of migration across the Aegean were perhaps not the only narratives which shaped archaeology. In the article at the centre of this discussion, the head of post-Bronze Age excavations at Troy, C. Brian Rose, suggests that scholars' ready acceptance of a real Aiolian migration to north-western Asia Minor can be attributed to one long-standing boundary:

> Archaeologists began to work in north-western Turkey during the second half of the 19th century, and the colonialist outlook of the time, coupled with the waning of the Ottoman empire, created an intellectual climate wherein stories of the west colonizing the east were easy to accept at face value, as was the assumption that cultural advances on the eastern side of the Aegean, after the Bronze Age, must have been dependent on some agency from the west.[373]

Rose shows clearly the ideological baggage which might be attached to movement across the boundary in the Aegean between European and Asian spheres. This was no purely academic issue. The migratory tradition was revisited by Greeks and Turks alike after World War I, stimulated by the conflict over control of Western Anatolia which culminated, in 1923, with the definition of the modern Greco-Turkish border by the Treaty of Lausanne.[374] Both Greek and Turkish nationalists envisioned an ancient

---

372 Rose (2008); Aslan et al. (2014); Aslan and Pernicka (2013); Aslan and Hnila (2015); Rose's article should be read alongside Parker 2008's discussion of the linguistic situation; see ch. 7.

373 Rose (2008) 422.

374 Mac Sweeney (2012).

civilizing mission which had created the modern population of Anatolia, and encouraged archaeological interpretation to suit. The reality of the Greek migrations to Anatolia continued to be accepted throughout the twentieth century without much examination. The Aiolian migration received little attention from any archaeologists beyond the art-historical analysis of Anatolian pottery types, which were long called 'Aiolian' when they could be dated to the first millenium BC.[375] The Early Iron Age at other sites is however increasingly coming to light, and scholarly overviews have begun to take up the traditional protest against seeing any 'Dark Age' in this region.[376]

It is worth keeping in mind the précis of archaeological methodologies relating to migration recently observed by Kotsonas and Mokrišová: some studies seek to support textual evidence with archaeological evidence; others observe the correspondences between archaeology and literature; still others treat them separately, following the view that the traditions are largely concerned with constructing a useful version of the past.[377] In this discussion I take the third view, but with important provisos: an inversion of the textual preference in the first method is at times in evidence, in which archaeological evidence is taken to disprove the validity of the legends (and thus *prove* their constructed or indeed falsified nature). The constructivist reading of myth applies to literary sources approaches from the field of cultural memory which addresses the 'invention of tradition', but there is a danger in taking this phrase too literally – it was never intended,

---

375 Bayne (2000).

376 Aslan (2019) surveys the evidence for the Aiolian area in the Early Iron Age and Archaic Period, but misses much of the recent work at Kyme.

377 Kotsonas and Mokrišová (2019) 236.

nor should it be understood, to suggest that cultural memories were invented out of whole cloth.[378] Plausibility is the most important characteristic of an invented tradition.

The following section reflects on approaches to identifying ethnicity in the archaeological record. I begin with an overview of migration's place within archaeological investigation over the last century, coupled with an analysis of the complex relationship between material record and ethnicity. I will highlight the importance of a broad view of the evidence. I then proceed to the historical context, and the evidence thus far available for the Troad, Aiolis, and Lesbos in the aftermath of the Bronze Age collapse.

It may seem peculiar to offer an overview of historical and archaeological methods for studying migration only at this late stage in my discussion of Aiolian migration. As we shall see, the views from anthropological and historical examinations of migration offer fruitful models for understanding material evidence and the realia of migration. It is however wrong to assume that models of human behaviour are more than indirectly relevant to narrative accounts. The literary evidence can be characterized as long-*post eventum* ideological positioning; while it must be plausible, it is not necessarily aligned with real behaviour. For example, the migratory traditions share many of their narrative motifs with the better-studied later Greek colonization stories, for which it has long been seen that the degree of symbolism and poetic licence vitiates addressing overpopulation and famine narratives in terms of cost-benefit analyses.[379]

---

[378] I.e. the phenomena evinced by Hobsbawm and Ranger (2012); see Østergård (1992) for critical comments.

[379] Dougherty (1993) chapter 3.

4.1 The archaeology of migration and ethnicity

A number of studies on migration, both methodological and empirical, have begun with reflection on the recent history of archaeological theory.[380] Migration has played a significant role in archaeological thinking, but it has had mixed fortunes over the last century; its fate is often very closely tied to paradigmatic shifts in theory. These studies, although they offer various typologies of migration, movement, and mobility, are often not explicit about the degree to which thinking about material evidence for ethnicity determines the approach. For prehistorians, who have dominated methodological discussions regarding migration, it is often the migration of ethnic groups which is under consideration. The archaeology of ethnicity itself has been substantially affected by theoretical reconsiderations, and the archaeological approach to peoples has often served as a middle ground between the general theory of the major paradigms – culture history, processual or New Archaeology, and post-processualism – and the use of migration within them.[381] I thus present an overview of methodological approaches to ethnicity and migration within these successive theories, to observe the inextricable relationship between them. It is also important to note that while successive general theories of archaeology have gained and lost preference, the approaches to migration and its relationship with ethnicity in particular have tended to accumulate. It will thus be useful to consider the recent intellectual history of migration and ethnicity in archaeology, in order to contextualize Rose's colonialist archaeologists of the late nineteenth century as well as the various, and at times old-fashioned, perspectives used in his own analysis.

---

380 See e.g. Hakenbeck (2008); Cabana (2011); more generally, Trigger (2006).

381 Chrisomalis and Trigger (2004); Trigger (2006); Díaz-Andreu García (2005).

This section seeks to establish a methodologically sound way forward for the study of migration with archaeological data. I begin with a consideration of definitions of migration as a real-world phenomenon rather than a narrative, then proceed to the survey of archaeological methodologies developed over the last century, particularly those relating to population or ethnic groups, which continue to impact modern thinking about the relationship between migration and archaeological evidence. I conclude with a summary of the principles which need to shape any study of migration, and how we might thus look for evidence of migration in the material record.

The term 'migration' comes with substantial baggage. As a term in general use and the life sciences, it often has connotations of a formal, and often bureaucratic, process. The definition of migration depends upon crossing a boundary, but this does not need to be a defined *border*. Attempts to control 'population flow' in antiquity have been identified,[382] but formalities and intent are not necessarily considered inherent in migration. 'Migration' as a concept has been used in various ways in different archaeological theories relating to the origins of observed cultural forms. Careful definitions are difficult and a comparatively late device in the scholarship. Irving Rouse, a specialist in the archaeology of the prehistoric Caribbean, offered an initial definition of population movement as 'the people of one area expand[ing] into another area replacing the latter's population.'[383] Such a definition has been criticised for its presumptions.[384] 'People' and 'population' need real consideration: Rouse's project focuses on the large scale, referring above all to what can be more specifically called

---

382 Moatti (2004).

383 Rouse (1986) 13, contrasting with immigration (penetration without replacement), transculturation or acculturation as explanations.

384 E.g. Curet (2011) 19.

'mass' migration,[385] but it seems that 'people' could also refer to smaller groups as long as they were from a defined area. Rouse's migratory event also involves but is in no way complicated by interaction between old and new (bounded?) populations. 'Expansion' obviates the agency and scale of what is discussed. In fact, the vision seems to be of population groups acting like lawn bowls rather than expanding networks of individuals.

Increasingly archaeologists and historians have been inclined to recognize many different types of movement in the past. In some scholarship 'migration' has been used as the term for all such movement, with typologies such as 'chain' and 'circular migration'. In general, however, movement has become the overarching term, with mobility (an impermanent and frequent form of movement) contrasted with permanent migration. Thus, more recently, Jeffery J. Clark preferred a definition which attempted to limit migration to a particularly pronounced process:

> a long-term residential relocation beyond community boundaries by one or more discrete social units as the result of a perceived decrease in the benefits of remaining residentially stable or a perceived increase in the benefits of relocating to prospective destinations.[386]

Clark offers a variety of boundaries – economic, cultural, political, or linguistic – which makes it clear that the boundaries in question belong more to the social imagination than the world of physical perception. Migration in this definition encompasses a series of moments, a process rather than an event, including decisions and movement. Beginning- and end-points are quite vaguely defined: it is not clear, for example, whether the social units involved must coalesce before the beginning of migration. The processual and behavioural nature of this idea of migration has substantial consequences for what we

---

385 Patrick Manning has also coined the term 'whole-population' migration: Manning (2013).
386 Clark (2001) 2.

can see in the physical traces. The balance of benefits will always be a matter of scholarly guesswork; other factors – long-term and residential relocation – will be far more evident in the *longue durée* than in the initial moment of movement. With these complications in mind we may turn to archaeology as its own *durée*: the history of 'migrationism', or the use of migration as a form of explanation for changes in the archaeological record, goes back to the beginnings of formal archaeological study and continues to this day. As Graciela Cabana notes, 'archaeologists have placed a research premium on culture change.'[387]

Scholarly 'Orientalism' (in Edward W. Said's sense) was one aspect of the milieu in which the early archaeologists of western Anatolia operated; it was just one expression of a blunt equation of material culture with population groups. In the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the earliest method of archaeological analysis conceived a formal model now known as culture history, which in prehistory especially tended to identify material blocks with groups of human agents. Migration was a basic part of archaeological understanding, a primary explanation of why (if not how) change appeared in the material record. Archaeology was in no way unique among disciplines in its attitude to migration; anthropology and Indo-European linguistics likewise focused on migration as an explanatory model – and the early history of Anatolia was vague until Hrozný's decipherment of Hittite cuneiform opened up Hittite and later Luwian sources for the period immediately prior to the Greek migrations.[388]

Culture history equated cultures straightforwardly with 'peoples' (ethnic groups, in modern parlance). The primary methodology was the meticulous collection and

---

387 Cabana (2011), quote at 23.

388 See now essays in Kim et al. (2020).

classification of material evidence, with a concomitant record of chronological and spatial distribution. Despite the primacy of 'culture' within this model, there was limited reflection on what actually constituted a culture: the prominent culture historian Vere Gordon Childe (1892–1957), writing late in culture history's heyday, saw cultures as an archaeological assemblage writ large across a landscape: 'a culture is defined as an assemblage of artifacts that recur repeatedly associated together in dwellings of the same kind and with burials by the same rite.'[389] Cultural traits, once studied and sorted, could be ringed on a map as spatial and temporal units. Where such blocks overlapped, a culture (or civilization) could be identified. Importantly, the blocks and their associated peoples were treated monolithically: culture history lacked any sophisticated tools for handling any kind of internal variation; all culture was normative.

Archaeological evidence could obviously never sustain an analytical system which did not allow for change; indeed the normative outlook of culture history only served to highlight changes. In a discipline of one-dimensional, well-bounded and (most importantly) static archaeological cultures which had a one-to-one relationship with population groups, change could only be explained by external stimuli. Mass migration was thus invoked as one of the best explanations for apparent breaks and spreads of culture. Childe expressed doubts about the definition of culture towards the end of his career, and allowed that cultural change was seldom straightforwardly represented in the archaeological record; his *Prehistoric Migrations in Europe* nevertheless still tended to see mobility as the productive process of cultural change, while collapsing any useful distinction between mobility of people and mobility of artefacts (i.e. 'diffusionism').[390]

---

[389] Childe (1950) 2.

[390] I.e. the spread of a cultural item, or piece of knowledge, independently of human mobility.

It is evident that the migration in question was a mass movement of a people who brought their culture with them into new territory, expelling or absorbing any extant population.

Adams et al. labelled models which highlighted the loss of culture and abandonment of sites 'invasionism':[391] this was precisely the model frequently envisioned in the twentieth century for the Mycenaean collapse and other prehistoric changes in the archaeological record.[392] The dubious links between material change and the so-called 'Dorian invasion' are just one example of a concerted effort to read traditions back into the material traces. The proliferation of tribal mythologies which depicted migration were generally trusted, even if the historicity and scientific validity of their world-view was not in line with archaeological procedure.[393]

Identifying peoples and their movement was not, however, as serious a concern for Childe as it had been for some earlier culture historians: alterations in the material record were the real objects of analysis here, and while these were taken as evidence of migration, migration itself did not demand much explanation or analysis. The only necessary standard was one which could distinguish the mobility of peoples from the mobility of goods and ideas through exchange. The long-running conflict between diffusion and migration as explanations thus pushed investigation towards the simple question of whether or not migration had occurred. Childe selected particular aspects of the material record as more diagnostic of migration (burial customs, home-made pottery), while technologies (copper smelting, the potter's wheel) were more likely to be spread by diffusion.[394] This amounts to a view not that ritual and domestic style were more

391 Adams et al. (1978) 488.
392 Adams et al. (1978) 488.
393 Adams et al. (1978) 483–84.
394 Childe (1950) 9–10.

persistent under the stresses of movement, but that these were better indications of ethnic identity.

Culture history suffered a backlash. From the 1960s the self-proclaimed 'New Archaeology' or processualism sought to distinguish itself from culture history with a more theoretical, anthropological methodology. The New Archaeology was still oriented towards understanding change, but archaeological method was redirected to investigate the predictable ways of human behaviour. Cultures were replaced as the main unit of analysis by societies, which were regarded as self-contained systems or ecologies which sought equilibrium by adapting. The key tenet of processualism was that adaptations and reactions should instantiate the universal rules of social behaviour which processualists sought to uncover. Rules, almost laws, took epistemological precedence over historicized, particularizing examples of cultural interpretation. Cultures and social systems were not however directly equated: a degree of flexibility about the fundamental building blocks of systems (sites, settlements, regions, etc) allowed multiple scales of perspective: various phenomena could be treated as 'internal' or 'external'.

Culture history had also acquired ugly associations. It was no coincidence that the Marxist Gordon Childe had to remark that race and culture do not coincide in the introduction to *Prehistoric Migrations*: 'There are no grounds for assuming that the creators and bearers of a culture were always of a single race, all of whose members shared distinctive genetic characters.'[395] The culture historical model had most expressly been formulated by the German nationalist archaeologist Gustav Kossinna. The Nazi Party, while not accepting Kossinna himself as official prehistorian before his death in 1931, employed his culture-historical settlement archaeology (*Siedlungsarchäologie*) as

---

[395] Childe (1950) 1.

the basis of racist propaganda and justification for eastwards expansion, the so-called *Generalplan Ost*. These associations prompted a general revision of the essentialist equation of culture to people in the social sciences; in archaeology this necessarily problematized the entire conceptual framework. Kristiansen further noted a broad parallel between the internal systems favoured by processual archaeology and the rise of post-war international organizations and the welfare state.[396]

The vision of archaeological cultures which processualists produced was far less stable, and far less straightforward. Processualists offered serious criticisms of how culture historians constructed coherent cultures. Distribution mapping and isomorphic delineation of cultural traits pretended to find sharply defined areas and concealed the potential for variation across space. The selection of 'type traits', or the identification of particular types of ceramic and other material styles as representative of a culture involved a parallelism of material practices and peoples (often now identified as the 'pots are peoples' fallacy) which could not meet the complex understanding of ethnic identity which was beginning to emerge. Although some studies succeeded in connecting ethnic groups to material culture, others failed: the lack of reliably applicable criteria ran counter to the processualist philosophy.[397]

Migration, meanwhile, was so heavily associated with culture-historical methodology that it was overwhelmingly neglected for the first three decades of processual archaeology.[398] The politics of academic trends played a part, but there were ideological issues as well. Above all, culture historians had invoked migration as a historically particular explanation, not as a predictable adaptation to predictable

---

396 Kristiansen (1989) 211–12.

397 See Kristiansen (1989) 211, for an overview of attempts.

398 Adams et al. (1978).

circumstances. The basically external nature of invasionist migration made it irrelevant to a disciplinary focus on the internal nature of systems. The critique of archaeological cultures moreover suggested that it was simplistic to ascribe them historical agency. As Kristiansen notes, however, the processual critique of migration maintained precisely the traditional view of static, undifferentiated archaeological culture developed by culture historians.[399]

Migration was however allowed as an explanation for the most extreme form of change in the material record, anomalies of 'site distribution'. Adams et al., though they developed an extensive critique of migration as a default explanation for changes in trait distributions, noted that there is 'hardly any other way of accounting for the total abandonment of sites or for the foundation of new ones', and that the beginning- and end-points of such migrations were far more easily recognized.[400] They posited, however, that the examples they recognized from the American South-west and the Maya region were confined to the same culture area ('internal migrations'). The reliance on archaeological culture as a heuristic tool persisted, not least because they assumed that small-scale migration would be difficult to trace.

Only when post-processualism had convincingly displaced the more narrowly defined method of processualism did processual approaches to migration attempt to advance from the 'whether question' in order to study migration *per se* in the material record.[401] From the late 1980s archaeologists increasingly looked to historical, economic, and sociological studies for more sophisticated understandings of the dynamics of movement involved in migration change. In an influential paper, David Anthony invoked

---

399 Kristiansen (1989) 211.
400 Adams et al. (1978) 488–89.
401 Kristiansen (1989).

migration as a regular cultural behaviour, as it had continually been seen in other fields of the social sciences, and thus a suitable feature for a processual archaeology.[402] Anthony diagnosed archaeologists with, *inter alia*, a 'paralyzing fascination' with the causes of migration; although contemporary sociological studies had developed a quantitative framework for analysing causes, based on so-called 'push' and 'pull factors', this data is rarely available to archaeologists, and cannot easily incorporate ideological factors.

Anthony was satisfied to address migration as the outcome of an equilibrium-seeking process within a large system, the *process* of which could more easily be examined in the archaeological record than the causes:

> From a constructivist perspective, viewing the actions in individuals within specific historical contexts, migration can be understood as a behaviour that is typically performed by defined subgroups (often kin-recruited) with specific goals, targeted on known destinations and likely to use familiar routes.[403]

Migration unfolds predictably once it has been initiated, along avenues maintained by kinship links, which Anthony characterized as a knowledge network. He noted however that confidence about the nature of 'decision-making units' in antiquity could not be high, one of the issues with adopting the conceptual frameworks of modernist disciplines.

Most importantly for the archaeological identification of migration, Anthony observed that migration was seldom purely one-directional. Modern studies have shown that there was a regular but delayed backwards flow of part of the population to their place of origin, often bringing with them increased wealth and perhaps *exotica*. Such behaviour might

---

402 Anthony (1990).
403 Anthony (1990) 895–96.

complicate the material record's reflection of putative social and cultural boundaries; it might also prompt further migration out, following the success of others within the kinship group. He later suggested that such 'chain migrations' might be reflected in a selective body of artefact types, reflecting the regional subgroups involved in the migration, and a pattern of settlements clustered around 'founder' communities.[404] We might note the likely material complexities of socioeconomic mobility which Anthony implies in return and chain migration.

Stefan Burmeister offers a particularly clear demonstration of the challenges inherent in tracking the origins of a singular type through the material record in a migratory setting.[405] His example is the Finnish log cabin, which became pervasive in temperate North America in the colonial period. By historical accident, as Burmeister shows, the log cabins built by Finns in the Swedish colony on the Delaware River became the standard form of colonial architecture, though Finns were never a substantial migrant group in America, and New Sweden was conquered by Dutch forces less than two decades after it was established. The form was well-suited to the American environment, which Burmeister deems 'preadaptation'; such preadaptation did not however entail the particular success of the group of Swedish Finns who established it. The form diffused itself. We might then conclude that associating house types with migrant groups is a futile exercise. Burmeister however extends his analysis by the application of Bourdieu's 'habitus' to the colonial world. Log cabins were not solely a matter of environmental adaptation but served as an outward-facing aspect of participation in the mixed communities. Within the private sphere of the household acculturation was not so strong,

404 Anthony (1997) 27.
405 Burmeister (2000).

and traditional social forms – in particular forms of worship – were preserved. This is not a question of 'passing' by presenting an assimilated façade; rather, the household may maintain but also control access to the interior social forms, thus developing a complex strategy of social interaction.

Post-processual archaeology, almost contemporaneously with the return of migration studies, de-centred archaeological cultures. This involved a significant return to empiricism and historicizing approaches to data. A way forward was to consider the evidence in extremely tight focus, even at the scale of individual artefacts. The form and function of objects could thus be considered in relation not to whole identity groups but the corresponding individual agents: artists and workers, users, traders, etc. Contextualization appears in examination of how cultural transmission and the development of style occurred at such a microscopic level – but spatial patterning also appears again in these debates, in a way not entirely distinct from earlier debates about migration and diffusion in archaeological cultures.

The concept of archaeological culture, although no longer imbued with ethnic or social systems, persists in current archaeology in a variety of terms, e.g. civilization, tradition, horizon, complex.[406] As Pluciennik points out, the heuristic device of culture is embedded in the intellectual fabric of the archaeological discipline; it is still necessary to handle the relationship between material patterns and human occupation of space and time. These approaches do not deal directly with the material record of migration: older studies of migration sought to explain and identify changes in the archaeological culture of a site or area; the revived anthropological migrationism of the last thirty years focuses

[406] Roberts and Vander Linden (2011).

instead on demographic change. Both hermeneutics involve the same difficult relationship between the material record and ethnic identity.

What Anthony and Burmeister's proposals generally lack is any useful approach to the material record – although Anthony promoted study of migration *per se*, rather than changes in assemblage (as indirect evidence of migration), there was not a way forward here in terms of identifying, let alone studying, migration by archaeological means.[407]

Finally, it is worth noting that archaeometric approaches have recently contributed much concise and definitive data relevant to mobility and migration, but cannot offer further clarity about the nature of migrations. Stable isotope analysis and neutron activation analysis have provided more or less specific origins for material goods and human remains – as we shall see, in some cases this demonstrates dislocation of objects from their place of origin, although it cannot of course indicate definitively the vectors of movement. In other cases, particularly relevant to the consideration of Early Iron Age Anatolia, it has become clear that items which are stylistically associated with distant areas are in fact local productions rather than imports.[408] The latest and most impressive set of data comes from improvements in the analysis of ancient DNA (aDNA) samples; genetic evidence, for example, suggests a partial Aegean origin for the Philistine population of Ashkelon: a confirmation of the old hypothesis that Aegean people were a substantial part of the Sea Peoples who settled in the southern Levant in the twelfth

---

407 Dommelen (2014) 215.

408 See Mountjoy (1998); Aslan et al. (2014).

century BCE.[409] Ethnicity and genetic sequences are of course to be linked with enormous caution; aDNA can only substantiate a general hypothesis of movement.[410]

There is a danger moreover in stopping at archaeometry: it is data for the 'whether question', and not necessarily conclusive evidence at that. There remain important questions about the dynamics of migration and the ways in which migration related to ethnicity. For example, a recent study of strontium isotopes from tooth enamel suggests that the population of south-western Thessaly (Pharsalos) in the tenth and ninth centuries BCE included an intrusive population from an unidentified area alongside locals, whereas two cemeteries on the Pagasitic Gulf seem to have received local residents only.[411] Panagiotopoulou et al. note that all three cemeteries show continuity of tradtional Mycenaean burial rites. They envision two scenarios: the new population of Pharsala came from within Thessaly or nearby, and had the same burial customs as the receiving settlements; alternatively, they picked up traditional funerary practices in order to assimilate themselves. Even if isotopic data linked this group of burials with Epeiros, it would not conclusively demonstrate that these people identified themselves as Thessaloi; it would in fact raise new questions about the interactions of this population with the indigenous Thessalians.

David Anthony characterized 'How is migration to be identified archaeologically?' as the wrong question with which to begin, but it seems an appropriate place to end this discussion. Mass migration undoubtedly occurred, and it is becoming increasingly clear that it likely did occur at a substantial level in the Early Iron Age Mediterranean. Anthony's caution was directed at bad assumptions about migration

---

409 Feldman, Master, Bianco et al. (2019);

410 For relevant critical comments on the use of DNA, see e.g. Hamilakis (2017); Grummond (2014).

411 Panagiotopoulou et al. (2018).

which formed a dubious foundation for methodological critique. We can summarize a set of *good* conclusions about the nature of migration which can be carried into further research:

1. Movement is extremely common and normal; mobility and sedentism should not be seen as contrasting or even complementary states;
2. Migrations of large groups and over long distances certainly occurred in human history, but all scales occur within *a* context and are a matter of perspective, generally *scholarly* perspective, rather than objective fact;
3. Migrations are not uniform in character even if we exclude other scales of mobility;
4. Migrations rarely involve the emptying of one population into another space, but rather tend to involve sub-groups (which is one of several ways in which EIA migration should be considered as closer to later 'colonization'), and consequently:
5. Migrations are not unidirectional movements, but entail the creation of a new or changed connection between places, which can result in ongoing migration ('chain' migration) and/or the return of parts of the migrant population to their place of origin ('return' migration);
6. Migrations are a process, not an event, and may involve a sequence of decisions;
7. The causes of migrations do not necessarily involve strictly rational decision-making processes; beyond economic causes (push and pull factors), ideological and attitudinal factors should be taken into account;
8. Migrations entail an interactive process, except in cases of the very first human settlement of an area (which is obviously not relevant here); in all

cases, an interaction with the new environment occurs, and thus aside from the ongoing connections considered above, acculturation (in the neutral sense of adaptation to a different environment) and acculturative stress should be considered as a tail-end of this process; relatedly,

9. Migration is disruptive (in a basic, neutral sense: I am not here invoking disruption as the sole cause of migration), both at point of origin and arrival, and perhaps along the migratory route too;
10. Migration may spur violence or adaptation; we should have a view towards power relations and interactions, but also towards an appropriate analysis of agency on the part of individuals and decision-units on all sides of process;
11. Finally, migrants like all peoples are possessed of a material culture, but this is not static or normative by default, and the same must be acknowledged of the 'receiving' culture.

It has become a truism that various forms of interaction including migration and exchange may leave similar forms of material pattern.[412] The above principles, however, must allow us to recognize some good and some bad ways of exploring migration in the archaeological record. New settlements can only be explained by human movement. That movement deserves explanation, and where the character of these is different from existing nearby settlements, it is valid to investigate reasons for the change. Town planning, residential and monumental architecture may best reflect lifeways and group decisions: we can of course be cautious *ad absurdum* about other factors which may have

[412] Kotsonas and Mokrišová (2019) 217.

prompted changes, but we should aim for a strong dataset in size and detail (especially chronological analysis). The case for or against migration should acknowledge the *longue durée* of a settlement and area, and it should not impose an assumption of stasis without empirical evidence. On the other hand, examinations of burial practice have repeatedly shown the rapid pace at which a basic social behaviour can demonstrate adaptation to local circumstances, e.g. in the attempt to differentiate a new polity from and perhaps out-consume neighbouring polities. It has been argued that large scale migration necessitates some degree of organization, but the above principles make it clear that scale and decision-making units are complex expressions of perspective: two particular desideranda are clear understanding of a migration's relation to space, and a better understanding of the materiality of involuntary migration.

As for bad ways of studying migration, small goods like pottery are more difficult in their analysis than settlements. Not only are such pieces individually mobile in a way that settlements are not (at least in the Aegean), but functional pieces also have an elastic relationship to the construction of social identities. The variables which result in the appearance and distribution of a single type are legion: functional needs, material(s) available, not only style but fashion, agencies of potters, painters, commissioners (etc.), sharing and imitation of technologies. The last but not necessarily the least of these is the communicative or discursive capacity of the piece. For this factor we can attempt to apply evidence derived from the deposit for use and attitude (e.g. applying Burmeister's dialectic of public and private spheres), but attempts to do so often involve reifying distinctions between local and foreign material culture based on our etic perceptions of a particular ethnic group.

The underlying cultural biases which Rose identified in the earliest archaeologies of the north-west Aegean are an example of this burdening of material culture, but it

should by no means be assumed that presentism has had its day. The historiography of archaeology has evinced an increasing consciousness of archaeology's role as a producer of contemporary meanings for the past. Kristiansen saw processual archaeologists' interests in internal systems as a rejection of the isolationism and nationalism of pre-war politics in the light of a new systemic internationalism. We can see three aspects of current thinking reflected in the most recent models of migration too: firstly, the intentional ethnoarchaeology promoted by Ian Hodder belongs to a context of so-called identity politics and decolonization. Similarly, the increasing commodification of ethnicity has supported materialist studies of social identity. Lastly, and perhaps most importantly for the current analysis, intersectional approaches to ethnicity and other social categorizations have invoked the variation in materialism, the instability of cultural expression, and the overlapping of identities as explanations. The study of migration in antiquity demands a methodology which is sensitive to the potential and the complexity of ethnic groups' material expression.

4.2 The Aiolian area, LBA to Archaic Period

There has been reason to expect, without reliance on the tradition, signs of disruption and large-scale population movement which was roughly contemporary with traditional dates for the migrations, i.e. the effects of the Mycenaean collapse. This long disaster is too complex an event to connect precisely to the chain of invasions which prompted the migrations in the traditions, and it is now generally accepted that archaeology does not directly attest the arrival of new Dorian or Boiotian populations from northern Greece in the Peloponnese or Central Greece.[413] Some amount of forced migration would however

[413] Dickinson (2006) 50–56.

be a natural consequence of catastrophe and social disruption. Such disorder was spread across the Eastern Mediterranean in the thirteenth and twelfth centuries, a fact almost completely absent from the Greek traditions, and there is (controversial) evidence for migration or movement toward Cyprus, Egypt and the Levant, some of which may have originated in the Aegean.[414] The situation in Western Anatolia is less clear. In the southern part of the coast, it is certain that a strong Aegean presence began centuries before the traditional date; on the evidence of ceramic and burial practices, Miletos and Müsgebi on the Bodrum peninsula can genuinely be called Mycenaean colonies by the end of the Bronze Age, which calls into question a historical Ionian migration in the Early Iron Age.[415] Material for the Early Iron Age north of Miletos is less than fulsome.

The Bronze Age and the Archaic Period of the Aiolian area are fairly well known. Due to the scant and likely unrepresentative evidence in the literary and material record, however, Aiolis, Lesbos and the Troad are enigmatic regions in the Early Iron Age. Recent scholarship on this period has focused on the migration, and it has favoured the material evidence to do so – Rose concludes that the literary traditions accurately reflect the commercial and political engagement of certain regions with western Asia Minor, but that there is no material evidence for the Aiolian migration per se:

> At no time during the early 1st millenium do we have evidence for attacks, for the arrival of a new population group, or for any substantive change in ceramic production. With the exception of the Protogeometric amphoras, produced in central Greece (10th/9th century) and Macedonia (8th century), the ceramic assemblages at these sites remained remarkably consistent, with very few

414 Cline (2014); Deger-Jalkotzy (2008).

415 Niemeier (2005); on the literary tradition, see Rose 2008, 403; Mac Sweeney 2017.

> imports until the 6th century B.C., when Greek also begins to appear in inscriptions.[416]

Thus, without arguing that they are pure invention, Rose suggests that the forms of the tradition which are fossilized in literary versions reflect only fifth century attempts to emphasize links across the Aegean. As I have already discussed, Rose's focus on charter myths of the Delian League invents a role for Athens in the traditions.[417] We can now turn to the material argument against the Aiolian migration. As we would expect from the survey of migration theories above, Rose's standard of evidence for the Aiolian migration, only articulated at the end of his article, highlights signs of violence or a change in material culture (specifically the pottery record) as proxy evidence for the migration. It should be self-evident that a methodology which uses change in the material record as the basis of analysis needs to fill in the historical background carefully in order to usefully identify what is new. In particular we need to be clear about the level of connectivity which might result in apparently foreign materials' presence in the Late Bronze Age in order to recognize changes in the pattern of distribution. It is also necessary that the analysis of change offers a reasonable explanation of the situation at the end – in short, the reconstruction of the Early Iron Age should connect well with the better-attested situation at either end. This section thus offers a brief contextualization, summarizing the Late Bronze and Archaic evidence for the political and ethnic situation in western Anatolia.

The political situation in this region before the final crisis of the Eastern Mediterranean Bronze Age is far from a complete picture; the fall of Hattusa and the loss

---

416 Rose (2008) 420.

417 See chapter 3.

of Hittite archival evidence (c. 1200) made it still more obscure.[418] Attempts to establish the territorial divisions of the eastern Aegean coast have however recently succeeded in drawing a more accurate map.[419] The recently destroyed Karabel Relief A, in a mountain pass c. 28km due east of Smyrna, is nearly the only documentary evidence from western Anatolia. It may well have marked the northern border of the Hittite vassal state, Mira, in the 13th century. Beyond this border lay the Seha River Land, according to Hittite texts, which would have incorporated most of what became Aiolis. Although perhaps increasingly important in the west at the end of the Bronze Age, little is known materially about this state. Until recently it was assumed that its capital was hidden beneath the Lydian layers of Sardis. Survey work has now identified an alternative candidate for the capital, at Kaymakçi north of the Hermos on the western shore of Lake Marmara.[420] The size of the citadel at this site, some three times bigger than the LBA citadel of Troy VI, confirms a well-connected and prosperous state. Lesbos (Lazpa) also fell within the sphere of the Seha River Land; presumably so did the parts of the later coast which lay between Kaymakçi and Lazpa. Hittite records continue to refer to Mira and the Seha River Land as well as the territory of Hapalla to their east as Arzawa, although the Kingdom of Arzawa proper, south of Mira, had recent been suppressed by the Hittite king Mursili II for leading insurrection against Hattusa, and its lands absorbed into Mira (c. 1300 BCE). Northmost of the Arzawan lands was Wilusa. The name Wilusa itself is not found in Western Anatolia, equation with Homeric Fίλιος notwithstanding. The scope of this territory is hence unclear. It has been suggested that the apparent borders of

418 Bryce (2006).
419 Hawkins (1998).
420 Roosevelt and Luke (2017).

Priam's own territory in the Troad reflect the Bronze Age kingdom of Troy/Wilusa. If so, the Troad as far as Adramyttion lay in one state, later Aiolis and Lesbos in another.

All of the states of Arzawa seem to have fallen under Hittite suzerainty, though not always peacefully. The ethnic affiliations of these individual states are far from certain. The name of a fifteenth century confederacy of western states preceding greater Arzawa including Wilusiya (Wilusa) and Truisa (Taruissa = Troy?), Assuwa, has been connected with the later Greek term Ἄσιος, but it is not certain that this was really an ethnonym in either period.[421] It seems very likely that the residents of western Anatolia spoke forms of Luwian, which takes its name from the old Hittite designation for the empire's western neighbours. It is uncertain how distinct these forms of language were: by the very early Greek archaic period there were several distinct non-Greek languages and ethnic groups in western Anatolia, some of which may have adopted the names of Bronze-Age Luwian states. These Luwian speakers may well have belonged to a single ethnic group to begin with; the material culture in the northern parts of the western coast is fairly homogeneous too.[422]

The most prevalent feature of material culture for western Anatolia was the so-called Grey Ware pottery.[423] Since this type of pottery continued often without change into the archaic period and will be relevant to the discussion later – it is a primary component of Rose's not substantively changed ceramic assemblages – an excursus into the Bronze Age background of the pottery is necessary. Grey Ware in fact denotes a number of different types within the Mediterranean and Near East. Some Grey Wares are easily distinguished as isolated or at least separate traditions; others are not: much study

421 Melchert (2003) 5.
422 See essays in Melchert (2003); Mouton et al. (2013).
423 Bayne (2000); Pavúk (2010); Hnila (2012).

in particular has been put into the relationship between the Aegean wares and their origins. In general, grey ware denotes vessels in a fine monochromatic clay, (mostly) wheelmade, unpainted but with a highly burnished surface, often smooth and even soapy to the touch.

On the western side of the Aegean, grey wares began in the Early Helladic III Period, and were predominant (though not universal) in the Middle Helladic, called Minyan Ware by Schliemann who found it first at Orchomenos. Late Helladic pottery featured a number of highly painted wares, but grey ware persisted to a lesser degree. LHIIIA–B Grey Ware followed the shapes of the Mycenaean pottery tradition, at Tiryns and Dimini, and was revived in LHIIIC in northern Greece, continuing into the Early Iron Age. There are also examples from Lefkandi, but in general the Grey Ware in the western Aegean did not last as long as in the east.

Only in the last two decades has it become common to prefer 'Anatolian' rather than 'Minyan' Ware to distinguish the grey ware of the eastern Aegean. There were Anatolian types of grey ware, resembling Minyan Ware in fabric but not shapes, only inland, south-east of the Sea of Marmara; these İnegöl and Tavşanli Grey Wares are difficult to date but probably start in the Middle Bronze Age. The contemporary coastal area (e.g. Troy V ~ MHI–II) saw neither Minyan Ware nor Anatolian Grey Ware. Interestingly, when grey wares do appear on the coast c. MHIII/Troy VIa, they appear from west and east at the same time, but the Anatolian types win out. Peter Pavúk sees the inland traditions as the origins of the wares which did become prevalent in north-west Anatolia in the Late Bronze Age. Anatolian Grey Ware then extended from Troy VI to Bademgediği north of the Kaystros. Examples from Troy and the small constellation of BA sites near Smyrna dominate the corpus, perhaps only because they are our major source of BA artefacts from western Anatolia. However, good LHIIIA Grey Ware is also

found at Antissa on Lesbos, and in small quantities on Chios as well. A number of examples from the Levant were shown by NAA to be made at Troy, which suggests that it is correct to see Troy as a major or even the primary centre of production.

Pavúk treats Helladic and Anatolian as entirely distinct traditions of pottery, but it is worth noting that there are occasional convergences in the Bronze Age: both Minyan and Anatolian Grey Wares found in a 'contact phase' on the Anatolian coast during the transition from MHIII to LHI, and more importantly the use of Mycenaean shapes for Anatolian ware from Troy VIIa, Troy's harbour town Beşiktepe and much further south at Panaztepe (Gk. Klazomenai). The corpus of Anatolian Grey Wares is still not well understood. Substantial continuity over time has meant that only examples from very clearly stratified deposits can be dated (further undermining archaeologists' ability to establish sequences). The area of distribution is large, and not uniform either.

The explanatory models for Grey Wares track quite well the overall trends in archaeological thought. At the beginning of the twentieth century, Minyan Ware was associated with the supposed invasion of Mycenaean Greeks from the north at the beginning of the Middle Helladic period. Mellaart constructed an ambitious hypothesis of Indo-European invasion (with Grey Wares) c. 1900 BCE which incorporated the Caucasus, Anatolia and the Balkans. Although the wave of destruction was shown to be a dubious construction, it was John Caskey's evidence of an Early Helladic precedent for Minyan Ware at Lerna, now called Fine Grey Burnished Ware, and the ringfencing of

inland Anatolian Grey Wares by French, which replaced migrationist explanation of Grey Wares with separate, indigenous developments.[424]

Mainland Greece undoubtedly already had significant communication with lands across the Aegean. Mycenaeans were likely already present in the Gulf of Mandalya, as discussed above. It is of no consequence for material culture whether this was part, or an annex, of a Greek kingdom called Ahhiyawa. Penelope Mountjoy characterized the area between Troy and Rhodes as an East–West interface throughout the Late Bronze Age.[425] Mycenaean goods are distributed by exchange to Troy, Lesbos and Lemnos, Menemen and in many sites in later Ionia: Klazomenai–Limantepe, Panaztepe, Kolophon and Ephesos. These were likely the result of trade activity, not necessarily indicative of Greek presence, and degrees of engagement varied; Mountjoy suggested that the central and southern interfaces were more active and engaged, while beyond Clazomenae interaction was less frequent; at Troy, Helladic pottery although sometimes locally produced never reflected more than 3% of the total ceramic assemblage. As Mountjoy observes, the Bronze Age collapse likely had some effect on the interface. More recently, scholars have asserted the unique character of western Anatolia: rather than simply a zone of contact

---

[424] Most interestingly, more Anatolian Grey Ware has been found in the Levant and Cyprus than in mainland Greece and the islands, but it is there often *associated* with Helladic pottery: with Mycenaean wares (not Minyan) at LBA Tell Abu Hawam and Lachish, in particular: Allen (1994). An isolated layer of grey ware at Tel Miqne (Ekron), appearing under a layer of Mycenaean IIIC:1b has been shown by NAA to originate at Troy. LHIIIC:1b pottery, often associated with an Aegean origin for the Philistine people, nevertheless is not found *with* Trojan material, although Allen reasoned that the Trojan material in the Levant must largely belong to a putative post-war Trojan diaspora. The firm evidence of the production sites does not however give us a good explanation of how Mycenaean and Anatolian pottery ended up in the Levant in notable quantities. There is not space here to consider any further the complications of the Levantine evidence for the end of the Bronze Age, but it is worth noting that many scholars have sought to explain the presence of both Mycenaean and Anatolian styles of pottery as a conjoint phenomenon, as gifts or high-status possession of people from one side of the Aegean or the other. Looking beyond the core contexts of these styles thus somewhat mitigates the exclusive association of these styles with a single people.

[425] Mountjoy (1998).

between Mycenaean and Hittite cultural and political spheres, they have noted its independent substance, an active participant in an interactive scheme which may have survived the troubles of the early twelfth century BC.[426]

We have every reason to suspect that the circumstances of the twelfth century BC were exceptional. Trouble, it almost goes without saying, had come to western Anatolia somewhat earlier; in the thirteenth century it seems that the coast was a consistently conflictual sphere. To give just the most relevant instances, the kings of Hattusa and Ahhiyawa had fought at Wilusa at some point, then Miletos (Milawanda).[427] King Tarhuntaradu of the Seha River Land rebelled against Hattusa with the support of the King of Ahhiyawa, while one of the latest Hittite texts, the Milawata Letter, mentions the restoration of Walmu of Wilusa to his throne, and implies that Wilusa has in fact become subordinate to the addressee of the letter as well, most likely the king of Mira. Disruption was compounded by ecological catastrophe, such as the earthquake which severely damaged Troy VI (c. 1250 BCE). Whether or not this situation persisted in any fashion after the end of documented evidence is unknown. Troy does not seem to suffer crises of exactly the same type and time as found elsewhere in the Eastern Mediterranean. The violent destruction of Troy VIIa (c. 1180 BCE) seems to have come slightly after the collapse of Mycenaean and Hittite states. Hittite documents, and the defensive structures put in place after the earthquake which marked the end of Troy VI c. 1300 BCE, suggest long-running regional issues rather than unexpected invasion. Nevertheless Arzawa is named in an Egyptian text from from Medinet Hebu, a list of states which experienced violence at the hands of the so-called Sea People. So what happened to the states in the

426 Collins et al. (2008); Mountjoy (2015).
427 Bryce (2006) 104, 111.

Aiolian area we cannot exactly say. Troy was reoccupied in a somewhat tentative fashion (VIIb1): from this layer with minimal rebuilding comes the only documentary evidence from Bronze-Age Troy itself, a Luwian seal. Its existence tells us nothing definitive about the political situation of Troy at the time, and it is the last documentary evidence for western Anatolia until Anatolian Greeks, Yaw(a)naya (Ionians?) appear in seventh-century Assyrian documents. The transition from Kaymakçi to Lydian Sardis remains to be explained. It is reasonable to assume that the states collapsed here, for there is no sign of political continuity at the other end of this 'Dark Age', but how and why, and with what effect on the local settled population, we cannot say. The Greek traditions, as we have already seen, do not actually address what the settlers found when they arrived in Asia Minor. They do not even attach themselves to any obvious memory of the Mycenaean collapse as a possible reason or context for migration.

At the beginning of the twelfth century, some Greeks – perhaps Aiolians – travelled across the Aegean with some regularity, and some of them even likely dwelt in Anatolia. Whether many of them reached Troy we may never know: although this is perhaps the most pressing question in Aegean scholarship, the level of interaction in the north-eastern Aegean was low enough that it has been suggested that Mycenaean pottery came to Troy only indirectly, and with the exception of a few specimens from Lesbos, Mountjoy's so-called Upper Interface is in fact largely without interfacing.

4.3 PG Troy and the Aiolian migration

Rose presents as an argument against the Aiolian migration a survey of the archaeological evidence from Lesbos, Aiolis and the Troad over the course of the early first millennium BCE. Although he incorporates some of the evidence from elsewhere, such as was available in 2008, the discussion rests above all on what remains at Troy. At this site,

Rose argues, the material culture showed noteworthy consistency from the last moment of the Bronze Age until the seventh century BCE; the few intrusive elements could generally be explained by trade and exchange across the Aegean rather than the presence of a new population. Archaeometric data has somewhat complicated that explanation by demonstrating that most of the material at Troy was locally made, but we may begin with an overview of the evidence from Troy particularly in the Protogeometric period. The appearance of Protogeometric pottery (c. 1050 BCE) has often been taken as a reflection of the arrival of Aiolian Greeks in the eastern Aegean; the eleventh-century date very roughly aligns with a tradition of migration two to four generations after the Trojan War.

The archaeological reflection of the Aiolian migration was never seen as a simple phenomenon. Earlier analysis of the archaeological evidence for Aiolian migration proposed either a high or a low date.[428] Blegen, who did not recognize evidence for continued activity at Troy between the end of the Bronze Age and the Archaic period, placed Aiolian migration at the end of the hiatus. Walter Leaf in fact espoused both, a Protogeometric migration of very brief duration, followed by an Aiolian migration c. 700 BCE. Bayne's doctoral thesis on the Grey Ware ceramics recognized LHIIIB ceramics on Lesbos as evidence of refugees from the Dorians, followed by an 'Aiolian' migration to Lesbos in LHIIIC, a third wave of central Greek immigrants who founded the southern Aiolian cities c. 1000 BCE, and a final northwards progression to the Troad c. 700 BCE.[429] Rose collects these scholarly reconstructions, but he is inattentive to the geographical particularities of the arguments. Dörpfeld, Blegen, and Leaf are concerned with explaining the situation at Troy alone. It is too simplistic, on the other hand, to say

[428] See citations in Rose (2008) 404–5.
[429] Bayne (2000).

that Bayne interpreted each change in pottery style as evidence for a new migration. Clearly there is some deference to the literary tradition here in Bayne's vision of the third wave of migration directly from central Greece to southern Aiolis, but more importantly Bayne like Blegen and Leaf makes the migration to Troy a secondary wave of migration, from Lesbos and southern Aiolis northwards, at the end of the eighth century. The absence of material occupation at Troy may have been felt thus to align with the literary evidence that emphasized growing Greek interest in the Hellespont and Black Sea for colonization in the seventh century. Rose is inaccurate to conflate these various putative instances of migration into a single phenomenon, implying that the Aiolian migration had up until now been understood as a rapid, massive, and indiscriminate expansion of Greeks into the whole of northern Asia Minor. Rose relies most heavily on the account of Strabo both for the date of the migration and a tradition which suggested that Aiolians entered Asia Minor from Thrace via the Troad; as we saw in the previous section, other, earlier traditions often suggest a sailing expedition to Lesbos and the southern Aiolid.[430] Perhaps surprisingly, none of the traditions mention Troy at all, which perhaps gives lie to the general assumption that the prestige attaching to Troy was an important factor in the development of the migratory tradition.

Troy VIIa, in fact the last phase of the great Bronze Age layer Troy VI, suffered a violent destruction at the beginning of the twelfth century (for periods and dates see Table 5.1, p. 183).[431] The following phase rebuilt. Although substantially impoverished, the VIIb1 population seems to have continued much the same material culture as the earlier city. There is thus no sharp break here, and indeed the next phase (VIIb2) is

[430] Rose (2008) 402.
[431] Rose (2008) 409–11; Aslan and Hnila (2015).

distinguished largely by the addition of a new pottery type alongside the continuing local Grey and Tan Wares, the local expression of Handmade Lustrous Ware (a.k.a. 'Buckelkeramik' or Aiolian bucchero), which has long been connected with south-eastern Europe. The citadel was densely occupied, with new building techniques, although without reconfiguration from the Troy VIIa street layout. A new type of locally produced coarse handmade ware replaced the earlier wheelmade cooking pottery. This has generally been considered on stylistic parallels to represent an influx from the Balkans, perhaps in more than one stage, although dining ware continued to feature fine wheelmade Grey and Tan Wares. We thus have a complete domestic pottery assemblage for Troy VIIb1–2, and evidence of interaction between the two traditions. Rose thus suggests that Troy participated in an intensification of a trade corridor between Thrace and central Anatolia which may have involved a 'demographic shift', i.e. a Balkan population residing alongside the Luwian(?) inhabitants of Troy. Handmade Burnished and Coarse Wares were found generally in shared contexts with older wares, which Hnila and Aslan thus interpret as evidence of acculturation.[432] Although materially different, there was little evidence of significant culture change between Troy VIh and VIIb2. The following table summarizes the absolute and relative dating given to the archaeological levels of Troy.

Level	**Absolute dates**	**Aegean eras**
Troy VIIa	1300–1190/80 BCE	LBA, Homeric?
Troy VIIb1	1190/80–1130 BCE	LBA/EIA
Troy VIIb2	1130–1070/40 BCE	LBA/EIA

[432] Aslan and Hnila (2015).

PG Troy (VIIb3)	1070/40–900 BCE	PG
Troy VIII	900–700 BCE	G

Table 5.1. Relevant chronological phases at Troy, after Aslan et al. (2014), Table 1. Dates for the beginning of PG are controversial; Aslan (2019) settles for c. 1050.

The Troy VIIb2 phase was abandoned for unknown reasons in the mid-eleventh century. Blegen came to the conclusion in his final publication that Troy had then been unoccupied for 400 years until the establishment of Troy VIII. Although a small number of Protogeometric pieces had already been found, Blegen dismissed them, observing that these were never found in a securely stratified deposit from Troy VIIb. Dieter Hertel however drew attention to the possibility that the Protogeometric pottery might represent the arrival of Aiolian Greeks at Troy, much earlier than Blegen had allowed.[433] The later excavations under Korfman and Rose showed fairly quickly that Blegen had underestimated the quantity and significance of Protogeometric finds in the layers directly above VIIb2. A new phase was distinguished in 1994 which came to be designated Protogeometric Troy (c. 1050–900).

The level of activity at Troy after the abandonment of VIIb2 suggests that PG Troy was at best an extremely small settlement. There is almost no recognizable building work from the Protogeometric period. One wall on the citadel in sector E8–9, c. 1m in length, was built into the stone tumble, effectively blocking the VIIb2 street which lay below the tumble. Its construction date is not certain.[434] A terrace wall of uncertain extent lies just above the walls of Troy VIIb2 cells south of the acropolis (sector D9). Any reconstruction which occurred may well have taken place in the centre of the citadel,

433 Hertel (1991); Hertel (2008).
434 Hnila (2012) 172.

where the clearing work for the Hellenistic temple of Athena and Schliemann's aggressive excavation work cleared away much of the Bronze- and Iron-Age material. As there is no sign of domestic activity elsewhere on the site, it is supposed that settlement was restricted to this small area. The evidence available is thus restricted almost entirely to ceramic finds. The absolute number of fragments found for PG Troy, however, is much lower than that found for VIIa (c. 100 years), and a fraction of those found for VIIb2, although potentially covering a much longer period.[435]

The ceramic assemblage of PG Troy shows a distinct mixture of painted Protogeometric sherds, above all amphoras, Anatolian Grey and Tan Ware, and Handmade Coarse and Lustrous Ware. Because Grey and Handmade specimens continued from Troy VIIb2, and are difficult to date stylistically, painted Protogeometric pottery effectively becomes the diagnostic feature of PG Troy levels. Hnila observes that Protogeometric pottery is thus overemphasized in the literature for its diagnostic utility, but likely underrepresented in statistical analyses of the different ware groups, as undecorated sherds were not categorized along with the painted sherds. Nevertheless, it seems that Protogeometric pieces represent a very small proportion of the overall assemblage (1.8%). Grey and Tan Ware pieces make up the largest proportion of the PG finds (29.1% and 9.8%); Handmade Lustrous Ware and Coarse Ware are also found in larger quantities (13.2% and 13.9%). Different shapes favour different wares, and there is not in general segregation by ware; the combination of wares at PG Troy thus seem to form a complementary functional set.

Rose emphasizes the minimal presence of the Protogeometric ware associated with the putative Greek migration. Moreover, he suggests that because Protogeometric

---

[435] Hnila (2012) pl. 12.

wares are limited to a single shape, the neck amphora, these cannot be seen as evidence of Aiolian settlers at Troy. Other shapes do in fact appear in small numbers, perhaps in later phases. The chronology here is very hard to follow. Rose distinguishes an early Protogeometric phase with Catling's Group I amphorae and EPG grey ware cups from a later phase with more diverse shapes. The later phase, according to Rose, is only attested in the West Sanctuary and Sector D9, which might imply a narrowing of activity, but Lenz et al catalogue a number of Group II and III fragments from other parts of the site. The phase distinction seems to be largely based on Sector D9, which is the only cleanly stratified context for PG material. The early phase there is a very small dataset. Catling observes that there are problems with stylistic dating of the amphorae as some of the types seem to be in continous use over centuries, so that the presence of Group I pottery in phase 1 of Sector D9 is the only confirmation that it begins first as Catling suspected.

The earlier phase of PG Troy does however see two changes in the shapes produced in the continuing wares: Grey Ware cups and kraters imitate the vessel shapes of Protogeometric types (which Rose explains as simply evidence of contact between Thessaly, Euboia, and Troy), while a cooking jug common at Protogeometric sites is found at PG Troy only in the Handmade Coarse Ware which was favoured for cooking wares in Troy VIIb (not discussed by Rose). This suggests a degree not only of contact but of adaptation from and interaction with Protogeometric pottery which is not directly attested at the site, resulting in hybrid wares. At times it seems that Rose's desire to disprove an Aiolian migration leads him to close off the possibility of smaller degrees of mobility.

There is no comprehensive publication of the PG material from Troy, and it seems that the Tübingen–Cincinnati team only belatedly became aware of possible stratigraphic

questions about the material in some areas.[436] Dieter Hertel collected such pieces of 'early Greek ceramics' as Schliemann returned to Berlin. Lenz produced a catalogue of all the material found by Korfmann and Rose's teams as far as 1998, including some from Blegen's diaries. The catalogue however is largely the groundwork for Catling's typology of PG amphorae and thus not very specific about find contexts; pieces are indexed by sector and 'Behälter', which may allow for later reconstruction, but Lenz simply classified the pieces as stratified or not. A number of points on the accompanying chart do not seem to be included in their catalogue. Aslan provides a catalogue of all pieces in Sector D9. Hnila's thesis on the ceramics Troy VII provides the largest corpus of PG fragments, including stratigraphic information, alongside the Grey and Handmade wares. The statistical analyses offer a comprehensive overview of all available material for each period, but the catalogue itself focuses on diagnostic materials, and does not incorporate all of the pieces published already published Lenz and Aslan. Neutron Activation Analysis was performed on pieces which mostly had not previously appeared in any of the above. Carolyn Aslan's publication of the West Sanctuary includes a full catalogue of the relevant pieces, i.e. those from Sectors z7 to A9, which I have not been able to consult.

Even more problematic than the literary methodology is the desire to let Troy speak for the entire region. Hisarlık is certainly the most thoroughly investigated site in an otherwise under-excavated region. Nevertheless, Rose may be mistaken to assume that Troy would show evidence of a new population at the same time as Lesbos and the more southern Aiolian cities. As discussed in the previous section, the later archaic Troad was still undergoing settlement: Sigeion founded by Mytilene, and then claimed by

[436] Hertel (1991); Catling (1998); Lenz et al. (1998); Aslan (2002); Hnila (2012).

Athens in the sixth century; Milesian colonies were founded along the Hellespont in the early sixth century. Survey has suggested that the handmade pottery of Troy VIIb was almost entirely restricted in distribution to Troy and Daskyleion, which might affirm a disjunction between the northern Troad and Aiolis in the south.

A rather different picture can be painted with the archaeological remains south of Troy, although the discovered material remains are fewer and a large number of the Early Iron Age finds, particularly the PG ceramics, remains unpublished. Nevertheless, the picture at Old Smyrna (Bayraklı), at the other end of Archaic and Classical Aiolis, is instructive. Archaeologically, Smyrna shows no indications of the supposed change from an Aiolian to and Ionian population; it is useful, however, because it remains the only Greek site in the region with a continuous archaeological record from Early Iron Age to the Hellenistic. The later stages of the Bronze Age site demonstrate neither Mycenaean–Millawandan influence nor Trojan;[437] instead its remains have some commonalities with the inland site of Beycesultan, itself Hittite-influenced.[438] Although there is no evidence of destruction or hiatus,[439] there is a sharp break in the ceramic sequence at the point of the Bronze Age collapse, after which PG pottery is found more abundantly than at any other site in Aiolis, as well as Aiolic Grey Ware.[440]

The site of Kyme, on the other hand, seems to have been an entirely new settlement in the Early Iron Age.[441] A century of excavation on the site had found little evidence which supported the eleventh-century foundation date suggested in the literary

---

437 Mycenaean pottery: some LHIIIA–B sherds found out of context in PG levels: Bayne (2000) 79.

438 Bayne (2000) 80, links less direct than previously thought.

439 Bayne (2000) 158 nevertheless thinks that the site was likely not occupied when it was occupied by Greeks.

440 Bayne (2000) 158 notes that Grey Ware loses popularity rapidly over the course of the Middle Geometric period and is very rare thereafter, coinciding 'more or less' with the Ionian occupation.

441 For an overview of the excavation history of Kyme, see Frasca (2017).

tradition. Digs by the Museum of İzmir in 1979 reported PG finds contemporary with the foundation, but these were never published and Kan İren reports that he has not been able to locate anything earlier than Late Geometric wares in the Museum's collection.[442] A single skyphos of the Pendant Semi-Circle type is known – NAA indicates that it is, like the PG material at Troy, a local product.[443] It is extremely close to Euboian models, but as a singular example seemed as likely to indicate the strength of Euboian trading networks as the presence of Greek consumers in the Kymaian Gulf. It therefore seemed likely that Greek Kyme was not established until the mid-eighth century.[444] Excavations in 2012, however, found a substantial cache of Geometric and Protogeometric sherds as well as Grey Ware within a single trench above the bedrock on the South Hill, Area IV.[445] It is clear now that Greek settlement at Kyme may have begun in the ninth or even tenth century. A recently excavated small PG cemetery west of Methymna further indicates that the difficulty of observing Greek settlement in the Aiolian area thus far may simply have been one of archaeological visibility.[446]

Rose followed Catling's suggestion that the amphora types found at PG Troy were the result of a trade network between Protogeometric production centres in the western Aegean, on the basis that representatives of those types had been found in western Aegean sites (in Euboia, Thessaly and perhaps Lokris for Group I; Macedonia for Group II).[447] More recently however it has been shown that many if not almost all of the PG Trojan amphoras were locally made. Neutron Activation Analysis of a selection

---

442 İren (2008) 31 n. 20.
443 Kerschner (2006) 113–14.
444 For Rose's interpretation and earlier bibliography, see Rose (2008a) 416 and n. 99.
445 For preliminary report, see Camera (2018).
446 Zachos (2017).
447 Catling (1998).

of Trojan pottery from various periods found that 83% of the sample could be connected to clay sources within ten kilometres of Hisarlık.[448] The Handmade cooking ware not only used the same ware as LBA cooking ware, but the same clay source. Aslan, Kealhofer and Grave note the potential significance of continuous exploitation of a specialized clay source. Samples from all three groups of PG Trojan amphorae have been connected by NAA to local clay sources, as have Grey Ware and Handmade samples; only one piece from the Protogeometric period was identified as an import. Although Catling divided the amphorae by visual identification of their fabrics, the NAA did not confirm this division. One group within NAA macrogroup A, 8 and 8.1, was almost exclusively represented in Protogeometric finds. Other groups were used to produce both Protogeometric and Grey wares. Carolyn Aslan et al. therefore observe that rather than evidence of trade networks, the Trojan pieces simply reflect Trojan potters' adoption of the multiple brush necessary to draw the concentric circles typical of Protogeometric pottery. The somewhat wobbly painted bands, it has been noted, must have been applied on the slow potter's wheel, which suggests that the potters of Troy were isolated from the techniques of contemporary Attic and Euboian potters.

Protogeometric pottery at Troy was not then the passive evidence of trade, but rather a strategic product. Aslan, Kealhofer and Grave suggest that the use of Protogeometric decoration was a communicative choice, effectively branding. Although amphoras resembling Trojan types have been found elsewhere in the Aegean, it is in some cases shown or suspected that these are also local products, in which case the PG decoration 'may have been intended for local producers'. The one near-complete amphora from PG Troy preserves two deeply incised signs over the banding on the

---

448 Aslan et al. (2014).

belly.[449] Although there are many other belly fragments preserved at Troy, this is the only example of post-firing marks. Post-production alternations are rare on PG pottery in general; one similar piece has been noticed from Xeropolis Lefkandi. (It may be worth noting at this point that we do not know where PG Troy's harbour was: the Skamander was already silted up in the LBA, and the alternative harbour at Beşik Tepe on the Aegean coast has not offered any evidence of Protogeometric activity.) Aslan et al. suggest meanwhile that the choice of Grey Ware for the PG-style cups and kraters 'may speak to the continued significance and value of Gray ware within the local community'; there is no evidence that drinking customs themselves changed.[450]

A more interesting explanation, which can be applied to the current evidence from PG Troy with slightly less speculation, arises from Aslan et al.'s discussion of the coarseware cooking pots. Changes in cooking ware, they note, have often been associated with major cultural change such as migration, as they relate to ingrained culinary practices. They cite (inter alios) Burmeister's contrast of exterior, socially marked performative behaviour with the internal domestic sphere, which offers better evidence of cultural change. Michael Dietler, however, has observed that there are many instances of ready adoption of foreign culinary practices, particularly those which can be deployed for social capital.[451] Aslan et al. thus suggest that the Trojans simply participated in a wider sphere of cultural changes of foodways. We might observe however that due to the scattered nature of the PG material from Troy, we have no evidence of domestic cooking contexts. Both of the handmade cooking jars tested by NAA come from the votive deposits of the West Sanctuary, and thus belong more clearly to Burmeister's external

449 Lenz et al. (1998) cat. I. B. 1; Catling (1998) 164–66.
450 Aslan et al. (2014) 297.
451 Dielter (2010).

and performative sphere. There is a tantalizing suggestion here that performative social interaction may have become important in eleventh and tenth century Troy. This surely could have related to a new population, or indeed new neighbours.

Noting Anthony's claim that migration is a well understood process in the social sciences, Burmeister retorted that archaeologists understood migration very little. He has repeated this complaint several times in the twenty years since he first made it. Although both Anthony and Burmeister are cited approvingly in Rose and Aslan's studies, it is not the case that a strongly developed theory of migration has been applied to the archaeology of western Anatolia. Rose's argument ultimately demonstrates not the absence of evidence for migration but the complex absence of ethnic material visibility.[452] It may come as a surprise that after asserting that the evidence from north-western Anatolia fails to reflect any migration, he nevertheless cedes the issue of Greek arrival in Anatolia without further discussion:

> Throughout the Iron Age and Archaic period, there would have been centuries of interaction between Greek-speaking communities and the settlements of western Asia Minor, in which trade, intermarriage, and territorial conflict played a part; but the culture in most, perhaps all, of the Aiolian/Ionian cities would have been a continually changing blend of Luwian, Lydian, Phrygian and Greek.[453]

Such a concession is more or less demanded by the unequivocal contemporary textual evidence of Greek presence in Asia from the eighth century onwards at least, very

---

[452] Thus a somewhat peculiar argument is prominent in Rose's section on archaic archaeology. He asserts that the development of the Aiolian architectonic order in Asia Minor, followed by the Ionian order, may be related to ethnic identity in those regions; then he goes on to say that the absence of these orders in the mainland reflects the unimportance of the migratory tradition. The familiar ethnicized names of the orders are of course only attested much later: Aiolic and Ionic buildings do seem to appear first in Asia Minor, as the local styles of their respective regions; it is not necessarily the case that they are ethnically salient, and I am not sure what to make of the relation to migration.

[453] Rose (2008) 420.

strongly so by the late seventh century. Rose implies that a strictly Greek material culture is still not really visible until sometime after that date. We must then conclude that Rose's explanatory model does not sufficiently explain the full body of evidence. Perhaps most importantly, if new populations are to leave strong signs in the material record, they must have clearly distinguishable material cultures – which are more readily distinguished when migration occurs across very long distances. It is not clear that the Aiolian and Ionian migrations, whenever they did occur, might be considered long-distance migrations. It is a question of perspective.

4.4 Conclusions

A recurrent theme in the archaeology of migration and culture change more generally has been the resolution of old problems not due to theoretical revisions but simply due to improvements in the state of the evidence. Thus, what previously seemed to be a substantial gap in the record (such as the break at Troy) is filled in by further discovery, while a greater geographical spread allows for a more granular analysis of something which might otherwise seem to be a broad but vague phenomenon: the increasing evidence from southern Aiolis and the middle Hermus valley for the Early Iron Age permits a more detailed picture of mobility. Discoveries since Rose's article was published have made it clear that there is still better evidence of the Aiolian area's Early Iron Age to be uncovered; Rose's conclusions are not yet particularly well supported, and we can hope for better evidence of population change than pottery styles. Even those who most firmly criticized migrationism in archaeological thinking allowed that movement was the only reasonable explanation for the establishment of new settlements. On the current evidence, it seems that such a new settlement did occur at Kyme by the tenth century, and later Aigai.

Beyond the somewhat confused argument for a significant Athenian contribution to the development of the migratory tradition, Rose argues that the migratory tradition did accurately reflect regions from the Greek mainland within a sphere of interaction. This may need reconsideration in light of the discovery that the PG material was not directly imported from such areas. More importantly, Rose and others have emphasized the variety of possible influences on the material culture of western Anatolia, and those cited in the varying migratory traditions: these do not entirely align with regions normally associated with Aiolian or Ionian ethnic identity. If however settlements in Greek Asia Minor drew on such varied sources for their populations and material cultures, including non-Greek sources, rather than being settled by the migration of an already ethnically affiliated group, we need to explain the ethnogenesis of Aiolians in Asia Minor, and particularly how they became distinct from the Ionians, by other means. It seems more likely, on the evidence of kinship myth, that some form of distinct identity was formed on the mainland, perhaps before migration.

5. Aiolian Kinship Traditions

Like the other intra-Hellenic ethnic groups (indeed, like all ethnic groups), the Aiolians as a group had both internal complexities and external relationships to manage. These naturally fluctuated over the course of the centuries which this thesis covers. One strategy for shaping, managing, and communicating these complexities and relationships was kinship myth. This was a straightforward tool of ethnic thinking whereby groups (sometimes places) were represented by human characters, and the relationships between the groups represented in terms of genealogy. I quoted at the beginning of this thesis one well-known piece of kinship myth from the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women*, to show that Aiolians were juxtaposed with Dorians and Ionians as major ethnic groups.

In this chapter I consider in more detail that kinship myth and what it reflects about the Aiolians' position in the Greek world. After some preliminary discussion of the *modus operandi* of kinship between eponymous figures, I will turn to the eponym Aiolos and his many descendants and variant traditions. I return at the end of the chapter to how we select the evidence which we draw upon for the study of kinship and ethnicity.

Eponymous heroes gave life to ethnic groups, and the narrative mode offers colour and reason to the emotional pull felt between the related groups. Jonathan Hall has suggested that kinship myth fulfils almost entirely the demand for a putative shared descent amongst Greek ethnic groups, and he thus particularly privileges texts which contain kinship myths such as the *Catalogue* as evidence of ethnic identity. Hall has clearly set out a methodology for understanding how kinship myths served to represent and bolster ethnic groups. He noted the structure implicit in the genealogy, arguing that beyond connecting Greek-speaking populations to a single common ancestor (and so a pan-Hellenic identity), 'the Hellenic genealogy employs the metaphor of kinship to

construct a system of ranked relationships between the groups'.[454] Thus Doros and Aiolos as brothers in the Hellenic genealogy had a closer relationship with one another than with their nephews Ion and Achaios. Robert Fowler demonstrates a distinction between two different modes of genealogy which may be characterized by the shape of the resulting family tree.[455] Genealogy which seeks to relate groups to each other are shallow, using just a few generations to express relationships. They will however be as broad as the number of groups which need to be incorporated. 'Pedigrees' on the other hand, link beginning and end point: they are thus narrow, often improbably so, and very deep. Both of these perspectives however prioritize the shape of the family tree over the narrative mode in which the kinship myth is displayed. In the case of the Aiolians, the narrative forms of their eponymous figures are more diverse and more complex than any other Greek group. Aiolos' descendants are legion, and the traditions around them are problematically pluriform.

It has to be recognized that the genealogies of Greek kinship myths did not necessarily form complete and precise relationships which modern scholars might expect to closely resemble a real family tree. In ancient Greece, kinship myth relied on the authority of its performance or author for the assumption that it was comprehensive and coherent in a way that was not in fact always borne out by the content of the myth. This is most evident in the occasionally haphazard conjunction of different generations, where the importance of articulating the relationship between individual mythical figures outweighs any reference to the normal passage of time as counted in generations. Figures and whole families could be relocated as contemporary ethnic relations demanded; these

---

454 Hall (1997) 43.
455 Fowler (1999).

reconfigurations did not always obliterate or contrast with what came before. It is not even the case than an individual author necessarily represented kinship myths in a consistent fashion. The fluidity of kinship myth is one of its virtues, but one which may have complicated the way in which the audience approached what kinship myth had to say about them.

We must think away, as with migration traditions, any clear division between myth and history. Jonathan Hall drew a firm distinction in purpose and substance between family genealogy and ethnic kinship. Family genealogies allowed 'individuals to trace their lineage back to three-dimensional characters', like Fowler's pedigrees, whereas ethnic genealogies were 'the instrument by which whole social collectivities could situate themselves in space and time, reaffirming their identity through appeals to eponymous ancestors'.[456] This may introduce a pre-emptive dismissal of evidence relating to the former. As Rosalind Thomas has discussed, there was a strong connection between distant heroic ancestors and historical individuals in ancient Greece, and that connection was no weaker for the dubious reliability of a line which could exactly be traced from contemporary figures into the past.[457] Unfortunately, personal genealogies in which historical Aiolians traced their descent back to the Aiolidai are not in our evidence. The point stands however that these *may* have been produced and consumed by Aiolians with a very personal interest. It is also important to note the general assumption that family genealogies served the interests of competing and cooperating aristocrats, whereas ethnic genealogies were addressed to the whole population.

---

[456] Hall (1997) 41.

[457] Thomas (1989) 173–77; McInerney (1999) 29–33.

It is difficult to ascribe to the Aiolians a sense of identity linked to the eponymous Aiolos. The evidence for this is firstly the breadth of the Aiolid stemma, which does not consistently prioritize or even feature the connection of Aiolid figures with Aiolian peoples. The general tradition of the Aiolidai demonstrates a different approach to eponymy than that given by the Dorid and Xouthid branches of the Deukalionid stemma.[458] The figures Doros and Xouthos, and Xouthos' sons Ion and Achaios, are associated with very small families, mostly of eponymous figures who have almost no narrative aspects beyond the purely relational. Aiolos on the other hand is father of seven sons and five daughters in the *Catalogue of Women* alone; we shall see that a number of other characters, normally eponyms, also become affiliated with Aiolos.

It has been suggested that the Aiolians did not attribute much significance to eponymy, or the many less eponymous figures within the Aiolidai.[459] Here we must compare the conception of the *Catalogue* and Apollodorus with the rather narrow group of people called Aiolians in the historical period,[460] or the broader sense of Aiolian dialect constructed by ancient grammarians. The character of Aiolos himself is hard to pin down; his sons are many and varied. His descendants are numerous beyond the scope of this chapter to consider in detail, but they include several key characters of well-known Greek myths, beginning with background references in Homeric epic and often employed *inter alia* in lyric poetry and tragedy. It is not excessive to speak of the use and abuse of the Aiolid stemma, which I will suggest was already evident in the earliest versions of the

---

458 Fowler, *EGM* 2:153–94 gives a brief overview of the Aiolid stemma; much of the discussion is then taken up with the difficulties of the many minor yet intriguing branches of the family.

459 Mele (2005) 19–20; cf. Rose (2008) 401–4; Hall (2002) 169–70 speculates on the invention of Aiolos.

460 Mele (2005) 15; Parker (2008) 434.

myths. I begin however not with Homer but with the *Catalogue*, which is the first full attempt at a kinship genealogy which we have.

The Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women* gives Aiolos twelve children, whose genealogies are followed over many generations.[461]

> Αἰολίδαι δ' ἐγένοντο θεμιστοπόλοι βασιλῆες
> Κρηθεὺς ἠδ' Ἀθάμας καὶ Σίσυφος αἰολομήτης
> Σαλμωνεύς τ' ἄδικος καὶ ὑπέρθυμος Περιήρης
> Δηϊών] τε μέγ[ας .....] τ᾽ ἀριδείκετος ἀνδρῶν
> ἐν δώμ]ασιν ἠβώοντες
> τ]έκοντό τε κύδιμα τέκνα
> αὖτις δ᾽ Αἰναρέτη τέκεν Αἰόλωι] εὐνή[θ]εῖσ[α
> ἠϋκόμους κούρας πολυήρ]ατον εἶδος ἐχούσας,
> Πεισιδίκην τε καὶ Ἀλκυόνη]ν Χ[αρ]ίτεσσιν ὁμοίας
> καὶ Καλύκην Κανάκην τε καὶ ε]ὐειδέ[α] Περιμήδην·
>
> [Hes.] fr. 10a.25–34

The immediate contrast with the nature and depiction of Doros and Xouthos' stemmata is striking. Having dispensed with the small families of Hellen's other sons, a total of maybe fifteen characters, in little more than 30 lines near the start of book one (fr. 10a.1–24 + fr. 233), the Aiolid section of poem seems to extend into the second book; book one comprised, it seems, over seven hundred lines.[462] The sons of Doros and Ion (though not clearly mentioned in the *Catalogue*) are representative of the tribal (φυλαί) systems of Dorian and Ionian *poleis*, while Aiolian states do not have tribes. The tradition of the descendants of Aiolos is thus even in its earliest attestation broad and complex; as we shall see, the later tradition enhances, rather than reduces, this complexity. Attempts to simplify the mythical tradition of the Deukalionids (such as Antonetti's 'vulgata' of the

---

[461] The children of Deianeira (fr. 25) and Klytaimestra (fr. 23), both descendants of Kalyke, represent the ninth generation after Aiolos.

[462] Position of fr. 233 ('threefold' Dorians?): West (1985) 59. Fr. 33a.10 seems to be marked line 700 in P. Oxy. 2481: West (1985) 72–3. Extent of the Aiolids into book 2: Casanova (1973) 18; West (1985) 42.

Catalogue and Apollodorus) often result in an artificial or idiosyncratically selective account.[463] The first source to give a complete account of the Aiolid stemma is the Apollodoran *Bibliotheke* (itself inconsistent with many earlier, if partial, accounts).[464] The *Catalogue of Women*, though apparently attempting to render a complete stemma, is un-reconstructed in parts, and cannot be taken itself as prestige tradition. As will become evident, a preferred tradition of the Aiolid stemma is even harder to identify. It is far from certain that a simple, original version from which a vulgate might derive ever existed; furthermore, it is unnecessary to narrow the variations; the Greeks could and often did entertain variations without being selective. The Aiolid stemma, however, is particularly prone to substantive variation, beginning with Aiolos himself.

The figure of Aiolos himself carries very little mythical background; in the *Catalogue*, he alone of Hellen's sons has an epithet (ἱππιοχάρμης, fr. 9.2), but it is a generic epic epithet; Brancaccio seems overly optimistic in taking this as a sign of a more developed character.[465] His treatment in the *Catalogue* is as brief as that of Doros and Xouthos. Indeed, although it has been suggested that his family was part of an independently developed mythical tradition,[466] Aiolos himself never appears as much

---

[463] Antonetti (2005) 59, see too Brancaccio (2005); Antonetti (2005); Larson (2007) for similar approaches to parts of the Aiolid stemma.

[464] Pseudo-Apollodorus specifically contradicts the Hesiodic tradition on Aiolos' son Perieres, acknowledging popular tradition that he was son of Kynortas, an Atlantid (1.9.5, 3.10.3).

[465] Brancaccio (2005) 50: a reflection of Aiolid associations with Poseidon Hippios, and (by reference to Mycenaean carriage-warfare) evidence of the antiquity of the Aiolid stemma.

[466] Càssola (1953) 287–94 suggests that the three consistently related figures Xouthos, Achaios and Ion were perhaps originally also linked to Aiolos as head of the stemma and Greek national hero (based on the filiation of Xouthos to Aiolos in Sicily, dating to Chalkidian settlement in the eight century), while Hellen and Doros are Hesiodic creations for the pan-Hellenic revision. Brancaccio and many others (2005, 32 and n. 65) suggest an almost entirely lost Aiolid epic cycle; perhaps the fragmentary *Melampodia* and *Minyas* too reflect part of this cycle?

more than a father figure to his children.[467] This role appears as early as Homeric epic, where he is briefly mentioned as father to Sisyphos (*Il.* 6.154, in the genealogy of Bellerophon and Glaukos) and to Kretheus (*Od.* 11.237; Salmoneus and Tyro are mentioned here without reference to their descent from Aiolos). Robert Fowler has argued that the Homeric poems here and elsewhere show nascent awareness of the Deukalionidai,[468] but reference to the eponymous figures (only Aiolos) should be distinguished from reference to the historical intra-Hellenic ethnic groups. Only an intertextual reading allows Homeric Aiolos to be associated with the Aiolian peoples.

A further complication of the Homeric situation is the presence of a homonymous character in the *Odyssey*, the master of the winds referred to as Αἴολος Ἱπποτάδης (*Od.* 10.2). Although the two characters are not definitively distinguished in the text of the *Odyssey* (except by the implications of the patronymic 'Hippotades'), exegetical tendency since antiquity has quite reasonably asserted that the two characters are distinct (see scholia ad loc.). Although impractical, it is possible to read the figures of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* as one character. The only reason we might do so, however, is the existence of a trend of conflation in parallel to the on-going trend of disambiguation.

By the later fifth century, Euripides' *Aiolos* demonstrates that the son of Hellen and the master of the winds were subject to conflation.[469] Any attempt to suggest that Euripides' Aiolos leans more closely to the son of Hippotes than to the son of Aiolos or

---

[467] Xouthos is in fact a more substantial figure, Càssola (1953) 17–20, 31–2: he is independently associated with wars in Euboia (Eur. *Ion*) and as *oikistes* of the Marathonian tetrapolis (Strabo 8.7.1, Conon, *Narr.* = *FGrH* 26 F 1.27). Jacoby (ad loc.) suggests that the unnamed third son of Hellen in Conon could in fact be Hecataeus' Marathonios; *contra*, Brown (2002) 199. He even received cult in the tetrapolis (*IG* i^3 255.A13, see Lambert (2000) 71–75). Aigimios seems to have been the subject of an eponymous epic (on his campaigns with Herakles?), which Athenaios attributes (11.503d) to Hesiod (= fr. 301) or Kerkops, both Aiolians(!).

[468] Fowler (1999): Ionians, *Il.* 13.685–9; Dorians, *Od.* 19.177, *Il.* 2.655(?).

[469] Eur. frr. 13–41 Kannicht.

vice versa can not be satisfactorily substantiated: the fragmentary hypothesis (test. ii) makes explicit reference to six sons and six daughters (cf. *Od.* 10.5–7), but reference is made to Salmoneus, and perhaps Tyro and Kretheus.[470] The deuteragonist, Aiolos' son Makareus, is perhaps an innovation; the sister he raped, however, was the established Aiolid Kanake.[471] There is some indication that the merger was Euripides' innovation, for Aiolos' prologue seems to have explicitly woven together details of Aiolos Hippotades and the Hellenic Aiolos.[472] However, the play lacks any particular indication of ethnic significance apart from the introduction of Makareus as son of Aiolos, discussed below.

Two further Euripidean plays feature yet another take on the Aiolos myth;[473] both *Melanippe the Wise* and *Melanippe Bound* feature a new Aiolid, Melanippe, as the mother by Poseidon of twin sons Aiolos and Boiotos.[474] Although the plot of the *Wise* focuses on the survival of the illegitimate infant boys, the play seems to be bound up too in ethnic material: fr. 481 (presumably from the prologue) has Melanippe rehearse the descent of Aiolos and the marriage of Xouthos and Kreousa (Doros could have appeared

---

[470] Fr. 14 = Strabo 8.3.32, cf. [Hes.] fr. 10a etc.; Gantz (1993) 169 places this in the prologue of the play.

[471] Restored, with some confidence, at fr. 10a.34. Kanake is not named in any surviving fragment or hypothesis, but in some retellings and references (Stob. 4.20.72, Ov. *Trist.* 2.384); she is labeled on a late fifth-century Lucanian *hydria* (*LIMC* s.v. Aiolos, 1).

[472] The play seems to have been notorious in antiquity for its incestuous plotline: Plat. *Legg.* 8.838a, Ar. *Nub.* 1370–3, *Ran.* 849–50, 1078–81; there may be some implicit critique of Euripides' treatment of the myth as well as his ethical contraventions. Archinus (*FGrH* 604 F 1), undateable ('zeitlich unbestimmbar', Jacoby *ad loc.*) author of a *Thessalika*, called the marriage of brothers and sisters in the *Odyssey* an ἀρχαῖον ἔθος (of the Thessalians?), which Aiolos initiated, betraying a conflation of Aiolos Hippotades and the Thessalian Aiolos (i.e. son of Hellen).

[473] Μελανίππη ἡ σοφή: Eur. frr. 480–87 Kannicht; Μελανίππη Δεσμῶτις: frr. 489–495.

[474] The sons are not named in any surviving fragment of the *Wise*; Melanippe hides her newborn sons in Aiolos' cowpen (test. i), which suggests a pun or etymology of Boiotos' name (cf. *Bound* fr. 489). A scathing remark in Aristophanes (*Thesm.* 546f.) suggests that Melanippe's behaviour was as scandalous as Phaidra's: the Thesmophoriazusai's complaints focus on Euripides' treatment of adulterous women.

in a lacuna after line 8); Hellen and Kretheus may have appeared as characters too.[475] In the *Bound*, Melanippe's plight sees her exiled to Metaponton and her children adopted;[476] Aiolos (II) and Boiotos are now threatened by their stepmother's younger sons or brothers, not their grandfather. This version of the story was popular, and may date back to the epic genealogist Asios of Samos,[477] although both Diodoros (4.67.3–6) and Strabo (6.1.15) change the details.[478] Diodoros notably weaves in Arne as Boiotos and Aiolos' mother, though Melanippe is mother to an Aiolos.[479] Diodoros' version suggests that the end of the play underlined the eponymy of these two characters, with Aiolos going to the Aiolian islands and Boiotos to his grandfather's home in Thessaly. Stephanos of Byzantion reports that Boiotos at least was attested in 'Hesiod' (fr. 219), as a father of Onchestos (another territorial eponym, cf. *Il.* 2.506); this is presumably from the *Catalogue* too, but it is not clear how Boiotos should fit within the genealogies.[480] The

---

475 Aiolos consults with Hellen in the hypothesis (test. i), but this need not have happened on stage (*pace* Kannicht's *dramatis personae*). Kretheus and Hellen are included on a Apulian red-figure volute krater which seems to illustrate the play (*LIMC Supp.* sv. Melanippe I, 1), along with other *dramatis personae*.

476 The Italian locale seems to gesture towards the Aiolian islands, but is perhaps a variant of an earlier tradition which associated Melanippe with Thessalian Dion and its hero cult to Metabos (cf. Strabo 6.1.5, quoting Asios fr. 2: see n. 477): Larson (2007) 21, following Huxley (1969) 93. Metabos was perhaps a son of Sisyphos (Steph. Byz. s.v. Μεταπόντιον); see Brancaccio (2005) 43 n. 147, on other links between Metapontum and Aiolid traditions.

477 Fr. 2 West: καὶ Ἄσιον τὸν ποιητὴν φήσαντα ὅτι τὸν Βοιωτὸν Δίου ἐνὶ μεγάροις τέκεν εὐειδὴς Μελανίππη'. Larson (2007) 20–21.

478 Strabo omits the youngest Aiolos, and mentions varying accounts regarding the Metapontian king involved (citing Asios, see n. 476).

479 i.e. Hellen – Aiolos – Mimas – Hippotes (m. Melanippe) – Aiolos – Arne – Boiotos and Aiolos (though 5.7.6 mentions Hippotad Aiolos as king of the Aiolian islands, while at 19.53 Boiotos is son of Melanippe). Cf. Hellanicus *FGrH* 4 F 51: Boiotos, son of Poseidon and Arne. Diodoros' version with three Aioloi may date to Asklepiades of Tragilos in the fourth century: *FGrH* 12 F 26; Brancaccio (2005) 48–49.

480 In Euripides, Melanippe is explicitly not the daughter of the *Catalogue*'s Ainarete, but a Hippe or Hippo whom Aiolos raped (fr. 481): her absence from the *Catalogue* is therefore not absolutely certain. Her relationship with Poseidon makes her a likely subject of the *Catalogue*: see Larson (2007) 18–20

Catalogue seems to categorize Boiotos as a different kind of Aiolid, if that, unlike the seven sons he had by Ainarete. He at least is an eponym, and the father of many further eponyms.[481]

The same ethnic charge is to be found in the *Ion*'s reorientation of Ion, Doros and Achaios as children of Xouthos and Kreousa.[482] Aiolos, however, is depicted as son of Zeus (perhaps in place of Hellen, who goes unmentioned) and father of Xouthos; Xouthos and Kreousa's parentage of Doros and Achaios apparently makes *all* of the traditional descendants of Hellen Aiolids.[483] Despite his new parentage, Xouthos is introduced as an Achaian, perhaps the last thing we would expect.[484] Ida Brancaccio has suggested that this demonstrates that Aiolos is a figure of even greater antiquity than Hellen; we might expect then rather more evidence of Aiolos outside or at the head of the Hellenic stemma.[485]

There are then (as the Homeric scholia assert) two or three Aioloi, sons of Hellen, Hippotes and Poseidon, but the characters do not lead separate lives. In particular, both the son of Hellen and the son of Poseidon are eponyms for the Aiolian people; all three

---

on Poseidon's fatherhood of Boiotos in early sources. Larson's view that Boiotos' mother is always an Aiolid relies on the evidence of Diodoros (4.67) that Arne is a daughter of Aiolos. Diodoros himself is not consistent on the mother of Boiotos! Brancaccio (2005) 44–46 notes a certain tendency towards equine names and associations in the Aiolid, often alongside Poseidon; she suggests (49) that Hippotes is a hypostasis of Poseidon Hippios.

481 See Larson (2007) chapter 1 on the importance of Boiotos as a local hero in Boiotia, although there is not much local evidence to support this.

482 A Xouthos, founder of Leontinoi, is listed amongst the sons of Aiolos, king of the winds (Diod. Sic. 5.1–2); Càssola (1953) 287–89 takes the two Xouthoi to be the same, based on the region's associations with Euboia, and suggests that Chalkis had a local tradition of Xouthos as son of Aiolos. Though the evidence is later the tradition may be old enough to have influenced Euripides, but equally so Euripides' play may have fed back into this tradition, not necessarily with any further conflation of the two Aioloi. Leontinoi was historically Ionian.

483 Except perhaps Ion, who might still be considered a Xouthid by name, if not descent (cf. 'Amphitryoniades' for Herakles).

484 West (1985) 58 n. 60 suggests the meaning is 'from Achaia Phthiotis'.

485 Brancaccio (2005) 30; she offers only Diod. Sic. 5.1–2 as further evidence.

can be eponyms for the Aiolian islands. Homonymous eponyms create complications to the mythological tradition, and were subject to both confusion and attempts at rationalization. A few causations are obvious: Aiolos becomes a brother of Boiotos in recognition of the tradition of migration which traced Asiatic Aiolians to Boiotia. The reduplication of Aiolos in Diodoros attempts to align the account of Euripides' *Melanippe* plays with the tradition of Arne as the Boiotian metropolis (now literally mother); it is curious that Diodoros draws in Hippotes as well, who is nowhere else part of the Aiolid stemma. All of these rationalizations are indicative, however, of the lack of substance to the traditions around Aiolos which drives all of the variations. The evidence is entirely literary and external, but a dissatisfaction with Aiolos as the eponym of the Aiolians seems evident. Doros, Xouthos, Achaios and Ion are much less subject to such innovation, perhaps maintained by genuine local tradition.[486]

Different too are Aiolos' children: not only are they many more than assigned to other branches of the Hellenic genealogy,[487] but they are of a different character: notably, their associations spread them across most of mainland Greece, not in strict association with areas which were historical occupied by Aiolians, while their descendants move even further abroad.[488] Most importantly, none of the names given in the *Catalogue* are

---

[486] See n. 467 on the substance of Xouthos; Dorians and Herakleidai occupy Tyrtaios fr. 2, see Hall (2002) 75.

[487] Mele (2005) 16, has a useful (if incomplete) set of references to each of Aiolos' sons in major sources.

[488] Aiolos' five daughters (themselves an oddity in comparison with the few female figures of the Deukalionid stemma) seem to associate to a roughly contiguous band of territory from Acarnania (Perimede) to Peneios and Ossa (Kanake): Brancacchio (2005) 28. The associations of the sons with central Greece through to the Peloponnese (Brancaccio *loc. cit.*) are more haphazard.

eponyms of Aiolian territory or of cultural aspects of Aiolian states, although confident reconstruction of all seven son's names has been elusive.[489]

The lacuna in the papyrus of fr. 10a.28 clearly obscures the identity of Aiolos' seventh (youngest?) son:[490] ironically, only the epithet ἀριδείκετος survives. Despite a number of candidates for Aiolos' seventh son, there is no satisfactory name. Supplementing the line requires a nominative form of eight or nine letters to fill the third and forth feet of the hexameter, i.e. two metrically long syllables or three syllables (⏑⏑–). The Apollodoran *Bibliotheke*, frequently used elsewhere to supplement the *Catalogue*, lists Magnes (1.7.3); this however conflicts with [Hes.] fr. 7, where Magnes is a son of Thyia (Hellen's sister).[491] The name is in any case too short for the lacuna. Alternatives, unfortunately, abound: Makedon, Mimas, Makareus, Lokros and Minyas have all been proposed.

Hellanicus (*FGrH* 4 F 47) makes Makedon a son of Aiolos, conflicting with the same Hesiodic fragment, although Makedon does at least fit the space.[492] By the time of Hellanicus, in the late fifth century, Argead claims to Hellenism had already been well established and to some extent well accepted, but these involved their descent from

---

489 Part of the problem is a tendency towards partial citation of the Aiolid stemma (such as the scholion at Pind, *Pyth.* 4.253 = [Hes.] fr. 10a.25–27), which cites only the first three lines, omitting Deion and the now lacunose seventh son. This is perhaps symptomatic of ancient problematization of Aiolos' tradition.

490 A lacuna at the start of the same line is much more confidently supplemented by Δηίων: West (1983) 28–29; Brancaccio (2005) 39. The difficulty of supplementing the second lacuna in comparison highlights the peculiarities of the Aiolid stemma.

491 West (1985) 54 observes that there is no clear reason for a doublet, *contra* Brillante (1981) 109 n. 69; Patterson (2010) 115 suggests that Homer may have known Magnes to be Aiolid, cf. *Il.* 2.756–8 and the association of Aiolids with Peneus and Pelion (Strabo 8.7.1, 9.5.21; Hdt. 7.176.4).

492 Fr. 7 gives Μακηδών; fr. 10a would require *metri causa* the far more usual form Μακεδών (as Hellanicus gives it). The difference is negligible, as the lengthened form is used almost only in dactylic.

Herakles through Temenos.[493] Hellanicus' revision seems to be concerned with rehabilitating the ethnicity of the Argeads' subjects;[494] it seems likely, however, that this was an innovation and not something drawn from the *Catalogue*; it is not picked up by any other source.

Diodoros' Mimas, Aiolos' successor in Thessaly (4.67.3), and therefore *perhaps* eldest son, is otherwise unknown as a son of Aiolos. His name is probably unmetrical and too short for the size of the lacuna. The possible derivation of his name (from μίμνω?) alongside the explicit statement that he inherited while the rest of his brothers migrated away from Thessaly suggests a new coinage to maintain the coherence of an Aiolid myth which was deeply rooted in Thessaly. (Mimas does reappear at Diod. Sic. 6.7.4, where he ejects Pelias from Thessaly; Pelias in other accounts is the one to eject Neleus, cf. Apollod. 1.9.9.)

Brancaccio has favoured the restoration of Minyas.[495] The character is known to have appeared in the *Catalogue* (fr. 70): his association with the territory of Boeotia (notably a son Orchomenos) makes him an attractive candidate.[496] As West has pointed out, however, in fragment 70.28–35 his great-grandsons Kopreus and Eteoklos marry daughters of Leukon, who are great-granddaughters of Aiolos:[497] the suggestion that they are of the same generation makes the filiation problematic, though generational cohesion

---

493 Hdt. 8.137, Thuc. 2.90, Isoc. 5.32–4; *contra*, famously, Dem. 9.31; see Hall (2001). The exact grounds on which the Hellanodikai accepted Alexander I's claimed Argive descent (Hdt. 5.22) are not absolutely definite; curiously for any discussion of heritable genealogy, they are always simply 'Argives': they do not elsewhere seem to have subscribed to a descent from Hellen.

494 Now ethnically distinct from the Herakleid Argeads: Hall (2001) 169.

495 Brancaccio (2005) 37–38.

496 See West (1985) 65–66 and now Larson (2007) 28 on Minyas' associations with Boiotian territory. To a certain extent his associations overlap with those of Athamas (see *infra*), although the characters themselves are not associated except by later intermarriage.

497 Minyas – Orchomenos – ? – Kopreus *m.* Leukonid; Aiolos – Athamas – Leukon – Peisidike and Euippe.

or alignment in the *Catalogue* is seldom straightforward. More importantly, none of the six suggested fathers of Minyas is Aiolos;[498] he may yet be a descendant of Aiolos (cf. Ap. Rh. 3.1094, Αἰολίδην Μινύαν), depending on the unclear identity of some of the proposed fathers. The supplement is too awkward, both in terms of the evidence for Minyas in the *Catalogue* and (as Brancaccio admits) the shape of his name, to be satisfactory.

West himself has tentatively favoured the supplement Lokros, though the name is shorter than the lacuna.[499] Such a parentage is not elsewhere attested, although the position of any eponymous Lokros is highly variable (as we might expect for such a diasporic group) in the general tradition. In Hecataeus (F 16), there is perhaps a Lokros, son of Physkos in the Aitolian branch of the Deukalionidai (eponym for the Ozolian Lokri? Cf. Paus. 10.38), although Hecataeus' presentation of the Aitolians (Orestheidai) is definitively different from the Hesiodic descent from Thyia. The *Catalogue* does include a Lokros (fr. 234) as the leader of the Leleges, who later become Lokrians.

The final possibility, Makar or Makareus, is fairly attractive.[500] Aside from being appropriate to the papyrus, he is the earliest attested son of Aiolos not named in the *Catalogue*, for the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* refers to Λέσβος τ' ἠγαθέη Μάκαρος ἕδος Αἰολίωνος (3.37),[501] and he is a speaking character in Euripides' *Aiolos*, where he impregnates his sister Kanake (always a Deukalionid Aiolid).[502] Euripides' *Aiolos* seems

---

498 Poseidon (Σ *Od.* 11.326; Tzetzes *in Lycophronem* 875), Orchomenos (Σ Ap. Rh. 1.230; Pherecydes, F 171), Chryses (Paus. 9.36.4), Ares (Dionysius, *FGrH* 15 F 14), Aleus (Aristodemus of Thebes, *FGrH* 383 F 16), Eteokles (Σ Pind. *Isth.* 1.79).

499 West (1983) 29.

500 This discussion assumes that Makareus is interchangeable with Makar. There is no good evidence to suggest that they were distinct personages.

501 Janko (1982) 112–15, 200 dates the first ('Delian') section of the hymn to the early seventh century; a date in the early to mid-sixth century might be more likely: Richardson (2010) 13–15.

502 *Supra*, n. 471. Mele's assertion (2005), 23 that *Hom. Hymn Ap.* 37 must refer to the son of Hippotad Aiolos neglects the clear conflation of Hippotad and Deukalionid Aioloi in Euripides.

to refer to him as νεώτατος, perhaps in line with the *Catalogue*'s lacunose last position in the list.[503] The association of Makar with Lesbos appears as early as the *Iliad* (24.544). The possibility that the *Catalogue* makes a Lesbian hero a son of Aiolos begins to rehabilitate the Aiolian associations of the Aiolid stemma in the *Catalogue*.[504] The *Catalogue* often seems to avoid the subject of post-Troy migration; although the presence of the nymph Kyrene is an unquestionable exception, it is far from certain that Makareus should likewise be allowed so high on the Deukalionid stemma. Most importantly, fr. 184 has a Makareus descended from the Aiolid Alkyone,[505] and Euripides' *Aiolos* seems to strip any Lesbian (or, indeed, favourable) associations.

Ultimately, the vagaries of a tradition which can provide no clear candidate for a grandson of Hellen are startling. None of the many other mythical characters also identified as sons of Aiolos are philologically or papyrologically suitable. The breadth of variant traditions speaks to the use of Aiolos as eponym of a flexible group of Greeks: almost all of the candidates are firmly associated, by eponym or mythical tradition, with Greek population groups, though only Mimas, Minyas and Makar are associated with groups or territories otherwise considered Aiolian. Magnes, perhaps the earliest candidate, has the strongest post-Hesiodic afterlife as a son of Aiolos.

The later stages of the Aiolid tradition add new sons who seem, being eponyms or founding figures, to develop a more rationalized tradition, attempting to make Aiolos

---

503 Impossible to say whether this is the intent of the *Catalogue*'s ordering, it is quite possible that later Greek did interpret the lists so. Specific references to age often contradict the unremarked order of other sources (e.g. Conon, *Narr.* = *FGrH* 26 F 1.27 suggests Aiolos is oldest, but he is third in *Cat.* fr. 9), sometimes bizarrely ([Apoll.] *Bibl.* 1.7, Protogeneia third-born!?).

504 Lesbian traditions on Makareus: Coppola (2005) 78–86. For Makar's other associations, in Arkadia (Alkaios fr. 306; Paus. 8.27.4, 10.38.4; Steph. Byz. s.v. Μακαρέαι) and Lokris (Paus. 8.3.3), see Mele (2005) 23.

505 West (1985) 98 notes that this is not the usual genealogy of Makareus: see now Coppola (2005) 75–78.

sit more comfortably as an eponym of the historical Aiolian groups. Although this clearly begins with Euripides' treatment of the eponymous Aiolos and Boiotos in the *Melanippe* plays, there is no tradition which specifies Aiolos, son of Hellen, as the direct eponym of the Αἰολεῖς. The unsystematic mass of the Aiolids is in stark contrast with the descendants of Doros and Xouthos (particularly Ion's sons), who are not only foundational heroes but eponyms for tribal structures clearly attested in the historical period.

The breadth of Aiolos' immediate descendants covers all mainland Greece. Apollodorus specifically associates each son with a territory (1.9): Athamas, Boiotia and 'Athaman(t)ia' (a plain in Pindos near Thessaly, Strab. 7.7.8, but also one near Thebes in Boiotia); Sisyphos, Corinth;[506] Deion, Phokis; Perieres, Messene; Salmoneus, Thessaly and Elis; Kretheus, Iolkos;[507] Apollodorus does not make explicit the link of Magnes to Magnesia, though his sons are noted as colonists of Seriphos. Most of Greece is immediately encompassed (though not the central Peloponnese, Megara, and Attika): generations thereafter spread even further.

The Aiolidai themselves are unlikely loci for ethnic identification. Martin West has pointed out the particular feature of Aiolian genealogy, that the Aiolidai are endowed with unusual powers. Kretheus and Melampous; Glaukos and his shapeshifting wife Mestra, Salmoneus' powers over thunder and lightning; Admetos' ability to avoid death and Aison's miraculous revival, in some versions, at the hands of Medeia. There are an unusually high number of endogamous marriages within the Aiolidai, too: Kretheus and Tyro, Bias and Pero, Admetos and Alkestis. Such marriages were not unknown in

---

[506] Much of the information regarding the Aiolian phase of Corinth has been attributed to Eumelos' *Korinthiaka*: Brancaccio (2005) 34; Morgan (1994) 137–38.

[507] Perhaps originally associated with the river Krathis and Aigai: West (1985) 140.

Classical Greece, but a less common feature of myth. Brancaccio offers the interpretation that these marriages represented an earlier closed stage of social organization, before exogamous marriage incorporated other groups. We should not suppose that the development from endogamous to exogamous marriage was a matter of fact, but served to further barbarize the Aiolidai.

Above all, these are very peculiar characteristics for figures with whom an ethnic group was supposed to identify: alongside the sheer number of figures involved in Aiolian myth, only some of whom were eponymous, it is apparent that the structuring of group relationships was far from the main concern. The eponymous characters which do appear are related not to peoples but places, and this has led to an emphasis in scholarship on the very broad associations of place which can be demonstrated from the Aiolid stemma. It is not uncommon to see a connection drawn between the very earliest evidence for Aiolids in Corinth and the western Peloponnese and Strabo's description of a largely Aiolian Greece. Perhaps more telling of Aiolian associations are the fifth-century retellings of this story by Euripides, which focus on a relationship between Aiolos and Boiotos. These are perhaps closely inspired by the moment of the Peloponnesian War, but the brother figures seem to have had a more lasting longevity than those figures who can and cannot be found in the *Catalogue of Women.* This question of evidence should lead us to reconsider the valorization of individual sources as evidence for ethnic identity.

It is widely assumed that the *Catalogue* is to some extent an imperfectly sewn version: internal inconsistencies make this clear. Indeed Hall's analysis of 'fracture points' in the Herakleid stemma relies on the assumption that the final revision did not successfully iron out all the wrinkles introduced by Argive attempts to dominate the

Argolic Plain through myth.[508] West, however, has argued for the use of writing as a resource for collecting the multifarious traditions assembled by the *Catalogue* poet.[509] In this view the living tradition occurred in its later stages in parallel with the concretizing function of written genealogy. Writing is one obvious way in which traditions which were relevant only to a specific locale or period might, without homeostatic revision, be adopted into a pan-Hellenic mythology. Even if writing was used, a rhapsodic tradition of genealogy need not have given way to the written form of the *Catalogue* much before the end of the Archaic Period.

We should not pretend that the *Catalogue* was the first or the last form of Hellenic genealogy: the existence of two apparently contemporaneous poems, the *Catalogue* and the less clearly attested *Megalai Ehoiai* (and many later versions, as we have seen), treating the same material suggests an independent tradition of topical heroic genealogy.[510] The relationship between the two poems remains somewhat vague,[511] but it is likely that they were orally composed at some stage in their development.[512] The resulting rhapsodic performances both wove together disparate traditions and embroidered them – but these performances must have been topical, [513] and the process

---

[508] As Jones (1998) notes, there is an incongruity between Hall's own theoretical cautions about flaws of instrumentalist/constructivist analysis of ethnic material and his analytical practice, e.g. (1997) 17–19.

[509] *Contra* (on Hesiod and Homer in general), Lamberton (1988) 15: 'we are not in a position to explain clearly the relationship between the composition of these poems and their recording in writing'.

[510] The overlap between the women of *Cat.* fr. 30 and 37 and *Od.* 11.225–332 has been taken as evidence that the author of the *Catalogue* had the *Odyssey* in front of him (or *vice versa*), but a common oral source is likely, and makes more sense of the very different treatments of the material: Ormand (2014) 43.

[511] See Hirschberger (2004) 26–29; Cingano (2005) 118–21; D'Alessio (2005) critiques Merkelbach and West's policy of assigning Hesiodic fragments to the *Catalogue* (rather than the *Megalai Ehoiai*) by assumption.

[512] The bibliography on oral poetry is now enormous; see Tsagalis (2009) on Hesiod and the Hesiodic corpus' place therein.

[513] The obvious comparandum is the highly controversial *Catalogue of Ships* from the *Iliad* (2.484ff.): see Kirk (1985) 168–69.

of elaboration centuries long.[514] Some indication of the ongoing importance of genealogical material is suggested by the writing of local histories with genealogies even in the Hellenistic period (to Polybios' apparent disapproval).[515]

There is a danger of special pleading in suggesting that parts of the poem which are not internally coherent represent much earlier or more specific situations than the time of the final redaction of the poem, but suggestions have been made. West, noting the close relation of the Magnesians and Macedonians to the Hellenic family though by a daughter of Deukalion (fr. 7), suggests that the core of the Deukalionid myth represents a Thessalian world-view.[516] Fowler, going further, has argued quite persuasively that the Deukalionid myth is Thessalian in origin (indeed, appropriated from a slightly earlier Phokian version of the flood hero).[517] It has thus been picked up that the Hellenic stemma might really represent an early Aiolian view in the first place.[518] In this view, the characters which are taken to represent the great intra-Hellenic ethnic groups are actually the representatives of much smaller populations: Doros of the metropolis in Doris, Ion of the Euboians (not all Dorians or Ionians). Xouthos, who *is* an entirely empty figure in the Hesiodic myth but is associated by both Euripides and Konon with Euboia, was perhaps a more substantive local hero. More importantly, the groupings implied by the kinship structure make some better sense in this geographical setting. From a Thessalian perspective, the Aiolians of Thessaly and the Dorians of Doris form a western group, while the physical proximity of Achaia Phthiotis and Euboia underlies the fraternity of

---

514 Catalogue poetry was even more 'sewn' than other Archaic epic, but see David (2006) 209–14, on the embroidering (or 'intemporizing') of catalogue material in hexameter poetry.

515 Polyb. 9.1: see Walbank (1972) 55–56; Thomas (1989) 155–95

516 West (1985) 139–41.

517 Fowler (1998) 9–12; (2013) 127–29.

518 Brancaccio (2005).

Achaios and Ion. This has more substance than Hall's suggestion that their affinity was independently developed through common association with a Peloponnesian homeland—the tradition often holds that Achaians from Phthiotis *displaced* the Ionians from their home in the northern Peloponnese.[519] However, the process of redaction which brought together disparate local, regional, and pan-Hellenic myths in the *Catalogue* occurred in a context largely unknown to us and even more obscure than the context of the Homeric poems.

The Hellenic genealogy is not a stable myth, nor is the *Catalogue of Women* the canonical expression of it. Direct testament of the poem before the Hellenistic period is hard to find.[520] The *Catalogue*'s greatest virtue for the many later authors and especially scholiasts who cited it was perhaps the comprehensivity and organization ('lemmatization') with which it approached the diffuse heroic tradition. (Which is not to say that the poem was in fact perfectly comprehensive.) These citations often ponder the identity of the characters referenced in a tale, not about the identity of the Greeks who composed such characters. Pausanias offers a good example of this (4.2.1): to answer a simple question about the children of Polykaon in Messene, Pausanias (who undoubtedly had the benefit of a well-stocked library) read the *Ehoiai,* the *Naupaktia*, Kinaithon, Asios and the *Megalai Ehoiai*. It may be no coincidence that his list starts with the *Ehoiai*, a useful first port of call for genealogical information.

A very few authors seem to repeat, more or less exactly, the *Catalogue*'s tradition of Hellen as the apical and primordial ancestor of a defined group of Greek eponyms,[521]

---

519 E.g. Hdt. 1.145 (cf. 7.94); Paus. 7.1.5, 7.6.1.

520 The scholiast to Pind. *Pyth.* 9.6 says (*post hoc ergo propter hoc*?) that Pindar took his account (ἱστορίαν) directly from the *Ehoiai*; it does indeed fit.

521 Strabo, Conon, Apollodorus: Hall (2002) 29. Neither Conon nor Apollodorus are wholly consistent with the *Catalogue*.

but the significance of the variations which Hellanicus, Herodotus and Thucydides present, which Hall deems 'not incompatible' with the Hesiodic text, should not be understated. Thucydides implies that Hellen's *floruit* fell between the Trojan War and the time of Homer, if the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* avoid the name Ἕλλῆνες by deliberate archaism. The chronological critique, which in Thucydides' own reading of the heroic age as Greeks 'before the name', defies both Hellen's primordinance and his claim to be anything more than an eponym. Moreover, he is quite vague about the sons of Hellen, in a way which suggests not an attempt to rationalize the myth but an implicit critique of the precisions of myth against the uncertainties of distant history.[522] Thucydides' reaction could perhaps be to Hecataeus,[523] for Herodotus barely mentions the Hellenic family. The sole members found in the *Histories* are in brief references: to Doros son of Hellen (1.56.3),[524] and to Ion (as a general and eponym of the Athenians, 8.44.2),[525] but on the whole he does not use kinship material; indeed, the discussion of Dorian and Ionian ethnicity (1.56–58) argues that the two groups are completely unrelated, the Athenians being autochthonous Pelasgians in origin and changing their language (with no reference to kinship, descent or γένος): ἅμα τῇ μεταβολῇ τῇ ἐς Ἕλληνας καὶ τὴν γλῶσσαν μετέμαθε (1.57.3).[526] Other authors go much further. Hellanicus adds a single new figure to the Hellenic family, Xenopatra (*FGrH* 4 F 125), to be the ancestor of other Greek groups.[527]

---

522 A scholiast quotes [Hes.] fr. 9 to enumerate the sons whom Thucydides leaves unnamed.

523 οἱ ἀπὸ Δευκαλίωνος τὸ γένος ἔχοντες ἐβασίλευον Θεσσαλίας, ὥς φησιν Ἑκαταῖος καὶ Ἡσίοδος (Σ ARh. 4.265 = Hes. fr. 6 = *FGrH* 1 F 14).

524 Herodotus delicately avoids implying anything: the Dorian race was called Dorian after moving to the Peloponnese, having lived in Histiaiotis in the time of Doros son of Hellen:

525 Velleius (1.4.3) says that the Ionians, *Ione duce*, colonized Ionia from Athens: a curious blending of Herodotus' colonial story and his reference to Ion, but perhaps still the earliest explicit association of Ion himself with the historical Ionians.

526 Munson (2014) 344–45. A (provocative) rationalization of Athenian autochthony: Thomas (2000) 120–22.

527 Hall (2002) 29.

This is not a contradiction of the Hesiodic tradition, but it does destabilize the *Catalogue*'s way of circumscribing Hellenicity. If the Hellenic stemma is concerned with delimiting the extent of Greekness, then any new addition to the stemma, such as Konon's Euboian sons of Xouthos, seeks to assert a different idea of Hellenicity; reorienting an established hero (as Alexander of Makedon is supposed to have done)[528] is not the only way of achieving this. Variations of the basic relationship between Doros, Aiolos, Ion and Achaios likewise achieve very different structures of ethnic grouping in Classical Greece: Hecataeus makes an Ion and a Lokros sons of Physkos, son of Aitolos (*FGrH* 1 F 16 with Jacoby's commentary), while Phoroneus' position as first man (i.e. the Deukalion/Noah figure) in Acusilaus (*FGrH* 2 F 23a) suggests that the independent Argive genealogy was not thoroughly extinguished when it was subsumed to the Aiolid stemma in the *Catalogue of Women* (fr. 10b).

To conclude, certain stages of development of the Aiolid stemma seem evident. In the earliest period, recorded in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, Aiolos was simply the father of several heroic children; the *Odyssey* characterizes these children as bad *exempla*. The next stage, preserved in the *Catalogue of Women*, records a much larger family, now endowed with an ethnic significance which is not wholly compatible with the other branches of the Deukalionid stemma. The sons of Aiolos (such as can be reconstructed for fr. 10a) do spread across much of the southern Balkan peninsula, perhaps in a cultural memory of expanding consciousness; they do not strictly map onto later Αἰολεῖς or Aiolian *habitus*. From the early fifth century onwards some attempts are made to use Aiolos and his sons rationally as eponyms, resulting in reconfigurations of the stemma and conflations of

[528] Hdt. 5.22, on descent from Temenos, see Hall (2001) esp. 168-170; (2002a) 154–56.

Aiolos with homonymous characters. In the Hellenistic period this rationalizing tendency brings both rejection of eponymy as a whole, and adoptions of the Aiolid stemma by groups which were marginally or recently Hellenised. Such adoptions seem entirely within the best tradition of the Aiolid stemma, which was always open to reinterpretation and in many ways a catch-all for Hellenes who did not fit within the Dorian or Ionian groups. Such a variable tradition demonstrates the enormous flexibility of genealogical systems and the degree to which the *Catalogue of Women* was not the dominant expression of ethnic kinship myths; indeed it is only in the Hellenistic Period, where there is already a noticeable shift not only in kinship diplomacy but in the reception of the *Catalogue*, that the full Aiolid stemma is clearly deployed as an ethnic myth. We must then press on to more robust evidence for the ways in which the Classical Aiolians might have explored their identity. In the three following chapters I suggest that the active day-to-day practices of the Aiolian peoples, seen through the lens of performance, was a more important *locus* of identity. I begin with music.

6. Aiolian Music

I begin my discussion of ethnicization in Greek music with a Pindaric obscurity. The first Olympian ode, for the tyrant Hieron of Syracuse, is not abstruse by Pindar's standards; thus Hellenistic scholars placed this ode at the start of their editions for its clear (if idiosyncratic) description of the games' mythical origins, as well as its elegance. Other elements also appeared to be programmatic: the poem begins and ends by considering the contribution which the epinician poet could make to the glory of the games and the honorand. In the closing lines, Pindar sets out in rapid progression his closing theme, enduring happiness and fickle glory, and the particular kind of song which he feels suits the occasion, attaching an ethnic term to what seems to be the terminology of a professional musician:

> ὁ νικῶν δὲ λοιπὸν ἀμφὶ βίοτον
> ἔχει μελιτόεσσαν εὐδίαν
> ἀέθλων γ᾽ ἕνεκεν. τὸ δ᾽ αἰεὶ παράμερον ἐσλὸν
> ὕπατον ἔρχεται παντὶ βροτῶν. ἐμὲ δὲ στεφανῶσαι
> κεῖνον ἱππίῳ νόμῳ
> Αἰοληΐδι μολπᾷ
> χρή· πέποιθα δὲ ξένον
> μή τιν᾽, ἀμφότερα καλῶν τε ἴδριν ἀμᾷ καὶ δύναμιν
> κυριώτερον,
> τῶν γε νῦν κλυταῖσι δαιδαλωσέμεν ὕμνων πτυχαῖς.
>
> *Ol.* 1.97–105

I shall return to the favoured metaphor in which Pindar juxtaposes his song with the victor's crown. What concerns us here are the two musical phrases. The first of these phrases is a technical term, the *hippios nomos* or 'horse-melody', later referred to one of the apparently canonical melodies; this was likely not what Pindar referred to. But what did Pindar mean, and what did the recipient and audience in Syracuse understand, when he called the ode an 'Aiolian song' (μολπή)? The oblique reference offers few clues.

Hieron was not Aiolian, nor were the Olympic Games. If it referred to the author, this might be the first explicit expression of Aiolian identity in Boiotia since Hesiod's references to his father. Following the technical description of the *nomos*, however, it is likely that the ethnic did not refer to the people or places involved. Ethnic names were used to distinguish between species of musical features, including the *nomos* or 'melody', the metre, the tuning of instruments or 'mode', and indeed the language – we must remember for the latter that dialect was associated with poetic genre, but poets sometimes incorporated a 'flavour' of other dialects. Scholars have accordingly considered the possible Aiolian-ness of each aspect of the first Olympian, without any clear conclusion. The term μολπά, describing the combination of song and dance, encompasses the verbal, melodic and rhythmic, and so does not obviously direct the reader towards any particular feature.[529] In the absence of a direct prompt to focus on any one feature, we could assume that the cultural context of Greek music gave the audience their direction; this may well have come from the melody and musical accompaniment which Pindar composed but which antiquity has not transmitted to us. Alternatively, audience members might have made up their own minds individually, or even appreciated the obscurity. It is worth considering nevertheless which features were likely to be appreciated by an audience in the 470s BCE, and why writers like Pindar used ethnic terms to classify musical features.

In this chapter I approach the ethnic descriptors in Greek musical theory, above all of the modes, within the theoretical framework of performativity – that is to say, approaching ethnicity not only as a discursive social construction focused on *being* a certain ethnicity, but also the manner in which one *does* that ethnicity. In what follows I

[529] For the definition of μολπά, see Bielohlawek (1924). Anderson (1994) 97 says μολπή in *Ol.* 1 'here (as often) refers to song alone'; he appears to mean that this has no relevance to harmony.

will discuss how a performative approach can better handle the relevance of ethnicity to cultural activities such as music. After setting out the evidence for the modes and their ethical and ethnic associations, I will explore the levels of discourse in which the modes are socially burdened, and in attempting to offer an answer to my initial question on the meaning of 'Aiolian song' in Pindar I will survey the ways in which the Aiolian mode in particular was employed and discussed. It will become clear that music was a frequent touchstone for cultural identity in the Aiolic regions of Greece. Overall, I suggest that the ethnomusicological discourse identified in this discussion points to a genuine understanding of music as an ethnic marker in sixth- and fifth-century Greece.

'Ethnomusicology' must not be taken too seriously here. This chapter is, first of all, about musical theory *in* ancient Greece – the field practices of modern ethnomusicology face substantial difficulties in any ancient application, and the rather exiguous remains of genuine music from the ancient world render traditional socio- and ethno-musicological analysis, based on reconstruction and performance, difficult.[530] In any case I am mostly concerned with historical analysis of the ancient discourse *as* discourse. I do not present this discourse, either, as a claim for a real intellectual field in ancient Greece which took an ethnographic approach to music, but as a unifying theme for exploring the cultural 'baggage' of music (which in the cases here considered is generally the only surviving evidence *for* the music) across a variety of philosophical, critical and poetic discourses. I therefore begin by discussing how to approach apparent links between cultural phenomena such as music and identity.

---

[530] Reconstructive work flourishes, however, on the technical, musical side, e.g. Hagel (2009), a 'technical history' of ancient practice, although the modal system is not a central part of that reconstruction, and D'Angour's ongoing work. Performance context and the cultural connotations are however key to our understanding. On ethnomusicological method, see e.g. Nettl (1983), esp. ch. 11. For the state of ancient evidence, see Barker (1984) 1–2; West (1992) 4–8.

6.1 Music & Greek identity

Song was undoubtedly an essential part of Greek life: the wealth of occasional poetry, almost all of it melodic and moreover accompanied by a string or wind instrument, suggests how often music was heard. There was also a broad scope of less formal song, which may not have taken accompaniment, and purely instrumental music: for example, the description of Greek life in the 'Shield of Achilleus' contains all three.[531] Setting out the position of music within the Black Atlantic, Paul Gilroy stated: 'The preeminence of music within the diverse black communities of the Atlantic diaspora is itself an important element in their essential connectedness.'[532] One can adapt this comment persuasively for Greek communities: the preeminence of music within the diverse Greek communities of the Mediterranean diaspora is itself an important element in their essential connectedness. The Greeks themselves very rarely made explicit the musical unity of Greece, though implicit contrasts of Greek music with supposedly non-Greek music abounded,[533] and it is clear from the many different types of musical discourse which survive that connectedness was only one aspect of the cultural valuation of music in ancient Greece.

Our evidence for ancient Greek music falls into several categories.[534] In order of proximity to actual music: practical evocations of musical composition and performance, including many in the works of poets themselves; philosophical and critical investigations of music's place in Greek society and culture, like Aristophanes; a set of

---

531 *Il.* 18.478–608.
532 Gilroy (1993) 102.
533 See e.g. Aesch. *Pers.* 1038-77; Eur. *Hel.* 164-90, *Bacch.* 55-63, 120-34, *IA* 573-8.
534 For the following categories, see Barker (1984) 1–2.

legends (some true myths) *about* music and musicians;[535] and technical or theoretical analysis of musical production, i.e. acoustic and harmonic theory. The philosophical sources convey evidence which has been essential for understanding how sound was produced by ancient instruments, including clear reconstructions of the modes, but it is not evident that they were in fact interested in, or accurately reflected, musical practice. Much of this surviving evidence generally seems to favour song, i.e. music with a voice component (accompanied or not: ᾠδή, κιθαρῳδία, αὐλῳδία): there are however numerous references to 'instrumental' music. It is entirely possible that this was *as* prevalent, but less well-attested in ancient scholarship, or understood in modern scholarship, because it was not attached to a textual medium which could preserve it. Musical notation arises by the mid-third century,[536] and so actual music is not reliably available for Classical compositions. For contemporary evidence from musical practitioners we must rely on what those practitioners said about their own practice and others'. This is therefore necessarily a textual analysis of Greek music, but I nevertheless focus on the textual evidence for non-textual features.

I am concerned above all with the philosophical and critical investigations. Ancient critics were often composers themselves, and frequently engaging in polemic over current practices;[537] the terms of the critique, however, overlap with the philosophers, particularly in the controversy over the so-called 'New Music' of late fifth-century Greece. Both critics and philosophers focus above all on the effect of music on the audience. The ethical philosophers often have little interest in the musician himself,

---

535 Barker (1984) takes 'deliberate attempts at analysis and historical reconstruction made by scholars and compilers of later antiquity' (1) as part of the first, practical, category I have described.

536 On musical documentation, see Pöhlmann and West (2001).

537 See Barker (1984) 99.

whereas the critics' attention suggests (harshly) that the morals of music, good or bad, reflect the general upstandingness (or not) of the composer. The New Music controversy coincided with, or perhaps even produced, the rise of musical theory in general– so many of our sources are in fact polemical and cannot be assumed to be neutrally descriptive.

The prominence of music in Greek life made it an obvious indicator of identity, though modern scholarship on the social aspects of music has focused overwhelming on the verbal aspects of musical life, and the communal nature of both performance and audience. In what follows I seek to focus on the non-verbal aspects of music as an indicator of identity, as they can be reconstructed from the words of composers themselves and the assessments of Classical philosophers who made up part of the audience. Although Pindar's broad reference to Aiolian song might suggest that an overall musical style was associated with each Greek ethnic group, more detailed ancient assessments suggests that particular features of music bore these associations. Of the various musical aspects which might lie behind Pindar's reference, the Greek musical 'modes' (ἁρμονίαι) were those most frequently associated with ethnic terminology. Before considering how ethnicity and music were entwined, it will be necessary to consider the nature of these modes.

6.2 Modes

It is somewhat beyond the scope of this discussion to consider the practicalities of the Aiolian and other Greek modes. Almost all of the Greek modes in sixth- and fifth-century music were given ethnic names;[538] they were the subject of technical, critical and philosophical discussion, though their nature in practice is somewhat elusive in spite of

[538] For a collection of pre-Hellenistic references to modes, see West (1992) 179–84.

this theoretical attention. In essence it seems that the modes related to the tuning of instruments (including the voice) and the resultant tonal structure of the melody. It is important to consider the nature of this musical structure in order to consider its social value: could the average consumer of Greek poetry and music have distinguished one mode from another enough to allow ethnic associations beyond the terminology to accrue to the modes, and why were these musical structures given ethnic names in the first place?

The definition of the ἁρμονίαι does not map well onto modern musical theory, nor indeed the similar tonal structure which was developed in the fourth century to replace the modes.[539] The term refers to the 'fitting together' (ἁρμόττω) of the individual notes into a scale for a song:[540] as Andrew Barker has observed, ancient criticism was exacting about the proper intervals between each note within the scale. For the kithara, the most prestigious Greek instrument, this was not only a technical structure; the strings had to be adjusted to the correct tension to tune the instrument.[541] Given that the strings were secured by hide wrappings and probably not held in tune between performances, we should assume that tuning was one of the basic skills of any kitharist.[542] Any kitharist therefore needed a good awareness of the interval structures of each mode. An aulete however originally had a permanently, if somewhat variably, tuned instrument.[543] All notes were possible on the voice, which of course was the primary instrument throughout the Archaic and Classical periods.[544]

---

539 West (1992) 184–85.

540 Anderson (1994) 49–50.

541 Barker (2007) 7–8.

542 Anderson (1994) 37–39 notes that the strange (and late: Eustathius) description of these wrappings has to be taken in absence of other evidence; they may have facilitated adjustment. Phrynis enabled modulation by means of a device called a στρόβιλος ('pinecone'): [Plut.] *de Mus.* 1141d.

543 Pronomos of Thebes enabled modulation by means of a collar: Paus. 9.12.5–6, Ath. 631e. On the parallels of aulos and kithara tuning, see Barker (1984) 51.

544 Voice and accompaniment almost certainly were usually in unison: Barker (1984) 52–53; Anderson (1994) 39.

The technical sources provide the most systematic comparison of different ἁρμονίαι in these terms: Aristides Quintilianus, perhaps drawing on Aristoxenus' work, provides a rare fully expressed set of intervals for each of the six modes discussed in Plato's *Republic* (and so not giving any evidence for Pindar or Pratinas' Aiolian mode).[545] Exclusive focus on the interval structure seems to be a theoretical abstraction, showing the harmonicists' foremost interest in the mathematical ratios involved. In practice it is necessary to base intervals around a specific pitch:[546] the fourth-century regularization of the modal system associated each mode with a particular pitch-range while discarding the various interval patterns of each earlier mode.[547] Various references to the earlier modes associate each mode with a pitch, which may have formed the basis of the later fixed pitch-ranges: the Aiolian mode is described in its first attestation as βαρύβρομον, 'deeply resounding'.[548] By the late fifth-century a clear idea of the modes as scalar had developed.[549] Even less well attested are the melodic tendencies and patterns associated with the modes, but it is likely that certain sequences of notes could be a feature of the modes, analogous to chord progressions in modern musical keys.[550]

The combination of these three aspects of the mode – intervals, relative pitch, and note progression– suggest that the songs of each mode would have had a distinct aural 'flavour', so to speak. The ἁρμονίαι may have been technical structures of which only trained musicians had a true understanding, but the mode determined the melody in an audible way for the audience. The difference in intervals suggests the notable difference

---

545 Arist. Quint. 18.15ff.: see Barker (1989) 15–17.
546 West (1992) 178–79.
547 Barker (1989) 17–26.
548 Lasus fr. 702 *PMG* = Ath. 624f, West (1992) 178; this need not be a question of absolute pitch; it could also refer to *tessitura* or melodic patterns (see following note) which used low-pitched notes more frequently.
549 Barker (1984) 98.
550 West (1992) 178.

between the regular note progression of music in the modern European tradition, performed on a diatonic scale, and the unfamiliar scales of non-Western music. More importantly, as with the major and minor scales of modern music, the affective quality of the different modes could perhaps be apprehended without any real understanding of the technical aspects of acoustic production.

The fundamental place of musical training in Greek education, and the direct references to modes (not melodies) by their ethnic names in Greek poetry, suggests that many in the audience had at least a casual understanding of musical technique. Music was an increasingly professional pursuit in ancient Greece (note both Phemios and Demodokos already in the *Odyssey*).[551] Choral performance however involved large numbers of citizen-status men and boys who, although trained for their particular piece, were not specialists;[552] perhaps relatedly, some knowledge of Greek music seems to have been considered an essential part of citizen education in various *poleis*, although probably only for élite individuals. Poets of various stripes do seem entirely ready to assume of their audiences a firm background in the technical vocabulary of music: I will discuss further in the next section Pindar's use of musical vocabulary including the modes. The fifth-century comic poet Aristophanes more explicitly presumed that the Athenian audience at the *Lenaia* was familiar enough with the modal system to base a passing joke at Cleon's expense around a play on musical terminology:

> φασὶ γὰρ αὐτὸν οἱ
> παῖδες οἳ ξυνεφοίτων,
> τὴν Δωριστὶ μόνην ἂν ἁρμόττεσθαι
> θαμὰ τὴν λύραν,
> ἄλλην δ᾽ οὐκ ἐθέλειν μαθεῖν·
> κᾆτα τὸν κιθαριστὴν

[551] Anderson (1994) 24–25.

[552] On the limitations of non-specialists, see [Arist.] *Prob.* 19.31.

ὀργισθέντ᾽ ἀπάγειν κελεύειν,
ὡς ἁρμονίαν ὁ παῖς
οὗτος οὐ δύναται μαθεῖν
ἢν μὴ Δωροδοκιστί.

the boys who were his classmates say that often he would tune his lyre only in the Dorian mode and refuse to learn another; and then the music teacher angrily had him expelled "because this boy can't learn any mode but the Quid Pro Quorian."

Ar. *Eq.* 987–95, trans. Henderson (1998)

Here a pun on the name of the Dorian mode is somewhat belaboured into a reference to Cleon's bribe-taking profligacy (τὴν Δωριστὶ 'Dorian mode' becomes Δωροδοκιστί, 'bribe-taking mode'). This is not particularly musical; it could simply rely on popular awareness of the Dorian mode's existence. However there may be more subtle references which rely on a greater knowledge of the modal system: the Dorian mode was dignified and generally prestigious;[553] if as this passage seems to suggest the Dorian mode was the first taught to young boys,[554] the audience must understand the depth of the Paphlagonian's educational and moral failings, and of course this passage reflects the musical education of Greek boys, who were expected to ἁρμόττεσθαι τὴν λύραν (note middle voice).[555] Moreover, it seems that the Dorian mode was in practice lower-pitched than most other modes; Aristophanes elsewhere makes humorous reference to Cleon's high-pitched voice.[556] It is perhaps not out of keeping with Aristophanes' mockery of Cleon to imply that the Paphlagonian cannot achieve a suitable timbre. If this is part of the joke it is rather obliquely made, requiring the audience to be familiar with the pitch

553 Pind. fr. 67; see West (1992) 179–80.
554 West (1992) 180 and n. 69.
555 Ar. *Eq.* 989.
556 E.g. Ar. *Vesp.* 36.

of the Dorian mode by name only, and making the association from the Paphlagonian's lyre playing to his speech.

It is clear that the mode, as a tuning, was an unavoidable aspect of the instruments from the very beginning. In a musical sense, however, the term ἁρμονία does not emerge until the early sixth century. It is at this point that we can see the first evidence of systematisation, which I argue is essential to the conception of ethnicized music. Different sources attest slightly different systems of mode, and it will be important to explore whether these reflect developments or encompass a single system. The following section will review the emergence, and systematization, of the modes.

The Greek traditions of the earliest stage of music suggest different genres of song, but no further potential for variation in musical style. Homer, despite a number of references to musical performance and kitharodic genres in particular, gives little sense of melody or the technical aspects of that music. It is worth noting that the musician in epic or ἀοιδός is often depicted as a settled performer, whereas the performer of epic or ῥαψῳδός was itinerant.[557] If this is in any way realistic, epic in its pan-Hellenic stage might not have been a vector for music, but it seems entirely unlikely that musical instruments (with fixed or accustomed tunings) were not mobile until the 'lyric' age.[558] The term ἁρμονία may appear in the very deficient fr. 70 of Sappho, where the musical terminology which follows (χόρος, λίγυς) suggests that this may be 'harmony', not the goddess Harmonia: there is no sign of an ethnic reference. However the development of a vocabulary for tuning instruments very probably implies the realization of options for

[557] On Homeric musicians, see Anderson (1994) 29–32.

[558] A vague reference to dance and harmony (βητάρμονες, 'step-harmonizers' or 'dancers') may be found at *Od.* 8.250; see Barker (1984) 27 n. 26.

tuning. It may be that the vocabulary of ἁρμονία arose from travelling musicians who noted, and perhaps began to systematically adopt, local variations.

There is an emerging interest in the ethnic values of music. The social value of Greek poetry has long been a subject of consideration. Now a historicizing turn has placed more emphasis on performance, including aspects, such as the musical part of song, which are poorly captured by codices and papyri. Konstantinos Panegyres has recently offered an initial assessment of the ethnic element of ancient Greek music.[559] His survey ranges much more widely in the musical arena than the current discussion, both in time, local boundaries, and aspects of music, which he largely avoids treating distinctly. He stops short of assigning strong ethnic associations to any of the musical features he considers, preferring to explore local musical types and local stereotypes:

> It is thus certain that one aspect of ethnographic studies by historians and geographers in the Greek and Roman worlds was the musical culture of local regions. This was associated with the ethnic terminology and myth of those regions, no matter whether such information was represented as mythological or historical. Furthermore, historiographers' comments on the interplay between ethnic identity and music could be affected by their own ethnic and intellectual identities, determining their individual interests and biases.[560]

We lack, however, a more exacting consideration of the ethnic identities involved, and the setting in which ‘local’ traditions could crystallize in a pan-Hellenic discourse about music.

Soon after Sappho, explicit poetic reference to ethnic characters of music begin to appear in the sixth century, alongside the flourishing of better information on Greek

---

559 Panegyres (2017).
560 Panegyres (2017) 270.

music and the Greek world in general.[561] Alcman and Stesichorus make reference first to a Phrygian μέλος, both probably referring to the use of the aulos.[562] Athenaeus preserves the earliest definite references to a ἁρμονία, from Lasus of Hermione's (fl. c. 515–500 BCE) hymn to Demeter and an unspecified poem of Pratinas,[563] both on the Aiolian mode:

> Δάματρα μέλπω Κόραν τε Κλυμένοι᾽ ἄλοχον
> μελιβόαν ὕμνον ἀναγνέων
> Αἰολίδ᾽ ἂμ βαρύβρομον ἁρμονίαν.
>
> Lasus fr. 702 *PMG* (= Ath. 624f)

> καὶ Πρατίνας δέ πού φησι·
> (a) μήτε σύντονον δίωκε
> μήτε τὰν ἀνειμέναν [[Ἰαστί]]
> μοῦσαν, ἀλλὰ τὰν μέσαν
> νεῶν ἄρουραν αἰόλιζε τῷ μέλει·
> ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἑξῆς σαφέστερόν φησιν·
> (b) πρέπει τοι
> πᾶσιν ἀοιδολαβράκταις
> Αἰολὶς ἁρμονία.
>
> Pratinas fr. 712 *PMG* (= Ath. 625a)

Alcman and Stesichorus are somewhat obscure in their language, but we can see clearly enough from Pratinas' αἰόλιζε τῷ μέλει that the references to Φρύγιον μέλος are very probably references to the mode.[564] Lasus and Pratinas' songs are quoted by Athenaeus in a section which preserves the fourth-century philosopher Heraclides of Pontus' contentious study of the development of the modes as local traditions. Heraclides (or Athenaeus) quoted these texts as evidence for the existence of the Aiolian mode;

---

561 Anderson (1994) 59–60.

562 Alcman fr. 126 *PMG* = Strab. 12.8.21; Stesichorus fr. 212 *PMG* = Σ Ar. *Pax* 797.

563 Pratinas' date is problematic: see now Prauscello (2012) 73 n. 89, for earlier bibliography and further argument for an earlier date.

564 West (1992) 177 n. 57.

Pratinas' imperative αἰόλιζε in particular implies the existence of other modes, understood by later scribes as a direct rejection of the Ionian mode,[565] but there is no telling exactly what scope of modes or social significance was understood by Alcman, Stesichorus, Lasus and Pratinas: references to singular modes do not draw a strong enough contrast for our analysis. Poseidonius claims that Anacreon referred to and used only three 'melodies', Phrygian, Dorian (if the text is correctly restored) and Lydian,[566] implying a wider range, but for a fully formed picture of multiple modes, and ethnic terminology of modes, we must return to Pindar.

6.3 Pindar

Pindar is a singularly useful source for ancient music, a rare example of a practitioner who discussed his own musical practices extensively. The surviving corpus of Pindar's poems contains many references to music (including dancing and singing), including many uses of ethnonyms alongside musical terminology. Pindar employed the language of musical composition, fulsomely in the epinicians, to accentuate his own prowess as a poet. The first Olympian is one of twelve known occasions upon which Pindar adduced an ethnic adjective to his musical compositions through the poetry which accompanied them; three of those occasions involve Aiolian music of some kind. The use of ethnicized musical vocabulary such as the Αἰοληίδι μολπᾷ (*Ol.* 1.102, see above) suggests either a strictly technical discourse within his poetry or a more widely comprehensible ethnic valuation of musical techniques. As we have seen, Classical critics did not treat musical technique as an obscure feature of composition. The following discussion will explore

[565] Hence the addition of Ἰαστί, deleted by Page.

[566] Ath. 635b. For the textual issue, see Anderson (1994) 81 and n. 56; Anderson's terminological precision is not entirely productive.

Pindar's own particular obscurity, already touched upon at the beginning of this chapter, which rarely used the technical or entirely explicit terms. Pindar's diction suggests that much of his ethnicized vocabulary refers to modal choices, and I will further argue that in highlighting the modes Pindar did bring ethnic discourse to bear on his songs.

I begin with a catalogue of those passages in the epinician poems where Pindar employed ethnic terminology alongside musical vocabulary, organized by ethnonym:

Table 6.1. Catalogue of ethnic vocabulary in Pindar.

(a) Aiolian:

i.

…ἐμὲ δὲ στεφανῶσαι
κεῖνον ἱππίῳ νόμῳ
Αἰοληΐδι μολπᾷ
χρή…

Ol. 1.100–105 (note also 1.13–15, (b).i.)

ii.

τόδε μὲν κατὰ Φοίνισσαν ἐμπολάν
μέλος ὑπὲρ πολιᾶς ἁλὸς πέμπεται·
τὸ Καστόρειον δ᾽ ἐν Αἰολίδεσσι χορδαῖς θέλων
ἄθρησον χάριν ἑπτακτύπου
φόρμιγγος ἀντόμενος.

Pyth. 2.67–71

iii.

…χαῖρε, φίλος· ἐγὼ τόδε τοι
πέμπω μεμιγμένον μέλι λευκῷ
σὺν γάλακτι, κιρναμένα δ᾽ ἔερσ᾽ ἀμφέπει,
πόμ᾽ ἀοίδιμον Αἰολίσσιν ἐν πνοαῖσιν αὐλῶν,
ὀψέ περ.

Nem. 3.76–80

(b) Dorian:

i.

…δρέπων μὲν κορυφὰς ἀρετᾶν ἄπο πασᾶν,
ἀγλαΐζεται δὲ καὶ
μουσικᾶς ἐν ἀώτῳ,
οἷα παίζομεν φίλαν
ἄνδρες ἀμφὶ θαμὰ τράπεζαν. ἀλλα Δωρίαν ἀπὸ φόρμιγγα
πασσάλου
λάμβαν᾽, εἴ τί τοι Πίσας τε καὶ Φερενίκου χάρις
νόον ὑπὸ γλυκυτάταις ἔθηκε φροντίσιν, …

Ol. 1.13–19 (note also 1.100–105, (a).i.)

ii.

…Μοῖσα δ᾽ οὕτω ποι παρέστα μοι νεοσίγαλον εὑρόντι
τρόπον
Δωρίῳ φωνὰν ἐναρμόξαι πεδίλῳ
ἀγλαόκωμον· ἐπεὶ χαίταισι μὲν ζευχθέντες ἔπι στέφανοι
πράσσοντί με τοῦτο θεόδματον χρέος,
φόρμιγγά τε ποικιλόγαρυν καὶ βοὰν αὐλῶν ἐπέων τε
θέσιν
Αἰνησιδάμου παιδὶ συμμεῖξαι πρεπόντως, …

Ol. 3.4–9

iii.

βία δὲ καὶ μεγάλαυχον ἔσφαλεν ἐν χρόνῳ.
Τυφὼς Κίλιξ ἑκατόγκρανος οὔ νιν ἄλυξεν,
οὐδὲ μὰν βασιλεὺς Γιγάντων· δμᾶθεν δὲ κεραυνῷ
τόξοισί τ᾽ Ἀπόλλωνος· ὃς εὐμενεῖ νόῳ
Ξενάρκειον ἔδεκτο Κίρραθεν ἐστεφανωμένον
υἱὸν ποίᾳ Παρνασσίδι Δωριεῖ τε κώμῳ.

Pyth. 8.15–20

iv.

…οὐκ ἄγνωτ᾽ ἀείδω
Ἰσθμίαν ἵπποισι νίκαν,
τὰν Ξενοκράτει Ποσειδάων ὀπάσαις

Δωρίων αὐτῷ στεφάνωμα κόμᾳ
πέμπεν ἀναδεῖσθαι σελίνων,
εὐάρματον ἄνδρα γεραίρων, …

Isth. 2.12–17

v.

τὸ καὶ νῦν φέρει λόγον, ἔσσυταί τε Μοισαῖον ἅρμα
Νικοκλέος
μνᾶμα πυγμάχου κελαδῆσαι. γεραίρετέ νιν,
ὃς Ἴσθμιον ἂν νάπος
Δωρίων ἔλαχεν σελίνων·

Isth. 8.61–64

(c) Lydian:

i.

Σωτὴρ ὑψινεφὲς Ζεῦ, Κρόνιόν τε ναίων λόφον
τιμῶν τ᾽ Ἀλφεὸν εὐρὺ ῥέοντα Ἰδαῖόν τε σεμνὸν ἄντρον,
ἱκέτας σέθεν ἔρχομαι Λυδίοις ἀπύων ἐν αὐλοῖς,
αἰτήσων πόλιν ἐυανορίαισι τάνδε κλυταῖς
δαιδάλλειν…

Ol. 5.17-21

ii.

Λυδῷ γὰρ Ἀσώπιχον ἐν τρόπῳ
ἐν μελέταις τ᾽ ἀείδων ἔμολον,
οὕνεκ᾽ Ὀλυμπιόνικος ἁ Μινύεια
σεῦ ἕκατι.

Ol. 14.17–20

iii.

ἐμοὶ δ᾽ ὁποίαν ἀρετάν
ἔδωκε Πότμος ἄναξ,
εὖ οἶδ᾽ ὅτι χρόνος ἕρπων πεπρωμέναν τελέσει.
ἐξύφαινε, γλυκεῖα, καὶ τόδ᾽ αὐτίκα, φόρμιγξ,
Λυδίᾳ σὺν ἁρμονίᾳ μέλος πεφιλημένον
Οἰνώνᾳ τε καὶ Κύπρῳ, ἔνθα Τεῦκρος ἀπάρχει

ὁ Τελαωνιάδας· ἀτάρ
Αἴας Σαλαμῖν᾽ ἔχει πατρῴαν·

Nem. 4.41–48

iv.

ἱκέτας Αἰακοῦ σεμνῶν γονάτων πόλιός θ᾽ ὑπὲρ φίλας
ἀστῶν θ᾽ ὑπὲρ τῶνδ᾽ ἅπτομαι φέρων
Λυδίαν μίτραν καναχηδὰ πεποικιλμέναν,
Δείνιος δισσῶν σταδίων καὶ πατρὸς Μέγα Νεμεαῖον
ἄγαλμα.

Nem. 8.13–16

There are few comparable references to mode in the extant paeans fragments of Pindar; one testimonium (fr. 67 Mahler = 5 Rutherford = Σ Pind. *Ol.* 1.26g) suggests that musical references probably were not limited to the epinicians: περὶ δὲ τῆς Δωριστὶ ἁρμονίας εἴρηται ἐν παιᾶσιν ὅτι Δώριον μέλος σεμνότατόν ἐστι. The very damaged papyrus of a paean or hyporcheme contains a clear reference to a Lokrian mode:

(d) Lokrian:

i.

Ἰων[
ἀοιδ[ὰν κ]αὶ ἁρμονίαν
αὐλ[οῖς ἐ]πεφράσ[ατο
τῶ[ν φε Λο]κῶν τις, οἵ τ᾽ ἀργίλοφον
πὰρ Ζεφυρίου κολώναν…

fr. 140b

As far as it is preserved, it is not clear if the poem simply narrates the invention of the mode by ‘some Lokrian’ (i.e. Xenocritus):[567] it is likely, but unconfirmable, that this poem also *used* the Lokrian mode. The first line preserves the first three letters ΙΩΝ

[567] West (1992) 184.

which are often interpreted as the introduction of a comparison of Lokrian and Ionian modes, but an exact supplement for the line is not clear,[568] and there are no other references to Ionian *or* Lokrian mode in Pindar's corpus. Pindar, it seems, made explicit reference only to three ethnic musics: Aiolian, Dorian, and Lydian.

The majority of these references are most clearly understood as internal references to the composition of the same poem in which they appear. (This may not always be the case, and I will explore below the possibility that the first Olympian ode, which contains reference to both the Dorian φόρμιγξ and Aiolian μολπά, extends its reach beyond the present performance.) Pindar utilizes music as evidence of his own competence as an epinician poet, making explicit his own contribution to the victory celebration, a necessary piece of self-promotion for a jobbing poet;[569] the repeated metaphor of Pindar's own song as a crown is closely associated with the crowning of the honorand at the games. At the same time, these references are unique to Pindar; the surviving epinician poems of Bacchylides, although a smaller corpus, contain no references to music at all. In the absence of real evidence for Pindar's music, we can only assume that the poetry matched and highlighted the musical aspects of the particular composition. In this context references to music are themselves tendentious assertions of Pindar's superior value as an epinician poet, and perhaps something more.

But who would have understood these references? Pindar's musical vocabulary is on the whole not very technical: he employs the term ἁρμονία in a musical sense only twice (*Nem.* 4.44, fr. 140b), in both instances with ethnic vocabulary (Lydian, Locrian) and further clarifying references to music: in the fourth *Nemean* the *persona loquens*

---

568 See Barker (1984) 60 n. 25.
569 Barker (1984) 55.

addresses the φόρμιγξ and refers to a μέλος; fr. 140b links the Lokrian ἁρμονία to an ἀοιδά. Otherwise Pindar's musicology tends to be straightforward: his terms for instruments are simply φόρμιγξ (the Homeric term), less often λύρα, and αὐλοί. The term τρόπος (*Ol.* 14.17) is almost certainly not the technical term for modes which later appeared,[570] but a simple emphasis on the novelty of the Lydian style of music.[571] Pindar regularly transfers technical aspects of the music to basic imagery, such as the breath of the pipes or the turning (τρόπος) of the melody, and more elaborate figures such as the crowning metaphor which concludes the first *Olympian*.[572] We might assume that Pindar's language was accessible to the audience, who did not need to understand the technicalities of interval structures in order to appreciate the nature of the song's melody, especially if the names for the musical techniques and their ethnic associations were suggested to them by the poet. In this way the musical vocabulary becomes a sort of speech-act, defining the music which accompanied the words as Dorian, Aiolian, etc.

The untechnical nature of his vocabulary can however make Pindar's musical references intractable, as I observed at the beginning of this chapter, and the first *Olympian* is by no means a unique case.[573] Obviously the vast majority of these references would become immediately lucid if we could hear these poems performed as songs. Faced with the loss of the music, scholars from antiquity onwards have attempted to connect reference to musical practice with the evidence which does survive, connecting ethnicized language with metre, mode, ethnicity, melodic patterns, Pindar's

---

570 West (1992) 185–86.

571 Anderson (1994) 97. Prauscello (2012) 62–64 makes a case for substantial innovation in the epinicians out of the comparative lack of later references to its traditional character. This is not entirely convincing.

572 Cf. *Isthm.* 2.15, 8.61; *Nem.* 8.15; Anderson (1994) 100–101.

573 Collection of possible modal references in Pindar with earlier bibliography: Prauscello (2012) 77–82, to which should be added for the Dorian mode *Isthmians* 2.15 and 8.61, and for Lydian, *Nemean* 8.15: see below on the polysemy of the garland/fillet imagery.

identity, dialect, etc. Pindar's own statements however did not have evidential intent. Rather, Pindar explicitly stylized his own practice by attaching ethnonyms: to a certain extent the ethnonyms must be taken at face-value no matter which feature might be read behind them.

The one musical feature which does persist is the metre of the poems, and it has long been suggested that the metre and mode must have been connected, since they were both often characterized with ethnic terminology.[574] Plato does state that the ῥυθμός and ἁρμονία *should* follow the nature of the song.[575] There are three issues with taking this as evidence that Pindar therefore refers to metre and mode together in the cases we have seen. Firstly, rhythm and metre are not precisely the same thing. Secondly, Plato is not a descriptive scholar of Greek music, and his argument is made aggressively enough to suggest that metre and mode were not (in his day) always unified. Finally, the suggested link is what is appropriate for each genre (which are, we must remember, to be highly limited); it is by no means definite that this meant a precise alignment of metre and mode. Only in one unequivocal case, the third *Olympian*, does Pindar seem to refer to metre in ethnic terms: Δωρίῳ φωνὰν ἐναρμόξαι πεδίλῳ ἀγλαόκωμον (3.4–5), 'fitting a voice of splendid celebration to the Dorian sandal' (an extension of the ideal of metrical feet, or perhaps using the imagery of the chorus' dancing).[576] The metre of the third *Olympian* is indeed 'Doric' dactyloepitrite, innovatively used by Pindar in praise poetry.[577] The sentence may also encompass the mode, if ἐναρμόξαι has a technical meaning, but it is a *hapax* in Pindar.[578] If in reality the metre and mode overlapped, then we can at least

---

574 Correspondence of mode and metre in Hellenistic scholarship on Pindar: Prauscello (2012) 64–65.
575 Pl. *Rep.* 397b–c.
576 Perhaps similarly *Pyth.* 8.20, see Anderson (1994) 98–99.
577 D'Angour (2011) 193.
578 Anderson (1994) 99.

observe Pindar's choice to highlight one over the other. Lucia Prauscello has shown quite clearly however that where Pindar uses ethnicized language it is not consistently in line with the metre (names here uncapitalized for clarity): Dorian mode can occur with aiolic (*Pyth.* 8) and 'Doric' dactyloepitrite metres (*Ol.* 3), Lydian with aiolic usually (*Ol.* 5, 14; *Nem.* 5), but also dactyloepitrite (*Nem.* 8):[579] see Table 1.

Poem	**Catalogue**	**Date**	**Ethnics**	**Metre**	**Honorand**
Ol. 1	(a).i, (b).i.	476	Aiolian, Dorian(?)	iambic-aiolic	Hieron of Syracuse
Ol. 3	(b).ii.	476	Dorian	dactyloepitrite	Theron of Acragas
Ol. 5	(c).i.	456?	Lydian	aiolic	Psaumis of Camarina
Ol. 14	(c).ii.	460	Lydian	aiolic	Asopichus of Orchomenus
Pyth. 2	(a).ii.	475?	Aiolian	iambic-aiolic	Hieron of Syracuse
Pyth. 8	(b).iii.	446	Dorian	aiolic	Aristomenes of Aegina
Nem. 3	(a).iii.	475?	Aiolian	iambic-aiolic	Aristocleides of Aegina
Nem. 4	(c).iii.	475?	Lydian	aiolic	Timasarchus of Aegina
Nem. 8	(c).iv.	459?	Lydian	dactyloepitrite	Deinias of Aegina

Table 6.2. Date, metre and honorand of Pindar's ethnicized music, cf. catalogue above, pp. 231–35.

Ultimately the phrasing suggests that many of the ethnicized musical terms in the epinicians are most easily understood to refer to, or at least encompass, the mode of the piece.[580] The Aiolian mode is probably suggested by the references to instruments and the parts of instruments which produced the melody: the Αἰολίδεσσι χορδαῖς and

[579] Prauscello (2012) 65.
[580] *Pace* Anderson (1994) 96.

Αἰολίσσιν ἐν πνοαῖσιν αὐλῶν;[581] likewise the Δωρίαν φόρμιγγα and the Λυδίοις ἐν αὐλοῖς.[582] Pindar does not generally elaborate upon the audible qualities of the modes and other musical features, unlike Lasus and Pratinas, but the ethnic character of the melodic instruments would most probably have been related to mode.

In a few cases it is not even clear whether ethnicized language which Pindar deploys is intended to have any musical force. Some usages seem to exploit the ambiguity or polysemy of his images: 'A crown of Dorian parsley' (Δωρίων … στεφάνωμα … σελίνων)[583] most obviously elicits the victory garland at the 'Dorian' Isthmus,[584] but equally so recalls the image of crowning in song heard in the first *Olympian*. We can suggest with some confidence that references to the voice and accompanying instruments were easily understood as modal; references to movement more likely to be metrical. References to dialect seem unlikely, on the grounds that Pindar's dialect does not obviously vary from one song to another; we do not possess enough good evidence to identify or disqualify references to a standard melody (i.e. νόμος), but Pindar does use the term explicitly on two occasions, and not with direct ethnic characterization.

On the grounds of melodic references, there are secure references to three modes in Pindar: three to the Aiolian mode, at least one to the Dorian mode, and at least two to the Lydian mode. However it is far from clear that the ambiguous references and polysemic figures could not have reinforced an overall ethnic stylization of each poem for the ancient audience.

---

581 Pind. *Pyth.* 2.69, *Nem.* 3.79.
582 Pind. *Ol.* 1.17, 5.19.
583 Pind. *Isth.* 2.15–16, cf. 8.61–64.
584 Cf. Pind. *Nem.* 5.37.

There has been surprisingly little consideration of how Pindar selected the modes for each song, and with some good reason: it is impossible to be very confident at all.[585] His musical references are not at all justificatory. We should however note the way in which Pindar drew attention through his diction to his choices, even if it were a purely aesthetic choice. If fragment 46 does not represent a scholiast's overinterpretation of a passing epithet, it suggests that Pindar was well aware of the affective nature of the modes, as he supposedly noted that Dorian was the most solemn mode.

The last, and most difficult proposed interpretation of the ethnic characterization of music in Pindar is that of direct reference to an ethnic identity. Ethnicity in generally is not a primary concern for the epinicians, but it is by no means absent. Pindar occasionally draws upon terms such as Dorian and Aeolian in addition to references to the migratory myths. In the eighth *Olympian*, for Alcimedon of Aigina, he calls the island 'controlled by (*or* for) the Dorian host' (Δωριεῖ λαῷ ταμιευομέναν); Aristagoras of Tenedos' ancestry is linked back to Peisandros of Sparta, who is given the honour of leading *with* Orestes the 'brazen force of Aiolians' (Αἰολέων στρατιὰν χαλκεντέα) which settled Tenedos ('here').[586] In both instances the reference is to the settlement of the honorand's home town. This once again is a peculiarly Pindaric feature of epinician poetry: Bacchylides and Simonides do not make any references to Greek ethnicities.

On the other hand, Pindar's corpus of modes in the epinicians is surprisingly limited; we have seen some evidence of other modes (Locrian, Ionian, Phrygian) to which Pindar makes no explicit reference. I would like to suggest that a broader ethnic reading

---

585 Prauscello (2012) 66–67 suggests that Pindar's metrical preferences changed over the course of his career, linking his earlier metrical forms with his supposed teaching Lasus' metrical and harmonic experimentation. This puts substantial weight on the biographical tradition.

586 Pind. *Nem.* 11.35; see chapter 3.2.1 on the migration story.

of the modes is possible. A few basic facts stand out. With the exception of the first *Olympian*, each poem contains a reference to only one ethnic music. The Dorian mode is only noted by Pindar in songs for victors from Dorian cities, although a number of Dorian victors receive poems in other modes (or the mode is not noted at all). The Aiolian mode is similarly marked out only for Dorian victors, and not (perhaps surprisingly) for victors such as Strepsiades of Thebes.[587]

Pindar himself probably identified as an Aiolian. Some very slight tendencies of expression relating to the poet or *persona loquens* for the different modes can be observed from the small corpus: two of the three references to Aiolian mode link the song fairly closely to the *persona loquens* (ἐμὲ δὲ στεφανῶσαι … χρή, *Ol.* 1; ἐγὼ … πέμπω, *Nem.* 3). On the other hand, references to Dorian mode are not so personal, often abstracted to the chorus (*Ol.* 1(?); *Pyth.* 8) or the abstract figure of the crown (*Isth.* 2, 8), treated here as acquired rather than given; in the third *Olympian* the new mixture of Dorian metre and mode is Muse-inspired. Three of the references to Lydian mode are directly related to the expression of the poet's *persona* (*Ol.* 5, 14; *Nem.* 8, with the crowning metaphor), one to the instrument. It seems that Pindar is more willing to associate himself as the poet with the Aiolian mode, and to some extent the Lydian, than with the Dorian.

The Lydian mode may seem to be the odd one out, since there are neither Lydian victors nor any other associations of Pindar with Lydia. However, some careful political positioning is possible: Asopichus of Orchomenus receives a song (*Ol.* 14) in Lydian mode, not Aiolian, but of course even in the early fifth century Orchomenus was still notably resistant to engagement with the rest of Boiotia, and may not have even recognized an Aiolian identity: Pindar uses the traditional ethnonym Minyan of

---

[587] Pind. *Isth.* 7: no ethnicized musical language.

Orchomenus twice in the twenty four lines of this poem. Similarly Psaumis, the refounder of Dorian Camarina, received a poem in Lydian, not Dorian mode, perhaps a way of side-stepping old associations with Dorian Syracuse. In the fourth and eighth *Nemeans*, both for Aiginetan victors, it is notable that Pindar makes little to no reference to the Dorian inhabitants of the island, focusing rather on the autochthonous mythical tradition which surrounded Aiakos and his family.

It is clear enough then that Pindar was inclined to make reference to the mode, and we should not be overly hostile to interpreting various ethnicized musical references as having technical meanings, although couched in language which is somewhat difficult for us to follow. The use of ethonyms in Pindar should not be treated as accidental to his work as a praise poet, or too obscure to have conveyed meaning to a fifth-century audience. What Pindar did not intimate, overtly or covertly, is his own reasoning, aesthetic or otherwise, for selecting the modes. But I hope to have demonstrated here that it is possible to find political readings of some of the modes which Pindar made explicit.

6.4 Terpander and the origins of the modes

Pindar makes a few simple claims for novelty linked to ethnic music (e.g. *Ol.* 3), but on the whole he seems to treat the Greek modes as a fully developed system. I have allowed that the obliquity of his musical references points only indirectly towards the modes, but it seems as well that on the whole the *ethnic* characterization of the modes was not in question. Later writers however were not insensitive to the question of how the modes related to their ethnic epithets.[588] One answer was found in the legacy of the seventh-century Lesbian citharode Terpander.[589] Terpander was a near-legendary figure, credited

[588] On Marsyas and Hyagnis' invention of the Phrygian ἁρμονία, see Anderson (1994) 54.
[589] For Terpander's dates, Anderson (1994) 61.

with a great many important musical developments in a disjointed tradition; although he was probably a historical figure, the substance of the tradition built around him is indicative too of the ongoing influence of Lesbian *kithara* music on the wider Greek sphere than his possible actual contributions. In particular Terpander was closely associated with the development of Greek music from Asiatic roots, particularly the adoption of new forms of instrument.

In the earliest attestation of Terpander's name, Pindar claims that Terpander invented the βάρβιτος, a lower-pitched form of stringed instrument, inspired by the Lydian πηκτίς:[590] σαφῶς Πινδάρου λέγοντος τὸν Τέρπανδρον ἀντίφθογγον εὑρεῖν τῇ παρὰ Λυδοῖς πηκτίδι τὸν βάρβιτον·

> τόν ῥα Τέρπανδρός ποθ' ὁ Λέσβιος εὗρεν
> πρῶτος, ἐν δείπνοισι Λυδῶν
> ψαλμὸν ἀντίφθογγον ὑπηλᾶς ἀκούων πακτίδος.

This particular invention is not repeated in any later source, though the tradition persisted until Athenaeus' time;[591] on the other hand, a wealth of variant traditions attributed similar developments to Terpander: the invention of the Asiatic kithara, and of the Mixolydian ἁρμονία, Most importantly, a fragment of Terpander's own poetry seems to suggest a change from a four- to a seven-stringed lyre: σοὶ δ' ἡμεῖς τετράγαρυν ἀποστέρξαντες ἀοιδὰν / ἑπτατόνῳ φόρμιγγι νέους κελαδήσομεν ὕμνους.[592] The authenticity of the couplet, as well as its meaning, is still a matter of doubt: τετράγαρυς

---

590 Pind. fr. 125 = Ath. 14.635b, a sympotic skolion for Hieron. On the pitch of the barbitos, see West (1992) 57–58. Although there is no particular line drawn between the Aiolian mode and the βάρβιτος, it is worth remembering that Lasus later described the Aiolian mode as 'deep'; see West (1992) 58 n. 41 for evidence.

591 Athenaeus also reports (175e) a claim that Anacreon brought the βάρβιτος to Greece.

592 Terpander fr. 4 Gostoli.

and ἑπτάτονος most probably refer to the number of strings.[593] Terpander's phrase may simply indicate that he used two rather different forms of lyre for different pieces, but in antiquity this was taken as evidence that Terpander was the inventor (πρῶτος εὑρητής) of the seven-stringed lyre.[594]

Seven-stringed lyres were already known in the Bronze-Age Aegean; if the seventh century offers some evidence of a shift in fashion towards the seven-stringed instrument, this is still unlikely to be entirely due to Terpander's contribution.[595] The number of strings on the lyre, however, is a fairly significant factor in the scale available to the poet.[596] It is significant then that Terpander was understood to have enabled a greater variety of notes to be played on one instrument, closer to the fully worked out set of intervals suggested by Aristides, without retuning or modulating devices (perhaps not developed until the fifth century).[597] Certain sources give very definite indications of how Terpander was supposed to have fitted the octave onto seven strings, by skipping over the *trite* or third note from the middle of the scale. These authors take the regularized form of the octave as the established basis to Terpander's modification for a seven-stringed instrument, which may be a retrojection of more familiar contemporary intervallic structure. It is obvious that a change to the strings would require some adaptation of the tuning system, probably to affect the ἁρμονίαι and perhaps even to produce the system which was used on seven-stringed lyres throughout the sixth century and into the fifth. He was attributed only one mode, the Mixolydian, whose name clearly

---

593 Anderson (1994) 62 and n. 8.

594 Cf. Terpander test. 53b Gostoli; Strabo 13.618 (quoting fr. 4); [Arist.] *Prob.* 19.32; [Plut.] *Mor.os* 1140f, 1141c; cf. *hH* 4.51. On the late-fifth and fourth century context for the tradition of musical development and invention ('heurematography'), see D'Angour (2011) 198–200.

595 On seventh-century developments in kithara, see West (1992) 53; Anderson (1994) 62.

596 Barker (1984) 49.

597 Anderson (1994) 63 suggests that the four-stringed instrument already spanned the octave, with the lower and higher notes of each tetrachord represented.

reflects Terpander's close association with Asia and Lydia in particular (cf. Pind. fr. 125, above), in keeping with the general view that the ethnic names of the modes reflected the regions in which they arose. However his change to the lyre must have been thought to affect all of the octave ἁρμονίαι. The bricolage of sources which report on Terpander encompass a number of other supposedly Terpandrean innovations, to do with metre and melody. It is by no means necessary to believe that Terpander was responsible for all of the innovations which he is assigned; the breadth of parallel developments suggests some extrapolation (perhaps even the forgery of fragment 4) from a vaguer tradition. However from the fifth century on these testimonia pretend to great precision, and all of them suggest that Terpander caused a significant change in the sound of music.

Terpander's most prominent biographical tradition related to the first κατάστασις of music at Sparta – less obliquely put, the organization of the kitharoidic competition at the Spartan Carneia – but it is not entirely true to say that he made no contribution to Aiolic musical life.[598] If he is not accredited with the establishment of a similar ἀγών in Lesbos (and we should note that the Spartan κατάστασις is not an independent historical development but part of the complex tradition of δυσνομία), he did create a tradition of Aiolic music which was apparently continued by his own descendants (ἀπόγονοι) and a somewhat indeterminate group of other Lesbian kitharoides. This has often been seen as simple appropriation of the historical figure's legacy; however, it may be more profitable to consider the figure of Terpander, like Archilochus or Homer, as a fictive founder and representative of a wider tradition, in Terpander's case of *kitharoidia*. The prestige of Terpander's followers at the Karneia is recorded in the phrase μετὰ τὸν Λέσβιον ἀοιδόν, quite literally an indication that Lesbian kitharoides performed before all others at the

[598] *Pace* Anderson (1994) 72.

Karneia. For these men Terpander was a founding figure, and parts of his story bear hallmarks of heroization.

It seems likely that Terpander's prominence as the most significant figure of Aiolian music was already well established by the early sixth century. Sappho (fr. 106) seems to refer to the tradition: πέρροχος ὡς ὅτ᾽ ἄοιδος ὀ Λέσβιος ἀλλοδάποισιν. This might have meant that the Aiolian music was generally better than that of other lands, or perhaps the 'Lesbian singer' here was specifically Terpander. However, this tradition certainly spread to Aiolian areas beyond Lesbos: Pindar seems to engage with it as well: we have already seen Pindar use Terpander as an authority figure, extrapolating on his own use of the barbitos in his *skolion* for Hiero of Syracuse (fr. 125). This was not an entirely incidental piece of rhetoric or erudition: the famous Lesbian kitharoide Aristokleitos, apparently one of Terpander's descendents, was a figure at the court of the tyrant in Syracuse, and Timothy Power has suggested that it was Aristokleitos who performed the skolion on Pindar's behalf.[599] Pindar must then have crafted the reference to Terpander into his *skolion* in full awareness that it would evoke something about the performer. Power interprets this as a question of cultural economics, normalizing Aristokleitos' presence at the symposium and obscuring the transactional background of Pindar and Aristokleitos' contributions. Perhaps Pindar and Aristokleitos had encountered each other earlier at Syracuse, but this is not the only reference to an Aiolian mode.

On the other hand, this brief suggestion of a network is not much; Terpander stands at the beginning of a significant tradition, and although it was clearly appropriated in various ways for a pan-Hellenic purpose, there is little trace in this of any earlier pan-

[599] Power (2010) chap. 3.15.

Aiolian musical identity, although Terpander may in fact have initiated one. Curiously, the *Suda*, drawing on an unknown source of unknown date, describes Terpander as Ἀρναῖος, i.e. with the ethnonym of the legendary Aiolian homeland that was more generally associated with the Boiotians.[600] Terpander became an Aiolian culture hero, perhaps an initiator of the musical identity of Aiolians or developed into such a legendary figure in order to provide a musical progenitor for Aiolian culture. He has been associated with an incoherent mish-mash of innovations, but a number of these have ethnic significance, including possibly the development of the modes. For clear evidence of the ethnic associations of modes, we must look beyond the fifth century traditions of music, to Plato.

6.5 Plato, Heraclides and the ethnomusicological discourse

Plato makes a notorious claim for the importance of musical modes in particular in the effectiveness of Greek music (*Rep.* 3.10.398d–99e; the first part of a discussion on song which extends to 403c). In order that the Guardians of the ideal polis be able to recognize what is appropriate (οἰκεῖος) to their state, they must be limited not only to poetry which is not overly mimetic in its narrative, lest the Guardians learn to imitate the wrong kinds, but music whose mode is best restricted to either the Dorian (Δωριστί) or Phrygian (Φρυγιστί) modes, which are military in use (ἐπὶ πολεμικῶν ἀνδρῶν), not drunkenly slack (χαλαραί) or dirge-like (θρηνώδεις; 398e–99a). The Mixolydian, Syntonolydian, Ionian and Lydian modes are excluded here simply because they are associated in vague terms with inappropriate behaviour, though it has been assumed that the reference is purely to the melodic nature of the individual modes: the proper term ‘slack’, χαλαρός,

[600] See chapter 3.1.1.

intruding into an otherwise untechnical conversation. However when Socrates comes to justify the selection of ἁρμονίαι, he gives a rather fuller sketch of the desired associations of his selected modes:

> οὐκ οἶδα, ἔφην ἐγώ, τὰς ἁρμονίας, ἀλλὰ κατάλειπε ἐκείνην τὴν ἁρμονίαν, ἣ ἔν τε πολεμικῇ πράξει ὄντος ἀνδρείου καὶ ἐν πάσῃ βιαίῳ ἐργασίᾳ πρεπόντως ἂν μιμήσαιτο φθόγγους τε καὶ προσῳδίας, καὶ ἀποτυχόντος ἢ εἰς τραύματα ἢ εἰς θανάτους ἰόντος ἢ εἴς τινα ἄλλην συμφορὰν πεσόντος, ἐν πᾶσι τούτοις παρατεταγμένως καὶ καρτερούντως ἀμυνομένου τὴν τύχην· καὶ ἄλλην αὖ ἐν εἰρηνικῇ τε καὶ μὴ βιαίῳ ἀλλ᾽ ἐν ἑκουσίᾳ πράξει ὄντος, ἢ τινά τι πείθοντός τε καὶ δεομένου, ἢ εὐχῇ θεὸν ἢ διδαχῇ καὶ νουθετήσει ἄνθρωπον, ἢ τοὐναντίον ἄλλῳ δεομένῳ ἢ διδάσκοντι ἢ μεταπείθοντι ἑαυτὸν ἐπέχοντα, καὶ ἐκ τούτων πράξαντα κατὰ νοῦν, καὶ μὴ ὑπερηφάνως ἔχοντα, ἀλλὰ σωφρόνως τε καὶ μετρίως ἐν πᾶσι τούτοις πράττοντά τε καὶ τὰ ἀποβαίνοντα ἀγαπῶντα. ταύτας δύο ἁρμονίας, βίαιον, ἑκούσιον, δυστυχούντων, εὐτυχούντων, σωφρόνων, ἀνδρείων ἁρμονίας αἵτινες φθόγγους μιμήσονται κάλλιστα, ταύτας λεῖπε.
>
> ἀλλ᾽, ἦ δ᾽ ὅς, οὐκ ἄλλας αἰτεῖς λείπειν ἢ ἃς νυνδὴ ἐγὼ ἔλεγον.
>
> *Rep.* 3.399a–c

Socrates claims to have no knowledge of the modes, but the outline of the Guardians' nature which has preceded leaves fairly little surprise in his explanation of them; we cannot presume that *Plato's* description here of the characters of these two modes are entirely novel explanations. Plato makes reference to six modes in total (Lydian, Dorian, Phrygian, Ionian, Mixolydian and Syntonolydian), which he seems to have taken from the fifth-century intellectual Damon. Robert Wallace however has contended that this is a misinterpretation of the citation of Damon; he argues that Plato's exegesis is an

amateurish novel interpretation of the Damonian association of *metre* with *ethos*.[601] The most obvious riposte is that later when Aristotle takes issue with Plato's interpretation of the Phrygian mode, he does not in fact have any concerns with the basic proposition.

Moreover, the explanation smacks of ethnic stereotypes: Socrates suggests that the Dorian mode will make the guardians brave in war and steadfast in the face of injury: these are familiar descriptions of stereotypical Dorian character.[602] It may seem curious that the connection between these points and the Dorian ethnos is not explicitly made, but I would suggest that the phrasing Δωριστί already made that clear. I have discussed earlier the use of ethnic adverbs in a variety of circumstances, and Plato likewise uses Δωριστί to mean 'in the traditional Dorian manner'; in the *Laches* he blurs quite thoroughly the character and (metaphorical) mode: [603]

> καὶ κομιδῇ μοι δοκεῖ μουσικὸς ὁ τοιοῦτος εἶναι, ἁρμονίαν καλλίστην ἡρμοσμένος οὐ λύραν οὐδὲ παιδιᾶς ὄργανα, ἀλλὰ τῷ ὄντι ζῆν ἡρμοσμένος οὗ αὐτὸς αὑτοῦ τὸν βίον σύμφωνον τοῖς λόγοις πρὸς τὰ ἔργα, ἀτεχνῶς δωριστὶ ἀλλ᾽ οὐκ ἰαστί, οἶομαι δὲ οὐδὲ φρυγιστὶ οὐδὲ λυδιστί, ἀλλ᾽ ἥπερ μόνη Ἑλληνική ἐστιν ἁρμονία.
>
> *Lach.* 188d

A Dorian focus to the ideal state is of course made clear in the first book of the *Laws*. If the Dorian mode fits well with the rest of Plato's project (not to mention attitudes) in its ethnic associations as well as its musical character, the Phrygian mode remains a more curious case. In the *Politics,* Aristotle rejected the *Republic*'s reaction to the Phrygian

---

601 Wallace (2005).

602 Cf. Plut. *Lyc.* 21, quoting Terpander.

603 Anderson (1994) 151–52; cf. Pl. *Ep.* 7.336c–d (the authenticity of the letter is of course still a matter of scholarly debate, but even if the words are not Plato's it seems likely the substance of his advice here was accurately reflected). West (1992) 180 n. 66 surprisingly seems to take Δωριστί in the *Laches* and seventh *Letter* as musical references.

mode, highlighting a disjunction between acceptance of the Phrygian mode and rejection of the *aulos*:

> ὁ δ᾽ ἐν τῇ Πολιτείᾳ Σωκράτης οὐ καλῶς τὴν φρυγιστὶ μόνην καταλείπει μετὰ τῆς δωριστί, καὶ ταῦτα ἀποδοκιμάσας τῶν ὀργάνων τὸν αὐλόν. ἔχει γὰρ τὴν αὐτὴν δύναμιν ἡ φρυγιστὶ τῶν ἁρμονιῶν ἥνπερ αὐλὸς ἐν τοῖς ὀργάνοις· ἄμφω γὰρ ὀργιαστικὰ καὶ παθητικά· δηλοῖ δ᾽ ἡ ποίησις. πᾶσα γὰρ βακχεία καὶ πᾶσα ἡ τοιαύτη κίνησις. μάλιστα τῶν ὀργάνων ἐστὶν ἐν τοῖς αὐλοῖς, τῶν δ᾽ ἁρμονιῶν ἐν τοῖς φρυγιστὶ μέλεσι λαμβάνει ταῦτα τὸ πρέπον.
>
> Arist. *Pol.* 8.1342a–b

The argumentation which follows balances between the factual association of the Phrygian mode with *aulos* music (like the Lydian which Plato *had* rejected), and the orgiastic and extreme response which Aristotle felt music in Phrygian mode aroused– Aristotle is not simply calling Plato illogical, but wrong in his characterization of the Phrygian mode. Modern scholars have on the whole agreed with Aristotle, because he has the weight of other evidence on his side,[604] although not without consternation at Plato's error. Recently Tosca Lynch has proposed that a logical explanation of Plato's acceptance of the Phyrgian mode can be found in what it has in common with the Dorian mode; not the calming aesthetics but a technical issue.[605] The Dorian and Phrygian mode do not permit modulation; by allowing only these two modes Plato rids the ideal city of music which is set to more than one mode. This is a reactionary fiction, harking back to a never-existent musical purity.[606] In this limitation of music, combined with ethnic

---

[604] For previous bibliography, see West (1992) 180–81.
[605] Lynch (2016).
[606] D'Angour (2011) 205.

valuation of the modes, we can see something like an essentialist concern for ethnic purity.

Plato's near contemporary Heraclides Ponticus made the ethnic evaluation of the individual Greek modes explicit. His discussion is tendentious, arguing for a definitive separation of the three Greek modes from those named after foreign ethnicities. The description, summarized by Athenaeus, of the substantial differences in the ἦθος of the three Greek ethnicities turns to arguments about migration and conservatism already rather familiar from Herodotus. We have already seen in the *Laches* Plato's view that the Dorian character made Dorian mode the only Greek mode; Heraclides goes further in explicitly linking ἤθη to the character of the modes, and in particular of the Aiolian:

> Ἡρακλείδης δ' ὁ Ποντικὸς ἐν τρίτῳ Περὶ Μουσικῆς οὐδ' ἁρμονίαν φησὶ δεῖν καλεῖσθαι τὴν Φρύγιον, καθάπερ οὐδὲ τὴν Λύδιον· ἁρμονίας γὰρ εἶναι τρεῖς, τρία γὰρ καὶ γενέσθαι Ἑλλήνων γένη, Δωριεῖς, Αἰολεῖς, Ἴωνας. οὐ μικρᾶς οὖν οὔσης διαφορᾶς ἐν τοῖς τούτων ἤθεσιν, Λακεδαιμόνιοι μὲν μάλιστα τῶν ἄλλων Δωριέων τὰ πάτρια διαφυλάττουσιν, Θεσσαλοὶ δὲ (οὗτοι γάρ εἰσιν <οἱ> τὴν ἀρχὴν τοῦ γένους Αἰολεῦσιν μεταδόντες) παραπλήσιον αἰεὶ ποιοῦνται τοῦ βίου τὴν ἀγωγήν, Ἰώνων δὲ τὸ πολὺ πλῆθος ἠλλοίωται διὰ τὸ συμπεριφέρεσθαι τοῖς αἰεὶ δυναστεύουσιν αὐτοῖς τῶν βαρβάρων. τὴν οὖν ἀγωγὴν τῆς μελῳδίας ἣν οἱ Δωριεῖς ἐποιοῦντο Δώριον ἐκάλουν ἁρμονίαν, ἐκάλουν δὲ καὶ Αἰολίδα ἁρμονίαν ἣν Αἰολεῖς ᾖδον, Ἰαστὶ δὲ τὴν τρίτην ἔφασκον ἣν ἤκουον ᾀδόντων τῶν Ἰώνων. ἡ μὲν οὖν Δώριος ἁρμονία τὸ ἀνδρῶδες ἐμφαίνει καὶ τὸ μεγαλοπρεπὲς καὶ οὐ διακεχυμένον οὐδ' ἱλαρόν, ἀλλὰ σκυθρωπὸν καὶ σφοδρόν, οὔτε δὲ ποικίλον οὔτε πολύτροπον. τὸ δὲ τῶν Αἰολέων ἦθος ἔχει τὸ γαῦρον καὶ ὀγκῶδες, ἔτι δὲ ὑπόχαυνον, ὁμολογεῖ δὲ ταῦτα ταῖς ἱπποτροφίαις αὐτῶν καὶ ξενοδοχίαις· οὐ πανοῦργον δέ, ἀλλὰ ἐξηρμένον καὶ τεθαρρηκός, διὸ καὶ οἰκεῖόν ἐστ' αὐτοῖς ἡ φιλοποσία καὶ τὰ ἐρωτικὰ καὶ πᾶσα ἡ περὶ τὴν δίαιταν ἄνεσις. διόπερ ἔχουσι τὸ τῆς ὑποδωρίου καλουμένης ἁρμονίας ἦθος· αὕτη γάρ ἐστι, φησὶν ὁ Ἡρακλείδης, ἣν ἐκάλουν Αἰολίδα … πρότερον μὲν οὖν,

> ὡς ἔφην, Αἰολίδα αὐτὴν ἐκάλουν, ὕστερον δ᾽ ὑποδώριον, ὥσπερ ἔνιοί φασιν, ἐν τοῖς αὐλοῖς τετάχθαι νομίσαντες αὐτὴν ὑπὸ τὴν Δώριον ἁρμονίαν. ἐμοὶ δὲ δοκεῖ ὁρῶντας αὐτοὺς τὸν ὄγκον καὶ τὸ προσποίημα τῆς καλοκἀγαθίας ἐν τοῖς τῆς ἁρμονίας ἤθεσιν Δώριον μὲν αὐτὴν οὐ νομίζειν, προσεμφερῆ δέ πως ἐκείνῃ· διόπερ ὑποδώριον ἐκάλεσαν, ὡς τὸ προσεμφερὲς τῷ λευκῷ ὑπόλευκον καὶ τὸ μὴ γλυκὺ μὲν ἐγγὺς δὲ τούτου λέγομεν ὑπόγλυκυ· οὕτως καὶ ὑποδώριον τὸ μὴ πάνυ Δώριον.
>
> fr. 163 Wehrli (= Ath. 14.624c–25a)

Heraclides suggests here that there was no such mode as Phrygian or Lydian, only the three modes with Greek names (Dorian, Aiolian, Ionian); he carries on to explain how each of the modes took its name from the music of those who used it. In the case of the Ionian mode, the Ionians (due to their ethnic flexibility) abandoned the traditional form of their music and adopted a new one. Heraclides recovers the Aiolian mode from references in Pratinas and Lasus (here omitted: they were cited above, p. 229) which he joins with the contemporary musical setting of Lasus' hymn in the Hypodorian mode. His most substantive explanation, however, rests on his appreciation of the characteristics of the Hypodorian mode, matching the character of the Thessalians – note the care to explain that these 'gave a share of the origins of the Aiolians' (τὴν ἀρχὴν τοῦ γένους Αἰολεῦσιν μεταδόντες, 624c).[607] Heraclides' argument shows him to be uninterested in the technicalities of the mode, but it does make two essential points in explicit fashion: a belief in the regional sources of the modes, connected to the migratory origins of the Aiolians in Thessaly in particular, and the view that the modes demonstrated the particular characteristics of each Greek ethnic group:

[607] The value of μεταδίδωμι here has not always been properly appreciated; Olson translates 'the origin of the Aiolian group can be traced back to them', but see *LSJ* s.v. 2.

> The Aeolic character is haughty and bombastic, as well as a bit conceited, and these characteristics fit their interest in horse-breeding and their emphasis on hospitality; they are not treacherous but dignified and confident, which is why they enjoy drinking, sex, and everything else associated with a relaxed lifestyle. Their character thus fits the so-called hypodoric scale; for according to Heraclides, this is how people referred to the Aeolic scale.
>
> Ath. 14.624e, trans. Olson (2011)

It has sometimes been assumed that Heraclides' rediscovery of the Aiolian mode was really an invention of his own; his explicit reasoning (which is reported, rather than quoted, by Athenaeus) assumes only a subjective parallel between the ἦθος of the Thessalians and the ἦθος of the Hypodorian mode. However, he may have had more reasonable grounds: we have already seen Hypodorian represented the lowest key in the earliest references of Aiolian mode epithets such as βαρύβρομον in the tonic system of Aristoxenus, which was probably derived from the systematized modal system reported by Aristides Quintilianus in Book 10.

Heraclides' reformation is more challenging, but not untenable. The three modes which he locates in Greek ethnic terminology seem to be part of an *a priori* assumption that ethnicity is significant in music (and, indeed, that modes were particularly Greek). It is clear enough too that Heraclides did not think that the Aiolian mode was entirely unknown to his audience, although its terminology needed some refreshing. Heraclides' preoccupation is with the ἤθη relative to the modes and the ethnic groups of Greece, and he makes no actual reference to the acoustic reality of the modes, though even in the mid-fourth century he was probably still well aware of what the different modes sounded like.

6.6 Conclusions

The Greeks used ethnonyms for their music, particularly as the names of the tuning systems for their instruments. But studies of ancient Greek music often neglect the

substance of these names. They are discussed, if at all, as regional names, although they are slightly vague descriptors for regions; the vocabulary used is often parallel to that used for dialects, other adverbs. Most importantly, as we have seen some of our sources outright associate these with immigration and mythology, with ethnic characteristics and stereotypes, with the development of regional musical traditions and famous practitioners. These should not be neglected: Heraclides attributed characteristics to Aiolian music which went far beyond the purely phonic, for example, in referring to the Aiolian mode as haughty and bombastic. Part of this was a tendentious argument similar to that which Plato set out for the modes, but part of it also reflects the kinds of value judgements common in ethnic discourse, which Vlassopoulos were lacking in the case of the Aiolians. Music was an essential part of Aiolian culture. It seems that Aiolian mode was phonically distinct, but it also had social and historical valuations which could be exploited to promote the Aiolians' relationship with early Spartan musical culture through Terpander, and developed by Pindar is his epinicia as poetic self-reflection and promotion. The discourse suggests to us that musical valuations were a part of the popular culture. My next section, on the social valuations of speaking, goes beyond and important part of culture to a completely inevitable one: language.

7. Aiolian Dialects

The identification of a group (or 'family') of Greek dialects including Boiotian, Lesbian–Aiolic and Thessalian, traditionally referred to as Aiolic, has been fundamental to the recognition of the Aiolic ethnic group in modern scholarship. Several scholars have however recently brought under new scrutiny the evidence for considering these three separate dialects as one group, noting that they are not only geographically separated but often linguistically quite distinct.[608] The criticism arises from strict application of linguistic principles of language development, without reference to ethnicity *per se*,[609] but the results do undermine linguistic support for Aiolian ethnicity. Moreover, the relevance of dialectology to Greek ethnicities, once a mainstay, has been relegated to a much-reduced place in post-Hall scholarship on ethnicity.

Here I wish to revisit both the Aiolic dialect group as a historical reality and the question of dialects as an imagined shared trait which can play a significant role in social interaction. I begin with discussions of linguistic attitudes in practice, in a discussion of moral language and dialect in Plato's *Protagoras*, and the more explicit use of language as a heuristic tool for ethnicity in the ancient world. I will reconsider Jonathan Hall's contention that the differences between Greek dialects were not known clearly enough to the Greeks to be used on their own merits as a distinctive characteristic of regional identities. I will argue that this is contradicted in no few narratives. The examination of contemporary Greek classifications of dialect and dialect grouping finds good evidence for an ancient awareness of an Aiolic group. I argue here that by treating linguistic

---

608 Vottéro (2006) and other essays in Brixhe and Vottéro (2006); Parker (2008).

609 Parker (2008) does explicitly refer to migratory myths, with Rose (2008), with obvious relevance to the Greek ethnic groups of Asia Minor.

perceptions as a social phenomenon which often relates to other criteria and indicia of identity, rather than examining purely linguistic data (which is in any case evidentially problematic as a source for sociological evidence), we can better understand why this Aiolic group existed in Greek linguistic awareness even if it did not have its origins in the historical development of the dialects. The final section rehearses a modern approach to Greek dialect development and the recent controversy over the objective existence of the group, in order to suggest that there were several endemic features of the Boiotian, Lesbian–Aiolic and Thessalian dialects which could form the basis of a perceived dialect group.

The 'Aiolic' dialect poses a terminological issue; it is sometimes asserted that ancient grammarians used the word Αἰολικός and related derivatives to refer to the dialects of Lesbos and Aiolis, and had no sense of the 'Aiolic family' – as we shall see, this is not entirely true.[610] Modern linguists nevertheless very often use the term 'Aiolic' for the family, and 'Lesbian' *vel sim.* for the dialect, highlighting in particular the literary dialect of Sappho and Alkaios. Here I focus on sociolinguistics, and therefore prefer the broader term 'Lesbian–Aiolic'; I will reserve 'Aiolic' for the putative group.[611]

7.1 Linguistic attitudes in Plato's *Protagoras*

The nuances of linguistic variation often prompt reactions, some conscious and some not, in listeners which shape not only their idea of the utterance but of the speaker also.[612] There is to some extent a symbiotic relationship between language and society: speech communities (those which use language in an independent manner to communicate

---

610 E.g. Parker (2008) 434.

611 Some, e.g. Vottéro (2006) 99 n. 1, maintain a distinction between Aiolian and 'Aiolian', i.e. dialect and group.

612 See Preston (2013) for an overview of language attitudes.

amongst themselves) both develop out of social groupings and use language to develop their communal identity. These processes are not always subtle, protracted or unconsciously executed: as Pierre Bourdieu argues,

> struggles over the ethnic or regional identity – in other words, over the properties (stigmata or emblems) linked with the *origin* through the *place* of origin **and its associated durable marks, such as accent** – are a particular case of the different struggles over classifications, …to impose the legitimate definition of the divisions of the social world and, thereby, to *make and unmake groups*.[613]

Thus members of speech communities use these language varieties both because it is how they communicate, and in order to communicate their identity to others. If linguistic nationalism, as examined by Benedict Anderson and Eric Hobsbawm, is not so evident in the ancient world, we cannot presume that Greek speakers did not respond to, let alone deploy, the many varieties of Greek as social tools as well as linguistic phenomena.

The study of such reactions is part of sociolinguistics, a well-established field, though it has been slower to find firm footing in the study of the ancient world. Greek 'accents' involve sometimes quite substantial differences of vocabulary, phonology and morphology. These differences were clearly not neutrally received. It so happens that one of the clearest examples of how an ancient Greek might react to the dialect of a fellow Greek is a somewhat surprising critique of Lesbian, treated in Plato's *Protagoras.* According to Prodikos, the Kean poet Simonides rebuked Pittakos of Mytilene for not recognizing that χαλεπόν was synonymous with κακόν; the dictum attributed to Pittakos ('it is hard [χαλεπὸν] to be a good man') therefore has an alarming tone to Simonides'

---

[613] Bourdieu (1991) 221 (bold emphasis mine); see further Joseph (2004).

Ionic ears. Prodikos speculates an underlying source of the problem: ὀνειδίζειν τῷ Πιττακῷ ὅτι τὰ ὀνόματα οὐκ ἠπίστατο ὀρθῶς διαιρεῖν ἅτε Λέσβιος ὢν καὶ ἐν φωνῇ βαρβάρῳ τεθραμμένος; (*Prot.* 341a). Here it seems likely that the two participial clauses make one cause: as a Lesbian, Pittakos spoke a barbarian language, dialect or register (φωνή), and therefore 'did not know how properly to make distinctions' of vocabulary.[614] Prodikos' choice of adjective to describe Lesbian has quite rightly aroused some consternation.[615] Lesbian dialect, although certainly distinct, was Greek by any modern standard; the adjective ξενικός was apparently the correct term for other dialects, at least in Athens (e.g. *Crat.* exx.).[616] The variations of Greek could be challenging to other Greeks (e.g. Thuc. 3.94.5), but they are not otherwise described as βάρβαρος,[617] a word of no small cultural import, and one which meant much more than simple linguistic difference in Plato's period.[618] To call Pittakos' language 'barbarous' seems like a slur; the conversation makes it clear that the characterization does not come from Simonides himself.

The Aiolic dialects are sometimes considered 'difficult'; modern unfamiliarity with the language, due both to the paucity of surviving Aiolic literature and to (necessarily) Athenocentric paedagogy, may play a role here, for it is not really in line with Greek attitudes on language to consider what was barbaric 'difficult'. Some Greeks, Plato included, instead saw barbarian νόμοι, including the linguistic, as indicative of the

---

614 Most scholars disregard that Pittakos' father was apparently Thracian (Douris, *FGrH* 76 F 75, cf. Thuc. 4.107, Alc. fr. 348) – certainly neither Plato nor any other source makes this point in connection with Pittakos' language, though we might assume that Pittakos did well speak some Thracian. Λέσβιος ὢν is curious *per se*.

615 Wernbe (1991).

616 Clackson (2015) 51.

617 Examples cited in Heath (2005): Aesch. *Sept.* 170 (in fact, ἑτεροφωνος, of the Seven), Ar. *Av.* 1700 (obscure?), [Xen.] *Ath. pol.* 2.8 (Athenian mixture of language – probably about Greek, really, but perhaps non-Greek influence, and obviously with prejudice).

618 Hall (1991) 4; Heath (2005) 197-; Hall (2002) 111–17.

Greeks' own prior customs: in a very literal sense primitive.[619] (As we shall see, there is some evidence that Aiolic dialects were conservative, though not primitive, but Plato was hardly an Indo-Europeanist.) Similarly, Thucydides' complaint that the Aitolians were of unintelligible language (ἀγνωστότατοι γλῶσσαν εἰσίν, 3.94.5), although not going so far as to associate Aitolian dialect with barbarian language, recalls his earlier statement that the north-western Greeks of his day were still in the habit of carrying arms, as the rest of Greece once did and the barbarians still do (1.5–6). Prodikos' statement is therefore unlikely to reflect other Greeks' difficulty understanding Aiolic speakers, and this would make little sense of the discussion at hand. The word φωνή takes on several meanings in the dialogue, but in this section it is twice more clearly used with the meaning 'dialect' (cf. 341b, 346d), and so we should probably not be in doubt that we are likely still talking about Greek, even if Socrates is sceptical that there is such a thing as Greek language. Ultimately it seems likely that φωνῇ βαρβάρῳ is part of an extended joke, but there is nevertheless some substance to Prodikos' ideas about the interaction of dialects between Pittakos and Simonides.

It makes better sense of Prodikos' argument to suggest that he thought Pittakos incapable of sufficiently sophisticated diction, and therefore susceptible to Simonides' moral critique, than to suggest that Prodikos found Aiolic brogue too thick to actually be a form of Greek.[620] Prodikos' comment cuts to the core of the *Protagoras'* topic, moral education: Pittakos, although a wise man, has been taught from early age (τεθραμμένος) a language which leads to moral error. In essence, the argument explores a one-word culture clash, but one which highlights fissures in the community of sophists – Socrates

---

619 Gera (2003) 184–95. On Herodotus' response to general Greek conceptions of barbarian language, see Munson (2005) 67–83.

620 *Pace* e.g. Hall (1997) 45.

assumes immediately that the Kean Prodikos is best qualified to interpret his compatriot's diction. Lesbian Pittakos too cannot give good morals. A degree of xenophobia is perhaps at play in the *Protagoras*' treatment of the diverse backgrounds of the sophist interlocutors, culminating in the exploration of whether every language is up to the task of teaching virtue.

It is clear that Plato did have an idea of the linguistic features of Lesbian. As the discussion of Simonides' poem concludes (*Prot.* 346d), Socrates notes somewhat pedantically that Simonides writes ἐπαίνημι for 'I praise' in order to address Pittakos, which he categorizes as φωνῇ … τῇ τῶν Μυτιληναίων, one of the examples of φωνή as 'dialect' in the *Protagoras*. It was indeed a feature of Lesbian–Aiolic morphology to use athematic terminations for a vowel-stem verb, the so-called Aiolic inflection, although it was not unique to Lesbian.[621] By contrast, in a fragment quoted earlier in the dialogue, Simonides (unremarked by the interlocutors) uses the natural Ionic inflection of the root, ἐπαινέω. The effect of using ἐπαίνημι instead of ἐπαινέω, both quite valid forms within their own dialect, is rather difficult to translate into English. Such dialect 'crossing', borrowing of features or dialect *in toto* as a matter of style, is not at all uncommon in Greek poetry; [622] Simonides himself crosses between Ionic and Doric in various poems. Socrates nevertheless sees a finer point in the choice of the word; for him, ἐπαίνημι underlines Simonides' harangue, turning a general 'I praise whomever' dictum into a more direct rebuke of Pittakos.

What Prodikos' passing explanation of Simonides' critique demonstrates is the attitudinal potential of diction. Socrates shows us that the Greeks were not inured to the

---

621 Buck (1955) sec. 157; Simonides' dialogue with Pittakos eliminates other candidates from play here.
622 'Crossing' as a distinct phenomenon from 'code-switching' originates with Rampton (1995).

prevalent morphological variations of their poetry, or at least not every Greek was. Neither speaker is directly concerned with linguistic analysis; indeed, although the persuasive potential of φωνή is an important part of the *Protagoras'* philosophy,[623] the question of dialect is largely a joking sideline to the more serious consideration of moral education. Lesbian dialect, as understood by Socrates and Prodikos, and aided along by context, nevertheless forms the basis of some potentially significant judgments not only of what is being said, but of the nature of the speaker. Moreover its linguistic features are known and can be deployed to deliberate effect, even by a non-native speaker.

7.2 Dialect difference and consciousness

Dialect grouping is not simply a 'heuristic fiction'.[624] Dialect is part of the *imaginaire*. No two humans speak exactly the same language: hence 'idiolect', the language of the individual, is the only level of linguistic analysis which does not in fact require some setting aside of variaton, albeit sometimes quite minimal, to group together speakers. Beyond the idiolect lies a substantial range of possible groupings of idiolects. The term ''lect' is sometimes used technically to refer to linguistic varieties and all forms of *heteroglossia*, avoiding the general connotation of 'dialect' as a regional (and non-standard) variety without requiring a raft of neologisms (ethnolect, etc.). Idiolect groupings overlap in complex ways, predicated on social structures – thus women's vs. men's speech, regional 'lect, ethnic 'lect, register (situational 'lect, but very often with an inflection of economic class).[625] I have said predicated, but as discussed cause and effect is a real hen-and-egg problem: as language can reinforce social difference to the

623 Quintela (2009).
624 *Contra* Collinge (1973) 295.
625 Joseph (2004) 41–65.

point of constructing it. To some extent, 'lects operate as linguistic tools not only in allowing communication within a speech community, but also because in many cases many speakers have at least partial communicative competence in 'lects which they do not typically employ. With Greek dialects, this is very often framed as 'mutual intelligibility' of dialects, a phenomenon to which Jonathan Hall is quite resistant (discussed further below). Communicative competence occurs between a wide range of 'lectal heteroglosses, however,[626] and often therefore singly or in combination suggest part of the identity of the speaker to the conversant. This can result in unconscious crossing: psychological studies have shown that humans are more likely to mimic the behaviour, including language, of people whom they are predisposed to like, and likewise more predisposed to like people who mimic their behaviour.[627] It is the attitudinal response, whereby listeners make judgements based on linguistic performance, which is of primary concern to us here.

The boundaries between dialects are equally a matter of construction, not simply of objectively measureable differences. Linguists traditionally refer to scientifically identified dialects as 'isogloss bundles'; that is, dialects are formed by a significant (geographical) overlap of individual distinctive features, but it is very often the case that one isogloss spreads beyond the geographic distribution of another, even if they do overlap substantially. The ττ~σσ isogloss groups Attica, Euboia and Boiotia in some periods, while the η~α isogloss (from original [a:]) separates them.[628] Boiotian features extended south as far as Aigosthena.[629] The idea of Boiotian and Attic dialects

626 See further Willi (2003).
627 See Adank et al. (2013) with earlier bibliography.
628 Colvin (2004).
629 *SEG* 46 514; see Beck and Ganter (2015) 156.

nevertheless persists. One reason is the holistic nature of language perception, which does not necessarily note features in isolation: the fission of language into isoglosses may be a misleading methodology.

Another, and more significant for these purposes, reason is that dialect boundaries are not a phenomenon disengaged from other human boundaries. Not only geographical features but geopolitically defined spaces are sometimes, but not always, determinants of dialect boundaries.[630] On the other hand, studies of Dutch speakers in the first half of the twentieth century, some of the earliest investigations of dialect perception, investigated perceived similarities of dialect.[631] These showed that in spite of an apparent continuum of dialect across the Dutch–German border, speakers generally did not think that speakers across the border shared their dialect: the national border also designated a traditional *language* border which was more salient than the actual speech. (The growing influence of Standard Dutch and German was perhaps already a factor.) It seems that the perception was not even reciprocal: speakers in Germany were more ready to identify with speakers in the Netherlands than *vice versa*.

Until about twenty years ago, dialectal difference was often considered a significant feature of Greek ethnicities: in 1995, Jonathan Hall traced the diminution of other aspects of ethnic identity over the course of nineteenth- and twentieth-century classical scholarship, until linguistic groups and ethnicities were near synonymous.[632] For his part, Hall has argued that language 'need not be a stable dimension within ethnic

---

630 See Britain (2013) for an overview of studies on relationships between space and language.

631 See essays in Preston (1999) pt.1 for an overview of the Dutch studies, and esp. chapter 3 by Kremer, on the national boundary. The 'little arrows' methodology of study has prompted significant controversy; a similar phenomenon however is seen in recent studies of American dialects which show a perceived correlation between state boundaries and dialect difference.

632 J.M. Hall (1996) 83–85.

identification',[633] and that Greek perceptions of dialect were not strong enough to operate effectively as the basis of ethnic differentiation:

> …the lateral operation of linguistic accommodation between dialects belonging to different dialect groups and the considerable heterogeneity within these dialect groups means that the Greeks themselves were incapable of identifying ethnic groups through linguistic cues alone.[634]

As Hall and others have noted, it is not always evident that Greeks did attempt to adjust their dialect, though accommodation is a persistent feature of communication.[635] Hall argues that language is not always and everywhere a feature of ethnic identity, and cites modern comparative cases where this is the case. But if Greeks did not place any stock in their own dialect as part of their identity, it would be surprising to find evidence of Greeks using dialect to determine another's ethnicity – and yet we do find such evidence. As I will now discuss, several cases suggest that it was considered quite valid to make a judgement of ethnicity, at least initially, based on the speech of someone just encountered.

The earliest example comes from Attic tragedy. Sophocles' Philoktetes, astonished to encounter another human being for the first time in his long exile on Lemnos, confronts young Neoptolemos:

> Φιλ. ἰὼ ξένοι,
> τίνες ποτ᾽ ἐς γῆν τήνδε κἀκ ποίας πάτρας
> κατέσχετ᾽ οὔτ᾽ εὔορμον οὔτ᾽ οἰκουμένην;
> ποίας ἂν ὑμᾶς πατρίδος ἢ γένους ποτὲ
> τύχοιμ᾽ ἂν εἰπών; σχῆμα μὲν γὰρ Ἑλλάδος
> στολῆς ὑπάρχει προσφιλεστάτης ἐμοί·
> φωνῆς δ᾽ ἀκοῦσαι βούλομαι· καὶ μή μ᾽ ὄκνῳ

[633] Hall (1997) 180–81.
[634] Hall (1997) 181.
[635] See also Hall (1997) 172–73; on linguistic accommodation, see Giles and Ogay (2006).

δείσαντες ἐκπλαγῆτ᾽ ἀπηγριωμένον,
ἀλλ᾽ οἰκτίσαντες ἄνδρα δύστηνον, μόνον,
ἔρημον ὦδε κἄφιλον κακούμενον,
φωνήσατ᾽, εἴπερ ὡς φίλοι προσήκετε.
ἀλλ᾽ ἀνταμείψασθ᾽· οὐ γὰρ εἰκὸς οὔτ᾽ ἐμὲ
ὑμῶν ἁμαρτεῖν τοῦτό γ᾽ οὔθ᾽ ὑμᾶς ἐμοῦ.
Νεοπ. ἀλλ᾽, ὦ ξέν᾽, ἴσθι τοῦτο πρῶτον, οὕνεκα
Ἕλληνές ἐσμεν· τοῦτο γὰρ βούλει μαθεῖν.
Φιλ. ὦ φίλτατον φώνημα· φεῦ τὸ καὶ λαβεῖν
πρόσφθεγμα τοιοῦδ᾽ ἀνδρὸς ἐν χρόνῳ μακρῷ.

Soph. *Phil.* 220–35

Philoktetes' questions include 'from which country or tribe would I rightly say you are?' This, broadly in line with standard Greek *politesse*, would usually prompt a discussion of kinship. Philoktetes however forestalls Neoptolemos' answer. He has leapt to a conclusion from Neoptolemos' dress: and so he asks Neoptolemos to speak. Neoptolemos' response is doubly clear: 'I am Greek' (Ἕλληνές ἐσμεν), he says in Greek. As Philoktetes replies, ὦ φίλτατον φώνημα – both the thing said and the way in which Neoptolemos says it.[636] Sophocles' scene responds to a scene in Euripides' version of the Philoktetes myth, which survives largely in a recondite comparison of tragic renditions of *Philoctetes* by the orator Dio Chrysostom, including the versions of Sophocles, Aeschylus, and Euripides: in Euripides, to deceive Philoktetes without mortal aid Odysseus needs Athena to change his appearance and way of speaking.[637] If Dio's paraphrase is accurate, so camouflaged, Odysseus has to assert that he is Greek: indeed, he says in quick succession that he is Argive, Achaean and Hellene. We can see, in these

[636] On the question of χαρακτήρ, the *Philoktetes* makes much of Neoptolemos' *physis* in terms of his inheritance from his father; the suggestion that he speaks as his father did is an interesting inflection of this.

[637] Dio 52.6 attributes this piece of the story to Homer, apparently in reference to *Odyssey* 13.

two inversions of the same moment, a clear prioritization of language as sufficient criteria to determine someone's ethnicity.

Hall notes the example of the Messenians whom Demosthenes placed in the vanguard of an assault on Ambraciots at Idomene in 425:[638]

> ἅμα ὄρθρῳ ἐπιπίπτει τοῖς Ἀμπρακιώταις ἔτι ἐν ταῖς εὐναῖς καὶ οὐ προῃσθημένοις τὰ γεγενημένα, ἀλλὰ πολὺ μᾶλλον νομίσασι τοὺς ἑαυτῶν εἶναι· καὶ γὰρ τοὺς Μεσσηνίους πρώτους ἐπίτηδες ὁ Δημοσθένης προύταξε καὶ προσαγορεύειν ἐκέλευε, Δωρίδα τε γλῶσσαν ἱέντας καὶ τοῖς προφύλαξι πίστιν παρεχομένους, ἅμα δὲ καὶ οὐ καθορωμένους τῇ ὄψει νυκτὸς ἔτι οὔσης.
>
> Thuc. 3.112

The Athenian force was able to pass because the Messenians' Doric accent (γλῶσσαν) fooled the sentinels; the surprised Ambraciots had thought that the force was made up of their own allies (τοὺς ἑαυτῶν), perhaps even Lakedaimonians.[639] Hall suggests that these Messenians must have picked up North-west Greek during their exile in Naupaktos (cf. Thuc. 1.103.3). This is possible, although they had not in fact been in Naupaktos long, but it goes directly against Thucydides' identification of the Messenians' dialect: they were speaking in Δωρίδα γλῶσσαν.[640] The polity which went to Naupaktos used the name 'Messenians', and seems to have coexisted with, rather than integrated with the Naupaktians. Curious in particular is the final suggestion that the game would have been up if the Ambraciots had *seen* the Messenians: presumably, had observed their dress.

Greek sources do occasionally represent the failures of dialect as a reliable indicium of identity, as in Xenophon's report of a certain Apollonides who exhorted the

---

638 J.M. Hall (1996) 86.

639 Hall (2003) 189 n. 57.

640 Davies (1987) observes that the Messenians' dialect could only be considered Dorian by abstraction: it cannot be *mistaken* for another Dorian group's dialect.

ten thousand to submit to the Great King (*Anab.* 3.1.26–32); he spoke in Boiotian dialect, or perhaps 'put on a Boiotian accent': βοιωτάζων τῇ φωνῇ, though he is outed as a Lydian:

> ἐντεῦθεν ὑπολαβὼν Ἀγασίας Στυμφάλιος εἶπεν· ἀλλὰ τούτῳ γε οὔτε τῆς Βοιωτίας προσήκει οὐδὲν οὔτε τῆς Ἑλλάδος παντάπασιν, ἐπεὶ ἐγὼ αὐτὸν εἶδον ὥσπερ Λυδὸν ἀμφότερα τὰ ὦτα τετρυπημένον.
>
> Xen. *Anab.* 3.1.31

Xenophon thoroughly rebukes Apollonides for his betrayal of the Greek cause before Apollonides is caught out. Agasias notices that Apollonides' ears are pierced in Lydian fashion, and therefore he cannot be Greek of any kind. Apparently Apollonides wore the same clothes as the mercenaries, leaving only his more permanent piercings to give him away; more importantly, although Xenophon reports his argument indirectly, and so we cannot know exactly how Apollonides mimicked Boiotian dialect, on the apparent basis of this language alone Agasias both pinpoints the dialect and presumes that Apollonides wishes to present himself as a Boiotian. The exchange is predicated on Greeks' ability to recognize the character of a dialect in passing speech, problematizing only the use of that dialect as a perfect indicator of origin. The *Anabasis* as a whole offers a rather curious picture of a dialectal ecosystem: in a population perhaps larger than that of some *poleis*, Greeks of many backgrounds mingled:[641] Apollonides' case may suggest that there did not arise a military *koine*; more importantly, he uses a specific dialect in order to be recognized as Greek. It is not in fact clear whether Apollonides is a Lydian fluent in a distant Greek accent, and perhaps with an assumed name, or a Boiotian who has gone

[641] See list in Anson (2009) n.18. As Vottéro (2006) 106–7 notes there are both native dialects (Apollonides? Laconian, 6.6.34, 7.6.39) and Boiotians speaking Attic (2.4.15; 3.1.4, 9; 7.1.33): 'Xénophon semble *faire* parler toute la troupe en attique' (emphasis mine).

native in Asia Minor.[642] Tsagalis suggests that Xenophon foreshadows the falseness of Apollonides' identity by introducing him with a note on his assumed accent rather than a toponymic, though he allows that Xenophon is coy in his description of the event.[643]

A pan-Hellenic literary culture, if such a thing indeed existed, must have helped to spread awareness of the somewhat abstracted literary forms of the dialects;[644] we should not presume that remote Arkadians had much less contact with dialect variation than cosmopolitan Athenians, only contact of a less direct type.[645] It has often been noted in scholarship on Greek dialectology that it is the literary dialects which form the framework for scholarly discussion of Greek vernacular. It is not out of the question that Greek literature, in its various normal dialects, was indeed a factor in popular perception of the dialects too.[646] It is by no means obvious how the literary dialects acquired their ethnic names, and some consideration should be given to whether the abstraction of the literary forms from vernacular speech represents a form of accommodation which identified specific linguistic features as fundamental to the group. The artifice of the Homeric literary *Kunstsprache* does suggest some kind of featural isolation, demonstrated by the combination of Aiolic inflections with Ionic stems, e.g. dat. pl. νέεσσι for ναῦσιν. The grammarians' name Aiolic for Sappho and Alcaeus' dialect is at the very least intended to create a literary dialect parallel to Ionic and Doric, but we have

---

642 Anson (2009) 22 renders (τούτῳ γε) οὔτε τῆς Βοιωτίας (προσήκει) οὐδὲν οὔτε τῆς Ἑλλάδος παντάπασιν as 'neither a Boeotian, nor from any part of Greece', I think somewhat misleadingly; προσήκει can have a sense of kinship and origin (*LSJ* s.v. III.3), but this is often qualified γένει *vel sim*.

643 Tsagalis (2009) 457–8.

644 Anson (2009) 24–25.

645 *Contra* J.M. Hall (1996) 95.

646 Further work from a historical perspective on the early appreciation of the so-called 'literary dialects' and *Kunstsprache* would be welcome.

already seen both Herodotus and Thucydides use the ethnic terms for these dialects as vernacular languages.

Moreover, Aristophanes drops into Dorian and Boiotian dialects, with considerable accuracy, to represent Spartan, Megarian and Boiotian characters. However, he is somewhat careful to make sure that his audience is forewarned: Lysistrata addresses Lampito, ὦ φιλτάτη Λάκαινα χαῖρε Λαμπιτοῖ, before the Spartan woman speaks – and Lampito fits six Laconian dialectal features and one substantial stereotype into her first two lines (*Lys.* 76–82). So too the Megarian merchant of the *Acharnians* (721), while the Boiotian arrives on the scene swearing to Herakles and Iolas, chased by fluteplayers 'from Thebes', and accompanied by one Ismenias (860–63). It seems that Aristophanes had full faith in his audience's ability to comprehend a non-Attic accent, but not necessarily to recognize them quickly and accurately, while other comic poets simply used lexical items to give the impression of Boiotians speaking their own dialect.[647] It has sometimes been argued that Aristophanes used Boiotian (and any non-Attic language) as a comic element *per se*, which is a question of the audience's reaction to language; Colvin has however noted that there is little reason to think that a language with which the Athenians had quite regular contact would have been inherently humorous.[648]

What these comic mimeses of dialect, and other such instances, do give us evidence of is the subjective appreciation of language features. Plato puts the phrase ἴττω Ζεύς into the mouth of the Theban Kebes (*Phaedo* 62a): as Stephen Colvin notes, the imperative is Boiotian in form (Att. ἴστω), and its combination with Ζεύς is not found in

647 Vottéro (2006) 107.
648 Colvin (1999) 301–6.

Attic, but Plato regularizes the name of the god from the Boiotian form Δεύς; Aristophanes, using the same phrase, does not (*Ach.* 911).[649] It is not necessary to assert that a development occurred in Boiotian in between the two(!), nor that one or both texts has been changed by copyists. It seems quite likely that both authors included what was necessary to paint a linguistic picture within the grasp of their presumed audience.[650]

Anna Morpurgo Davies, exploring the idea of an abstract notion of Greek as a language in the Classical period, when the reality was a set of neighbouring languages, noted that the Greeks possessed an idea of Greek dialects, and of dialect groups, prefiguring the grammarians' identification of dialects. [651]What we have seen here is the execution of that language awareness in the field of identity, both as a tool for finding common ground and identifying outsiders, and a way of creating identity in literary works whereby careful attention to linguistic features allows Aristophanes and Plato to fill out characters, in a way which we find somewhat stereotypical. These demonstrate not only the mutual intelligibility of Greek dialects but a somewhat selective appreciation of linguistic features.

7.3 Dialect classification and dialect perception

The recognition of the Aiolic dialect group has a long history: the family of Boiotian, Lesbian–Aiolic and Thessalian was identified as one of the major branches of Greek language by Ahrens, in the first modern work on Greek dialectology (*De Graecae Linguae Dialectis*, 1846). Subsequent work on the classification of Greek, taking into account new evidence, brought the Thessalian dialect into the same group. Some analyses

649 Colvin (1999) 142.
650 Brixhe and Vottéro (2006) 107.
651 Davies (1987).

struggled with the position of the dialect group within the wider family tree of Greek dialects: although its basic characteristics are quite similar to Doric and North-Western Greek, as Strabo seems to have seen, it nevertheless demonstrates some features which are distinctly East Greek (Mycenaean, Attic–Ionic, Arcado-Cypriot), including the first person plural ending -μεν (for WGk –μες) and certain vocalisms. Nevertheless it has generally been accepted that these three dialects were a coherent group. Holt Parker has recently suggested that the Aiolic dialect family is the result of modern linguistic analysis, beginning with Ahrens, but lacking ancient evidence for the conglomeration of Boiotian, Thessalian and Lesbian–Aiolic.

Although evidence for an ancient conception of the Aiolic family is scarce, it is not entirely true that ancient scholarship has no such conception whatsoever:[652] Herodian, explaining the unusual form of εἰμί (without any awareness, of course, of the original form **esmi*), refers to Αἰολεῖς and Βοιωτοί while discussing τὴν Αἰολίδα διάλεκτον. Two scholiasts on Dionysius Thrax suggests that Boiotian and Lesbian make up the Aiolic dialect: Αἰολὶς μία (διάλεκτος), ὑφ᾽ ἣν εἰσι γλῶσσαι πολλαί, Βοιωτῶν καὶ Λεσβίων καὶ ἄλλων (Σ *G.G.* 1.3.302,33–303,4; cf. I.3.309,23–36).[653] A third scholion relates the Aiolic dialects quite specifically to their literary output, i.e. Corinna's Boiotian, Sappho's Lesbian; if the literary modes are the basis of this description, then the absence of Thesslian is not especially surprising. Numerous glosses of otherwise unattested words in ancient lexicographers' treatises refer to 'Aiolic', and it is not always possible to determine what this really means.

---

652 Vottéro (2006) 101–3.

653 Vottéro (2006) 102; Heraclides does separate Boiotian from Aiolic: Eustathius, *Iliad* 734.50f.

Most curious, and unquestionably problematic for our study of Aiolic dialect classification, is the somewhat involved explanation of the antiquity of Greek dialects from Strabo, quoted in part in the introduction to this thesis. Strabo explains the relevance of dialect to the various Greek tribes at the outset of his description of mainland Greece:

> Ἑλλάδος μὲν οὖν πολλὰ ἔθνη γεγένηται, τὰ δ᾽ ἀνωτάτω τοσαῦτα ὅσας καὶ διαλέκτους παρειλήφαμεν τὰς Ἑλληνίδας· τούτων δ᾽ αὐτῶν τεττάρων οὐσῶν τὴν μὲν Ἰάδα τῇ παλαιᾷ Ἀτθίδι τὴν αὐτὴν φαμέν (καὶ γὰρ Ἴωνες ἐκαλοῦντο οἱ τότε Ἀττικοί, καὶ ἐκεῖθέν εἰσιν οἱ τὴν Ἀσίαν ἐποικήσαντες Ἴωνες καὶ χρησάμενοι τῇ νῦν λεγομένῃ γλώττῃ Ἰάδι), τὴν δὲ Δωρίδα τῇ Αἰολίδι· πάντες γὰρ οἱ ἐκτὸς Ἰσθμοῦ πλὴν Ἀθηναίων καὶ Μεγαρέων καὶ τῶν περὶ τὸν Παρνασσὸν Δωριέων καὶ νῦν ἔτι Αἰολεῖς καλοῦνται. καὶ τοὺς Δωριέας δὲ ὀλίγους ὄντας καὶ τραχυτάτην οἰκοῦντας χώραν εἰκός ἐστι τῷ ἀνεπιμίκτῳ παρατρέψαι τὴν γλῶτταν καὶ τὰ ἄλλα ἔθη πρὸς τὸ μὴ ὁμογενές, ὁμογενεῖς πρότερον ὄντας. τοῦτο δ᾽ αὐτὸ καὶ τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις συνέβη, λεπτόγεών τε καὶ τραχεῖαν οἰκοῦντας χώραν ἀπορθήτους μεῖναι διὰ τοῦτο καὶ αὐτόχθονας νομισθῆναι φησὶν ὁ Θουκυδίδης, κατέχοντας τὴν αὐτὴν ἀεί, μηδενὸς ἐξελαύνοντος αὐτοὺς μηδ᾽ ἐπιθυμοῦντος ἔχειν τὴν ἐκείνων· τοῦτο τοίνυν αὐτὸ καὶ τοῦ ἑτερογλώττου καὶ τοῦ ἑτεροεθοῦς αἴτιον, ὡς εἰκός, ὑπῆρξε καίπερ ὀλίγοις οὖσιν. οὕτω δὲ τοῦ Αἰολικοῦ πλήθους ἐπικρατοῦντος ἐν τοῖς ἐκτὸς Ἰσθμοῦ, καὶ οἱ ἐντὸς Αἰολεῖς πρότερον ἦσαν, εἶτ᾽ ἐμίχθησαν, Ἰώνων μὲν ἐκ τῆς Ἀττικῆς τὸν Αἰγιαλὸν κατασχόντων, τῶν δ᾽ Ἡρακλειδῶν τοὺς Δωριέας καταγαγόντων, ὑφ᾽ ὧν τά τε Μέγαρα ᾠκίσθη καὶ πολλαὶ τῶν ἐν τῇ Πελοποννήσῳ πόλεων. οἱ μὲν οὖν Ἴωνες ἐξέπεσον πάλιν ταχέως ὑπὸ Ἀχαιῶν, Αἰολικοῦ ἔθνους· ἐλείφθη δ᾽ ἐν τῇ Πελοποννήσῳ τὰ δύο ἔθνη, τό τε Αἰολικὸν καὶ τὸ Δωρικόν. ὅσοι μὲν οὖν ἧττον τοῖς Δωριεῦσιν ἐπεπλέκοντο (καθάπερ συνέβη τοῖς τε Ἀρκάσι καὶ τοῖς Ἠλείοις, τοῖς μὲν ὀρεινοῖς τελέως οὖσι καὶ οὐκ ἐμπεπτωκόσιν εἰς τὸν κλῆρον, τοῖς δ᾽ ἱεροῖς νομισθεῖσι τοῦ Ὀλυμπίου Διὸς καὶ καθ᾽ αὑτοὺς εἰρήνην ἄγουσι πολὺν χρόνον, ἄλλως τε καὶ τοῦ Αἰολικοῦ γένους οὖσι καὶ δεδεγμένοις τὴν Ὀξύλῳ συγκατελθοῦσαν στρατιὰν περὶ τὴν τῶν Ἡρακλειδῶν κάθοδον), οὗτοι αἰολιστὶ διελέχθησαν, οἱ δ᾽ ἄλλοι μικτῇ τινι ἐχρήσαντο ἐξ ἀμφοῖν,

> οἱ μὲν μᾶλλον οἱ δ᾽ ἧττον αἰολίζοντες· σχεδὸν δέ τι καὶ νῦν κατὰ πόλεις ἄλλοι ἄλλως διαλέγονται, δοκοῦσι δὲ δωρίζειν ἅπαντες διὰ τὴν συμβᾶσαν ἐπικράτειαν. τοσαῦτα μὲν οὖν τὰ τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἔθνη καὶ οὕτως, ὡς τύπῳ εἰπεῖν, ἀφωρισμένα. λέγωμεν δὴ διαλαβόντες ὃν χρὴ τρόπον τῇ τάξει περὶ αὐτῶν.
>
> Strabo 8.1.2

Strabo here paints a picture of the historical development of four Greek dialects from two original forms, with Doric and Attic both being developments in isolation from Aiolic and Ionic respectively. The development of Doric was supposed to have occurred in central Greece (τραχυτάτην οἰκοῦντας χώραν), although somewhat allusively framed, and its strength within the Peloponnese to have been a result of what a modern scholar would call language contact between the migratory Dorians and the original 'Aiolian' population after the return of the Herakleidai. More explicit is the statement that any Greek dialect which was neither Doric nor Attic–Ionic should be Aiolic, including Arkadian and Eleian (unmentioned: Phokian, Lokrian, Aitolian, Akarnanian…).

Both Parker and Vottéro have noted with some consternation Strabo's broad definition of Aiolic dialects, which not only does not make any clear reference to the three dialects included in the modern treatment of the group (though Boiotia, Thessaly and Lesbos clearly do fall within the geographical range suggested), but also involves several dialects which are definitely not closely related to the Aiolic family. Perhaps the most obvious underlying explanation of Strabo's linguistic map is that Dorian and Attic–Ionic have distinctive features which allow definition, while the Aiolic category serves as a catch-all group, which has no distinguishing features of its own. This latter-day

creation of a dialect is essential in particular to Parker's scepticism.[654] However, Strabo does not seem to envision an early Greek-speaking southern Balkans which diverged from a unitary dialect until the undistinguished parts became themselves isolates such as Eleian and Arkadian, engulfed by the new dialects (as Parker suggests), for at 14.5.26 he explicitly identifies two original tribes, Aiolian and Ionian. The Aiolic grouping implicitly rests on some supposedly shared characteristics, if not necessarily linguistic ones.

Although Hainsworth characterized Strabo's description as the 'most systematic piece of dialect study that has come down from antiquity',[655] no few scholars from Ahrens on have simply taken the view that Strabo is wrong on the facts. It should really be observed that there are no facts here; elsewhere Strabo observes occasions on which forms of a name diverges from the Attic form (e.g. Μυκαλεττός vs. Μυκαλεσσός, 9.2.11), but this is not reflective of a consistent dialectological practice underlying his description at the beginning of book eight. He makes no mention of the substantive difference between the dialects: each dialect is treated apparently as a cohesive whole, although the grammarians' distinction between διάλεκτος (group) and γλῶσσαι (dialects) is perhaps apparent in a reference to Ἰάδι γλώσσῃ as the Ionian reflex of the original Attic–Ionic group. The framework is instead one of isolation and of migration which produces contact, in all cases tied into the Greek traditions of their origins. It does seem in any case that the vocabulary for dialects here is reflective, like most ancient accounts, not of the vernacular but of the literary expressions. The only genuine linguistic point

---

654 Stevens (2006) also employs this explanation as part of the basis of 'Aeolism', i.e. the belief that Latin was substantially derived from an Aiolic dialect of Greek. Roman claims to descent from Trojans, i.e. the former inhabitants of Aiolis, also likely played a part.

655 Hainsworth (1967) 67.

which is offered as explanation comes in the concluding explanation of variations in the Peloponnese, and Strabo is not as attentive to variation within the dialects as he might first seem; his final statement is not that a variety of different dialects fall under the umbrella-term Doric, but that a variety of different dialects are named Doric due to the power of Dorians in the region (διὰ τὴν συμβᾶσαν ἐπικράτειαν). The actual cause of variation was simply how strong the Aiolic substrate is, or perhaps, given his comment on Eleian conservativism, how strong the ethnic identity of the Aiolian substrate was. This however is not a genuine analysis of language contact; as Hainsworth notes, mixture was a typical *explanans* in Greek scholarship for instances which did not suit a clear division.[656]

The discussion is therefore not scientific dialectology but an early example of perceptual study. As the beginning and ending statements make clear, the intent of the discussion was to give observable substance to the 'oldest tribes' (ἔθνη… , τὰ δ' ἀνωτάτω) in Greece, and throughout Strabo is concerned with detailing the shape and customs of population groups which were the subjects of longstanding Greek traditions – and not, it should be noted, very salient ones for Augustan Greece. Strabo does not in fact say that all Greeks outside the Isthmus spoke Aiolic, but that they were once called Aiolians; this is equally odd. It is possible that Strabo's discussion in general relies upon some earlier study; the only source cited is Thucydides' famous statement of Athenian autochthony (1.2), and the scope of the migrationary myths and tribal affiliations is in line with Classical and even Archaic Greek depictions, less the dialectal significance. Strabo's claim about the Aiolians does however bring to mind Thucydides' own claim, directly after the discussion of Athenian autochthony, that the Greeks had no common

---

656 Hainsworth (1967) 69.

name until the influence of Hellen and his sons spread throughout Greece: it seems most likely then that when Strabo refers to the earliest tribes and earliest dialects, he is referring back to exactly what Thucydides discusses, and acknowledging that the already well-established names of dialect groups are paralleled, if not directly based on, the mythological Hellenic stemma.

Assuming a linguistic rationalization of kinship mythology and regional identities helps to elucidate some of Strabo's more curious arguments: Elis receives the most direct discussion of its particular situation, and Strabo claims that it did not adopt Doric because of their Aiolic origins (τοῦ Αἰολικοῦ γένους οὖσι). Associating the western Peloponnese regions with Aiolic peoples make the best sense if understood as based in kinship mythology: Neleus son of Tyro and Kretheus (or Poseidon) was banished to this part of the world by his brother Pelias. The reference to Oxylos refers to a group who came in cooperation with the Herakleidai (under Oxylos, himself of Eleian origin) from Aitolia – another Aiolic area in Strabo's world, and therefore presumably not overrun by Dorians at the time of the supposed migration. The association of the Arkadians and Eleians too is not a simple bundle: as Pausanias notes (5.1.1), the old description of the five parts of the Peloponnese (i.e. Thuc. 1.10) might have taken Elis and Arkadia together. On the whole then we should not rely on Strabo as good evidence that Aiolic had lost its relevance, nor that it lacked substance in a much earlier age. The Greeks did, clearly, from the earliest stages of grammatical analysis, have a concept of dialect grouping which must have been related to their overall capacity to identify particular dialects.

The features which constitute linguistic varieties can be more or less objectively observed in the modern world, obviously much less so from ancient evidence. Jonathan Hall has argued that the ability to delineate Greek dialects relies strictly on the distance which modern observers have from the data:

> The Greeks of antiquity were certainly aware of dialectal variations, and they could probably have recognised certain lexical features as dialect-specific. They could not have failed to notice that other dialects were divergent in certain phonological and morphological respects, but it is extremely unlikely that they were then capable of using these isoglosses as linguistic cues in assigning speakers to the appropriate dialect groups.[657]

Hall's examples however fail to take into account that in most cases Greeks would not have been observing single features in isolation, but likely complete utterances. Other contextual information is also likely vital. Moreover, the observation of those features by non-specialists is a social phenomenon: there is a further distinction to be made between reaction to language (i.e. reception), and the description of language and its place in society (folk linguistics).

For example, many English speakers would expect speakers of British English to use a 'non-rhotic' accent, and American English a 'rhotic' one (e.g. *hard*, /ˈhɑːd/ vs /ˈhɑːrd/), when full examination of the isoglosses reveals that many areas of England, not to mention Scotland and Ireland, have inherited rhoticity.[658] The American North East maintains several areas of non-rhotic dialect, most notably Bostonian and New York accents, while a major socio-ethnolect, African American Vernacular English, is also generally non-rhotic.[659] In none of these cases, of course, would the average speaker think in terms of '(non-)rhotic' language; it is not even necessarily the case that they would think in terms of pronouncing /r/. Regional labels often make for useful handles for a

---

657 J.M. Hall (1996) 87–88.

658 Indeed the situation is even more complex, as rhotic dialects west of a line from Hastings to Chester differ had retroflex articulation of post-vocalic /r/, parts of Berkshire, Kent, Cheshire, Yorkshire and Lincolnshire alveolar articulation, and Northumberland uvular.

659 William Labov's studies of English in New York are fundamental to the development of modern sociolinguistic studies: see now Labov (2006).

holistic appreciation of language variation, e.g. a Yorkshire accent, a Midwest accent. It should be apparent that class and other social categories have been a factor in the perception of these dialects, as the overgeneralization selects features of British Received Pronunciation and General American.[660] Moreover, other perceptions adhere to the linguistic features: stigmatism of rhotic accents in modern Britain is certainly not a question of simple conformity to standard, and reactions are unsurprisingly influenced by the background of the observer as well as the observed.[661]

The *locus classicus* for perceived dialects in the Greek world, usually observed as an evidential problem, is Herodotus' description of the dialects of Ionia:[662] he says that there are four, but epigraphy evidences only one or two dialect *groups*, although there is clear variation between individual locales.[663] If we take Herodotus at his word, we must then assume that there was already in the fifth century also something like a Standard Ionic which is reflected in these texts. It is worth considering closely what Herodotus actually describes:

> γλῶσσαν δὲ οὐ τὴν αὐτὴν οὗτοι νενομίκασι, ἀλλὰ τρόπους τέσσερας παραγωγέων. Μίλητος μὲν αὐτέων πρώτη κέεται πόλις πρὸς μεσαμβρίην, μετὰ δὲ Μυοῦς τε καὶ Πριήνη. αὗται μὲν ἐν τῇ Καρίῃ κατοίκηνται κατὰ ταὐτὰ διαλεγόμεναι σφίσι, αἵδε δὲ ἐν τῇ Λυδίῃ, Ἔφεσος Κολοφὼν Λέβεδος Τέως Κλαζομεναὶ Φώκαια· αὗται δὲ αἱ πόλιες τῇσι πρότερον λεχθείσῃσι ὁμολογέουσι κατὰ γλῶσσαν οὐδέν, σφισι δὲ ὁμοφωνέουσι. ἔτι δὲ τρεῖς ὑπόλοιποι Ἰάδες πόλιες, τῶν αἱ δύο μὲν νήσους οἰκέαται, Σάμον τε καὶ Χίον, ἡ δὲ μία ἐν τῇ ἠπείρῳ ἵδρυται, Ἐρυθραί. Χῖοι μέν νυν καὶ Ἐρυθραῖοι κατὰ τὠυτὸ

[660] Loss of rhoticity seems however to have started in lower-class 'lects: Mugglestone (1995) 98–103.
[661] Giles (1970).
[662] Crielaard (2009) 45.
[663] Hall (1997) 171.

διαλέγονται, Σάμιοι δὲ ἐπ᾽ ἑωυτῶν μοῦνοι. οὗτοι χαρακτῆρες γλώσσης τέσσερες γίνονται.

Hdt. 1.142.3–4

Herodotus' vocabulary is untechnical – he refers to the dialects as τρόποι παραγωγέων or χαρακτῆρες γλώσσης. Παραγωγαί or 'perversions' of language is, apparently, a pejorative term:[664] this is our first clue that Herodotus' description does not rest on strict linguistic analysis. The second clue is that Herodotus describes only cities which he considers canonically Ionian – Smyrna, and his own Ionic-using Halicarnassos are not to be discussed. Two of the four groups are explicitly geopolitically divided: one dialect in Caria, another in Lydia. Erythrae and Chios are both close to each other and somewhat removed from the other poleis: a good environment for a shared dialect, and one which is in fact evident in the epigraphic record.[665] Samos is different from all others. This may be a historical reality, but on the other hand Jennifer Cramer's studies of acknowledged differences between dialects in the American South has suggested that most speakers perceive a clear and definitive difference between their own regional dialect and all others, which may not be apparent to those less familiar with the dialects of the region.[666] It has long been suspected (if not on wholly secure grounds) that Herodotus had some particular association with the Samians: a Samian source for this folk dialectography would explain the emphasis on Samos' exceptional dialect, and perhaps the organization from south to north, circling back to Samos.

It has been suggested that phonological features are more salient in the perception of dialects. The phonology of each Greek dialect, helpfully, is attested to some extent by the orthography, although other potentially salient features – and concerns – are not so

---

664 See details in Asheri, A. Lloyd, et al. (2007) 173.
665 Asheri, A. Lloyd, et al. (2007) 173.
666 Cramer (2016).

clear. What is important to note here is that it is the spoken language, not the written, which is fundamental to identity formation. Sociolinguistic approaches to historical dialects are an evidential minefield: modern methodology to language attitude research relies largely on survey of listeners' reactions to controlled examples, and often asks indirect questions. Almost all the evidence available to modern scholars of ancient Greek dialects, however, is mediated in some fashion, and so we rely largely on what Garrett classes as evidence on 'societal treatment'.[667] The potential for individual variation (both *between* individuals, and in an individual's own language) is substantial in any language, and perhaps even more so when speakers were isolated. But when it comes to Greek dialects we have almost no evidence which unequivocally reflects day-to-day speech.

Literature is not a natural reflection of spoken language. Moreover, the comparative method which was used in Alexandrian scholarship to edit the dialect of Classical texts levelled any linguistic variation, so that all literary dialects are in part Hellenistic constructions whatever their prior status as spoken idiom or *Kunstsprachen* – in each case presumably a prestige variety.[668] It has been generally suggested that Alkaios and Sappho's language is little removed from Lesbian vernacular (though not without poetic crossings often deemed epicisms),[669] but that the scholarly influence on unfamiliar Aiolic forms has distorted the evidence. The downfalls therefore of using literary evidence for dialect have already been well-observed; however epigraphic evidence is *not* unproblematic either when it comes to social factors.[670]

---

667 Garrett (2010).
668 Hooker (1977).
669 Hamm (1957); Hodot (1990) chap. 1; *contra* Tribulato (2010).
670 See Bile et al. (1984) on the limitations of linguistic reconstruction from epigraphy.

We may now turn to inscriptions. A substantial majority of the surviving inscriptions from ancient Greece can be classified as 'public', rather than 'private', texts. In such texts, we should expect not simply some formality of register but a generalized high degree of linguistic accommodation, perhaps even conscientiously reflective of the desired audience. Why, for example, was the apparently dialectally conscientious Simonides' epitaph for the Spartan dead at Thermopylai inscribed in Ionic? It was Simonides' native dialect, presumably, but many lyric poets were quite capable of crossing dialects; indeed Simonides used Laconicisms in places (perhaps including the controversial ῥήμασι in this epitaph).[671] It is unlikely overall that an elegiac couplet could not be composed in Laconian Doric. The use of Ionic appealed to epic associations – but with this come the advantage of a widely used, and therefore widely understood, literary dialect.

Dialect in epigraphy was no less susceptible to manipulation than literary works. There are very clear signs (even direct attestation) of attempts to regularize spelling of public documents in both Attica and Boeotia.[672] The orthographic reforms of Archinos at Athens might suggest that there was no particular concern to regulate language beyond orthography, but it was clear that the official change reflected a popular shift which was perhaps reflective of Athens' relationship with Ionian Greeks during the Sicilian and Ionian wars and hoped to pave the way to closer relations at the beginning of the fourth century.[673] We should not hesitate to acknowledge the ethnic potential of what are two essentially accommodating linguistic processes: the selection of the Ionic alphabet, and the apparently careful and ongoing approximation of written Boiotian to changes in

---

671 Mickey (1981): no particular tendency for verse inscriptions to assume Ionicism or Homericism.
672 See e.g. Vottéro (2006) 101 on the 'political' dialect of the Boiotian federation.
673 On motivations and background of Archinus' reforms, see Angour (1999).

spoken Boiotian. The achievement of these reforms, with their implicit centralized structures, demonstrate a clear degree of mediation between vernacular utterance and epigraphic record. Even more extreme regulation is perhaps possible: there is no evidence that the Halikarnassians spoke the Ionic which they notoriously used in their inscriptions; it would simply be astonishing if they used one dialect to write and another to speak, but we might ask about the number of Carian speakers in Halikarnassos too.[674] Perhaps less organized forms of dialect mediation are suggested by the standardized Doric of Thucydides' Spartan and Argive treaty (5.77, 79), although the transmitted text is not sound enough to be confident. We have to be optimistic, however, about the accuracy with which other alphabets represent the vowels produced by compensatory lengthening, which is a fundamental tool for distinguishing Greek dialects: for example, if the decree of Archinus had not brought new distinctions to Attic orthography, we might have little idea of the reality of the Attic vowel system.

The formal and municipal concerns of most epigraphy likewise give us texts which are neither individual nor idiomatic. As a final point, we must consider that vexed question of literacy: these texts reflect the concerns and language of only a portion of Greek society. Even rare graffiti and dipinti, the least mediated surviving texts, need not represent normal Greek: how could we identify slang or argot in isolated examples? They may very well be bellelettrist, too: again, the question of who had the education exactly to write arises. What we can recognize from the epigraphic record are morphological isogloss bundles, with a few phonological isoglosses reconstructed from comparisons of spelling. We are given some leeway by the fact that language grouping must be subjective. Given that regional 'lect or ethnic 'lect are only two of the possible divisions

[674] Hall (1997) 169 presumes a disjunction between Dorian ethnicity and Ionic language at Halikarnassos.

of language, it naturally follows that the particular features by which 'lects were distinguished were and are social constructs, and ones based on contemporary spoken language; the accommodations and mediations of the epigraphic process are a separate phenomenon, and so too is the aesthetic process which produced the language of Greek poetry (and, probably to a lesser degree, prose). With that in mind, I will not for the time being pay much attention to ancient grammarians' analysis of Aiolic (and the other dialects), which seem to be significantly based on literary, not vernacular, language.

7.4 Aiolic classifications

The traditional analysis of Greek dialect families, based on innovations which caused the dialects to splinter from an original shared language (Common or Proto-Greek), uses a model which relies in part on the movement of peoples together and away from their origins (cladistic, or *Stammbaum* theory).[675] Central to the identification of dialect families here is a period of initial divergence in which a set of deutero-Greek dialects developed their primary features before diverging further into the historically attested dialects (*when* this occurred is a rather difficult point). Other models suggest that a dialect continuum, comprising progressive variations of individual features were broken up by post-Mycenaean migrations. Both models give substantial weight to Greek traditions both of dialectal grouping and of migration and population divergence.

Within these models, the Aiolic dialect group has prompted various difficulties for modern dialectologists. Unlike Attic–Ionic and Doric, its members are far from identical, and in some features they are not even really very similar. Various handbooks on the Greek dialects identify a small set of distinctive features, summarized below,

---

[675] Hall (1997) 162–65.

which are held in common by the three dialects. Each dialect also has a some independent features, as is typical of any Greek dialect: many of these can be treated as developments out of contact with neighboring dialects once the three Aiolic dialects were *in situ*. A substantial critical discourse has now arisen around the process by which the historically attested Greek dialects developed: in the case of Aiolic, it is argued that there is little evidence for the kind of common development which would indicate that the members of this group reflect an original Proto-Aiolic dialect.

To some extent the historical reality of the Aiolic family is a moot question. Colvin has summarized the controversy thus: 'the problem [of the Aiolic group] reduces to the theoretical question of how many isoglosses constitute a dialect.'[676] However, as we have already discussed, the identification of a dialect by its own speakers and other speakers of the language is somewhat subjective and cannot be reduced to a measurable number of features. The following discussion will highlight a number of features which, in the absence of comparative evidence from the earlier stages of Greek and Indo-European, may have formed the basis of a perceived dialect group. The controversy however may shed some light on the date and development of Aiolian ethnicity, and I will argue here that the strict linguistic analysis of the data tends to neglect important human factors in language change, i.e. ethnic sympathy and use of language as a feature of identity.

Table 7.1. Summary of the recognized features of the Aiolic dialects

Section references are to Buck 1955. This list is not exhaustive; for full treatments see Buck (1955) §201–222, Hodot (1990), Vottéro (2006).

[676] Colvin (2010) 209.

Shared between all three dialects:

1. Perfect participle termination: -οντ- (see Buck §147.3)
2. Sigmatic aorist infinitive termination: active -σαι, middle-passive -σθαι
3. Athematic dat. plur. termination: -εσσι (also Delphic, see §107.3)
4. First sing. nom. personal pronoun: ἐγών (mostly literary)
5. Patronymic adjective in -ιος in naming formulae (whether other dialects use genitive) (see §168)
6. αἰ, 'if' (also West Greek incl. Doric, §134.1)
7. ἴα, 'one', fem. (see §114.1)
8. Proto-Greek labiovelar *K^w always > labial B (see §68.2)
9. Proto-Greek vocalic resonants *R. vocalized with [o] (also Arkado-Cypriot, see §5)
10. Some variant vocalizations

Shared between Lesbian and Boiotian:

11. πεδά = μετά (also Arkadian, Cretan, see §135.5)

Shared between Lesbian and Thessalian:

12. Athematic inflection of vowel-stem verbs (also Arkado-Cypriot, see §157)
13. *Irrealis* particle κε(ν) (also Arkado-Cypriot, see §134.2)
14. ὀν = ἀνα, ἀπύ = ἀπό (also Arkado-Cypriot, see §6, 22)
15. Proto-Greek resonant clusters *Rs and *Ry > RR, without compensatory lengthening (see §74–76, 77.1, 79)

Shared between Boiotian and Thessalian:

16. Active infinitive (athematic and thematic verbs) termination: -μεν (see §155)
17. Initial [w] (Ϝ) retained until koine-period (medial [w] retained in archaic Boiotian? See §)
18. Third plur. termination: -νθι (see §138, 139.1)

Independent Lesbian:

19. Psilosis (see §57)
20. Recessive accent (see §103)
21. Active infinitive (athematic verbs with monosyllabic stem) termination -μεναι (= -μεν + -ναι?); otherwise, thematic termination -ην vel sim. (see §147.2, 153.1, 154.2, 155.2)
22. Third plur. imperative termination: active -ντον, middle-passive –σθον (see §140.5)
23. [w] lost by sixth century (attested in Sappho & Alcaeus, see §50)
24. Compensatory lengthening of *Vns > *Vis (see §77.3, 78)

Independent Boiotian:

25. *Irrealis* particle κα (see §134.2)
26. ττ for σσ (also Attic, Euboian Ionic, see §81, 82)
27. Vowel shifts attested by spelling reforms:
    - αι > αε (6th c. end) > η (4th c. midd.)
    - οι > οε > υ (4th c. midd.)
    - υ > ου (4th c. early)
    - ει > ι (5th c., though delayed before a vowel)
    - Secondary long e, o > [ε:, ɔ:]

- η > ει (4th c. early)
- εV > ειV (6th c.) or ιV (4th c.): both representing synizesis

Independent Thessalian:

28. Thematic masc. gen. sing. termination -οι and –οιο (see §106.1)

29. Secondary long e, o > [ɛ:, ɔ:] > [e:, o] ει, ου (Larissa, αι > ει?, see §25)

José García-Ramón posited in *Les origines postmycéniennes du groupe dialectal éolien* that the three dialects developed their shared features in Thessaly in the late second millennium BC.[677] This developmental stage must have been comparatively brief, and was cut short by the relocation of Boiotians to central Greece c. 1200–1150 BCE (i.e. 60 years after a historical Trojan War, as attested by Thuc. 1.12). The divergence of Lesbian from Thessalian occurred at point of migration across the Aegean, c. 1000 BCE. It is important to note Dunkel's critical refinement: for this reconstruction to work, the attested shared features of Boiotian and Thessalian (#16–18) must also be Proto-Aiolic features which have been lost in Lesbian–Aiolic. The infinitival ending in Lesbian seems to have been reanalyzed, partly under Ionic influence (see #21: the Aiolic ending -μεν does seem to have some reflexes in Lesbian–Aiolic), while Ionic influence may also account for the loss of digamma and palatalization of third person plur. terminations. Thessalian and Boiotian did not lose these features, despite being similarly in contact with (and certainly capable of borrowing from) dialects which had similar features to those adopted in Lesbian; García-Ramón's position has been criticized for its inability to explain retention vs. innovation, but as we will see it is often difficult to assert with confidence reasons for failure to change.

---

[677] García-Ramón (1975).

Most problematic is the set of migrations from which García-Ramón has extrapolated the historical process of diversions: assuming that the linguistic evidence will reflect the migrations effectively begs the question of how the dialects diverged. There are moreover now well-established difficulties with the migratory conception. In particular it tends to presume that the population groups performed a wholesale separation, coupled with isolation, at the point of divergence, and that the diverging group was entirely homogenous in dialect.[678] A great deal of work on mobility in the ancient Aegean has suggested that the movements of the post-Mycenaean era were extended processes. It is certainly doubtful to suggest, as Holt Parker and Brian Rose seem to have done, that Greek populations were static over the usually recognized period of migration. Moreover, very many native Greek traditions suggest that the groups which migrated, including those which went to Boiotia and to Lesbos and northern Anatolia, were quite heterogeneous in place of origin: the supposed linguistic homogeneity which is found at the other end of the migration needs explaining. A final possibility is that linguistic homogeneity is a modern misunderstanding of the use of a standard language in inscriptions: comments such as Herodotus' description of Ionian dialects would counterindicate a purely written common language. The construction of a standard dialect would likewise be a significant event in a new community – and perhaps cause for substantial disagreement.

The grouping of Aiolic has remained a point of contention, and in particular has been seriously questioned by the work of the Nancy school in light of their general problematization of cladistic methods in Greek dialectology. Skelton, using automated analysis of the traditional dataset, has affirmed the accuracy of reconstructed family tree,

---

[678] E.g. Hall (2002) 72–73 on diversity of Aiolian origins.

including García-Ramón's branching.[679] However, in a tendentious article, Holt Parker argued that there is insufficient evidence of shared innovation (cf. García-Ramón's Proto-Aiolic stage) to substantiate the existence of a family of Aiolic dialects encompassing Thessalian, Boiotian and Lesbian–Aiolic:

> Boiotian is an archaic dialect, most closely related to West Greek, … and which underwent various later minor changes of its own. Lesbian (i.e. Lesbian-Aiolic) and Thessalian are both archaic branches of Greek that did not undergo the First Compensatory Lengthening. They share no demonstrable common innovations, and nothing argues for a relationship between them. They are best viewed as two relic areas of a relative unaltered early Greek.[680]

Parker proceeds to argue that each of the shared Aiolic features which he considers does not reflected García-Ramón's hypothesized Proto-Aiolic innovative period but rather the continuity of the general Greek features, thus leaving no good foundation for the grouping. García-Ramón noted in his response to Parker that the method Parker employed treated each feature as an entirely separate phenomenon without reference to a holistic language: this he refers to as 'hypercriticism'.[681] I agree that Parker's thesis relies on an excessively strict (and not always perfectly worked out) idea of innovation. Parker also dismisses somewhat perfunctorily two significant categories of linguistic relationship: conservation and selection. Although Parker is overtly skeptical about a model based on diffusion (i.e. *Stammbaumtheorie*), the methodological criteria which he espouses is one in which the relationship between dialects can only be demonstrated by shared innovation.

---

679 Skelton (2015).
680 Parker (2008) 460.
681 García-Ramón and Luis (2010); see also Skelton (2015).

A reasonable approximation of the way in which languages change, endorsed by Parker, is suggested by a model where individual features spread from an epicentre (wave or *Wellentheorie*). This in particular is fundamental to understanding why a number of features of Greek are distributed across dialects which seem to have no other relationship, though often a degree of geographical proximity or continued contact, e.g. the shared Boiotian and Attic development of κτj to ττ. It does not however always cope very well with the wider picture of language: having noted that waves of linguistic innovation can spread beyond any of the borders normally identified by cladistic modelling, it is hard to explain why innovations do not always spread universally. It is also possible for the waves to be effected by population movement. As Hall noted, a mixture of *Stammbaumtheorie* and *Wellentheorie* most effectively makes sense of the data, although we must be careful about implications for identifying human mobility. Several of the supposed features of Aiolic require a subtle consideration of when and how a complex set of innovations spread and in particular when they make have failed to distribute themselves as fully as possible.

For example, Parker argues that the three Aiolic dialects do not show a shared innovation in their unusual treatment of labiovelars (#8).[682] Greek inherited from Indo-European a labiovelar set of stop consonants alongside the labials, dentals and velars which survived in historic Greek dialects: /k^w, g^w, g^{hw}/. These were still attested as a separate series of Linear B signs (<Q-> in transcription) in Mycenaean Greek, but in all later-attested dialects had merged with the other stops: for most dialects this had been a conditional development, with labiovelars becoming dentals before /e, i/, and labials elsewhere: thus PIE *k^wetwores > Mycenaean *qe-to-ro* (k^wetro?) : Attic τέτταρες : Latin

[682] Parker (2008) 445–46.

quattuor. Separate and largely uncomplicated is the development of labiovelars into velars near /u/, which is a straightforward dissimilation: cf. αἰπόλος vs. βούκολος, both from a stem *-k^{w}olh$_1$o. (Mycenean *qo-u-ko-ro* = *g^{w}oukolos* suggests that this change came before the others.) The Aiolic dialects do not demonstrate the conditional development into dentals. All labiovelars become labials: thus Boeotian πέτταρες : Lesbian πέσυρες : Thessalian πετρο- (cf. Attic τετρα-). It is sometimes noted that the development in Boiotian is incomplete or mixed, as there are some dental reflexes of labiovelars evident in Boiotian texts. This deserves closer consideration: under what conditions should *penk^{w}e produce πέντε (cf. Lesbian πέμπε), but *k^{w}etwores > πέτταρες? Such variation run counter to the basic principal that sound change is regular.[683] The palatalization of labiovelars which led to dentals was an innovation in all other dialects: this change must have been prior to the universal change of remaining labiovelars into labials. Parker however argues that the labial development of labiovelars in Aiolic bled (i.e. preceded, and therefore left no need for) the dental development.

This relies on a common but somewhat untenable approach to linguistic conservativism. We can in the use of good evidence identify what does change and what does not change in a language, innovation and conservation, objectively. Parker (like many historical linguists) declines to see conservation as an actual process: conservation (or archaism) is simply the complement of innovation.[684] In neither case can motivation be identified from purely linguistic data, but innovation is an objectively observable process. On the other hand, changes have limits. If innovations were entirely unmotivated and unconscious, then change is a chain reaction from speaker to speaker which would

---

683 Examples of the Lesbian labial reflex are not forthcoming either: Hodot (1990) 152–53. How many roots in *K^{w} do we have in Greek?

684 Parker (2008) 439–441; *contra*, Hall (1997) 179–180.

be stopped only by the *inability* to change – having already lost the original feature (without, somehow, having diffused that innovation), or being unable to identify the change (accentual deafness?). But any isogloss map demonstrates that changes do not spread evenly or universally. The existence of *Sprachbunden*, language or dialect areas with shared features, demonstrates that changes occur quite independently of other linguistic borders. Geography does play a role: the landscape can both hinder and facilitate contact. But what geography creates is not-insurmountable boundaries between human groups, and these boundaries can clearly be social. If identification is a prerequisite of diffusion, then conservation or failure to innovate does demonstrate something more than linguistic continuity, which is to say that conservation must be approached as a phenomenon in its own right, a long-term accommodation process.

In this case, it is somewhat unsatisfactory to suggest that there was no significance to the *failure* to change; as Parker notes, Arkadian and Cyprian did not palatalize labiovelars either, which has obvious cause in the isolation of these dialects from the main Greek language dialect continuum. Either ordering of the labial and dental developments suggests a border, geographical or social: either Aiolic developed the labial reflex, [p] etc., of all labiovelars first, but this did not spread to other Greek dialects (thus not bleeding the dental reflex), or the dental reflex, [t] etc., before front vowels occurred in other dialects, but did not spread to Aiolic. There is no good evidence for either ordering. It would be very difficult to posit that Thessalian, Boiotian and Lesbian–Aiolic were linguistic isolates on this feature alone. Isolation of a Proto-Aiolic dialect in Northern Greece, with later separation of the dialects, is a possibility. Finally, if the dialects must been seen as developed *in situ*, as Parker would suggest, then we must also consider that there is some reason why these three dialects in their own regions did not adopt such a wide-spread innovation.

Dating such developments is not easy, but we might recall that Linear B records, including those from Thebes, still have the labiovelar consonants. It is possible that the development into labiovelars had already occurred in Northern Greece by the Mycenaean collapse, but if the Aiolic dialects were *in situ* at the end of the second millennium, this development may post-date Linear B; otherwise we need an interpretation such as Wyatt's view that the Aiolic dialects all derived from Mycenaean lower-class 'lects.[685]

A number of features of Aiolic are probably not the result of direct innovation, but rather demonstrate the existence of alternatives at some stage in the earlier language. The process by which one alternative becomes universal (as the original distinction between alternatives has been levelled) and the other is lost is called selection. For example, it seems likely that Proto-Greek allowed the syllabic resonants to be vocalized with both [a] and [o]: most Greek dialects therefore show [ra~ar] from *ṛ; Aiolic dialects seem to have [ro~or] (e.g. στρότος, 'army', #9).[686] (Parker contends that there is comparatively little evidence for the [o] reflex in Boiotian and Thessalian, which is true but not especially substantive: if a reflex in [a] existed, that would be a problem, but simply exiguous evidence is the norm in Greek dialectology.[687]) Similar selections seem to be the feminine form of the numeral (#7), the *irrealis* particle (#13, 25), and the preposition ἀπύ (#14).

However Parker aggressively rejects the value of selections on rather vague methodological grounds.[688] He reasons (inductively) that individual cases of selection show convergence or parallel development of a feature in dialects where there is not

685 Wyatt (1970).
686 Parker (2008) 446–447.
687 Cf. García-Ramón (2010) 225–226, on ῐ̈α in Boiotian.
688 Parker (2008) 441.

otherwise a genetic relationship; his example from Greek is the shared use of αἰ for 'if' in Aiolic and Doric vs. Attic–Ionic and Arkadian εἰ vs. Cypriot ᾖ.[689] While the selection from a limited number of options inevitably results in somewhat random similarity and dissimilarity between groups, it is not completely useless information: in this case, Aiolic, Doric and Attic–Ionic do show internal coherence. This is in part a failing of Parker's hypercriticism: individual instances of selection are not clearly indicative of family relationships. Multiple parallel selections, and some of them quite limited in distribution such as ἴα for μία, should at least be recognized as a repeated pattern which suggests that the initial selections date to a stage before diversification of the dialect. Parker does note that the development of *ṛ, which still shows signs of effect in Homer, must have been quite late.

The various features which the Aiolic dialects have developed in later stages have confounded analysis in several ways; the dialect group as a whole has sometimes been considered a bridge dialect between the reconstructed West and East Greek groups. The non-uniform nature of the Aiolic dialects remains something of a problem, though José García-Ramón makes a vigorous counter-case to many of Parker's contentions.[690] I have suggested here that the Aiolic dialects were individually isolated enough to develop some local features through contact but connected enough, through archaism or contact without geographical proximity, to preserve other features, perhaps consciously. It is clear that some of those features were both markedly different from many other Greek dialects' features, and limited enough to become noted as not simply Boiotian, Thessalian and Lesbian features but as the reflexes of a dialect group.

---

689 Parker (2008) n. 37.

690 García-Ramón (2010).

7.5 Vectors of change: linguistics and identity

What can a dialect, or dialect group, tell us about ethnic identity in early Greece? It is no longer the case that Greek historians prefer to treat ethnic groups as linguistic groups. Though language retains some respect as a useful and often important symbol of ethnic identity, it is all too clear that the boundaries between dialects may be very blurred, and in some cases even deliberately so. I hope to have shown however that if dialect was not necessarily a primary criterion of their personal ethnic ascription, it was often employed as a primary criterion of others' identity. It is clear that the Greeks recognized the traits of an individual's speech as reflective of their origins to the degree that they could attempt to identify someone based on speech alone. We must be conscious of the subjectivity involved in the impression of a dialect which an ancient Greek held: what is cited in ancient sources as a clear distinctive feature very often seems to be inadequately specific to a modern observer of Greek. Nevertheless there is a discourse of dialect which is not well recognized in modern scholarship (and admittedly not very well attested in the extant sources). This dialect perception and even caricature can form part of the discursive construction of ethnicity. We have seen that Aristophanes' mimesis of non-Attic dialects may not be inaccuracy so much as ethnic stereotype, and that the dialectal mish-mash of Greek lyric poetry can be imbued with unexpected significance.

It is perhaps surprising that ethnic judgments based on language are not better attested. A frequent suggestion is that ethnicity in general becomes more salient at points of conflict and meeting of boundaries: the cases from Xenophon and Thucydides demonstrate the power of dialect in navigating difficult interactions between different ethnic groups. Both examples in fact represent a failure of dialect as a good criterion of ethnicity which led (or nearly led) to substantial conflict, but in neither case is the value of dialectal judgements directly impugned. In both examples, the infiltrators were not

simply falsifying their language, but their entire identity. On the other hand, the comfort of hearing the same language spoken back by an interlocutor is not so noteworthy, unless like Philoctetes one has been isolated from it. The normality of speaking the same language as someone of the same identity necessarily underlies the conflict encountered in meeting an outsider.

An obvious reflection of the capacity of dialect in identity politics can be found in the persistence of dialects in the face of substantial changes to the day-to-day language of Greece in the Hellenistic Period. The Aiolic regions have been characterized as particularly resistant to koineization: Boiotian documents tend not to blend native Boiotian dialect into koine documents, and Thessaly produced documents in Thessalian down to 200 BCE, Lesbos until the first century AD. Indeed Julia Balbilla was able to produce four epigrams in Aiolic dialect from the court of Hadrian (*SGDI* 320–23), though their preservation on the Colossus of Memnon in Egypt affirms that these were literary endeavours.[691] The language is artificial, but not overly so.[692] Perhaps more pointedly, the citizens of Larissa published a decree (*IG* IX,2 517; c. 217 and 214 BC) accepting Philip V's suggestions that Larissa should accept new citizens in the aftermath of the Social War. The original letters from Philip, in koine, are quoted; the Thessalians' response is nevertheless given in the traditional language of the region even as it grants citizenship of Larissa to many newcomers in accordance with Philip's wishes. The context may be one of ethnic conflict, especially in light of the apparent failure of the first attempt to bring in new citizens; at the very least an enduring civic pride is expressed through the maintenance, even overt use, of the old dialect.

---

691 Hodot (1990).
692 Cassio (1986).

The value of language groupings for ancient Greek ethnicity has often seemed to be predicated on the idea of migration:[693] that dialect, like ethnicity, was a product of pre-migratory cohabitation between the different groups, an idea which draws a parallel between kinship *Stammbaum* and linguistic *Stammbaum.* In this period of cohabitation other ethnic institutions and features of identity would have arisen. It is this relationship of population to language to which Parker is most aggressively opposed, and he notes that if migration was a factor in introducing a dialect to Lesbos it needs only have been a small number of people who in fact crossed the sea;[694] the significance for the identity of those who adopted the new dialect goes unstated. However that dialect continued to be used and to facilitate communication after divergence. It is important to be aware of the latter, and in particular that the *Wellentheorie* of language change identifies linguistic change which moves through human channels: it is not simply a matter of geographical proximity which allows for the adoption of innovations, nor geographical boundaries which necessarily produce conservative areas. We have seen that some of the features which are designated Aiolic in modern dialect handbooks seem to have been produced comparatively late, even well into the period which produced the earliest surviving Greek myths and songs – and perhaps even after 'migration' or the formation of regional identities. If these linguistic features were adopted *in situ*, then we would have some surprising evidence of the relevance of ethnicity to language change. Bosniaks, having developed a clearer sense of identity in Tito's Yugoslavia, then sought to distinguish

693 E.g. Meillet (1975) 76.

694 Parker (2008) 435–37; cf. Hall (1997) 165–66.

themselves linguistically with the break up of the state,[695] and Hall argues in parallel that the abstraction of Greek is a reification based on the pre-existing Greek identity.[696]

However, we also need to be conscious of the evidential difficulties of the reconstruction of Greek dialects. I have argued that the first and foremost of these is the comparative irrelevance of a modern approach to dialectology. The absolute ranking of features, and attempts to find singular reflections of a shared innovation, do not reflect ancient dialect perceptions but modern scientific methodologies. The Greeks can have had very little awareness of the historical development of their dialects, and limited technologies for developing any such awareness in the most important period for this. Innovations and conservations (which must be recognized as a *potentially* active process) can only have occurred through contemporary contact. Even if Parker is right to argue that some of the designated Aiolic features are simply retentions of the earlier state of language (and this cannot be so for some), there was little way to be aware that these were conservations. The result is that a particular pronunciation of the Greek word for 'four', arising from a particular treatment of labiovelar consonants in the early Iron Age, and other such phenomena, may have encouraged the conception of a dialect group, for we have seen that the Greeks did have a sense not only of dialect, but of the Aiolic dialect. Language can be converted into identity, as in the case of Wolof speakers in Senegal.[697]

I would suggest a parallel in the idea of Arkado-Cypriot. There is no such group in ancient accounts of dialect, and indeed Strabo inevitably says that Arkadian was an Aiolic dialect; it was not until the nineteenth century CE that a putative Arkado-Cypriot group was added to the canonical list of dialect families. It has always been generally

---

695 Safran and Laponce (2005).
696 Hall (2002) 191–192.
697 Safran and Laponce (2005) chapter 7.

assumed that the two dialects were isolated from each other by the collapse of Mycenaean civilization, although not every shared feature is reflective of the Mycenaean attested by Linear B despite the otherwise close proximity which suggests that Mycenaean was a near ancestor. More recently, and again in parallel with Aiolic, it has begun to be suggested that Arkadian and Cypriot do not share a group.[698] However, the *idea* of a prehistoric relationship between Arkadia and Cyprus is ancient. Herodotus (7.90), with no particular reference to myth, notes a number of ἔθνεα amongst the Cypriots: 'some from Salamis and Athens, some from Arkadia…'. It seems likely that he refers here to Salamis and Paphos, and by the time of Lykophron (479–93) or Pausanias (8.5.2) the Arkadian hero Agapenor, a fairly minor hero in the *Iliad* (2.603–14), had become the oikistes of Paphos. It is striking that Paphos in particular is the first Cypriot settlement where the Cypriot Greek dialect has been attested. Other ideas of an Arkado-Cypriot ethnicity do not seem to have arisen, but perceived linguistic similarity due to isolation (and perhaps no true linguistic relationship) has been recognized through a myth of colonization.

I have argued throughout this chapter for a clear and definite consciousness of commonalities between Lesbian–Aiolic, Thessalian and Boiotian in the Classical Period and later. Approaches to language identity have very often relied on strict linguistic data; here I have suggested that this is sometimes misguided because it ignores the social phenomena which play out alongside the day-to-day use of language. This is not intended to be an appeal to the authority of the grammarians and other ancient descriptions of language, but to focus on the discursive potential of language. Although I have suggested

---

[698] Ringe, *pers. comm.* in Parker (2008) n. 40, and Scarborough (2016); *contra*, García-Ramón (2010) 227–230.

that there may well have been a genuine and historical relationship between the three dialects, it was the consciousness which was key to ethnicity. Ethnic identity may have encouraged the conservation of linguistic features in the Early Iron Age, when it is hard to be sure about the exact salience of Aiolic identity, but equally so apparent dialect groupings (whether historically well-founded or not) clearly helped to form Greek ideas about ethnicity even in the Archaic Period.

8. Aiolian interactions

We come finally to the question of direct interaction between historical Aiolians and individuals. Beck presented political interactions in particular as a field in which the salience of Aiolian ethnic identity should come to the forefront, but argued that evidence of such political interaction was largely absent. We know very clearly that Dorians and Ionians did at times seem to cooperate on ethnic grounds, particularly in the ethnically charged times of the Persian and Peloponnesian Wars.[699] I prefer to present these within the framework of opportunities for performative action.

I will draw the first two cases from the historians. First, in Herodotus' treatment of the Aiolians as Medizers, Herodotus repeatedly subsumes the Aiolians within larger groups, first of Greeks, and then of Persian subjects. Second, in his treatment of the Boiotians and Lesbians' allegiances in the later part of the Peloponnesian War, Thucydides juxtaposes the Boiotians and Lesbians in a way that seems to problematize the Aiolians as a group. The final case thematically addresses the question of shared Aiolian religion, a subsidiary set of case studies. There is very little evidence for ethnically defined religion in Greek antiquity in general, and I suggest that looking at individual sanctuaries and cults in the absence of an ethnicized discourse may be misleading. In the Hellenistic Period, it is possible that Aiolians particularly favoured some of each other's agonistic festivals.

This chapter makes no pretence of an exhaustive survey of known interactions between Aiolians within our period. Such a survey might be possible, from a scholarly point of view, but it would potentially be lengthy, and it would have two methodological

---

[699] Alty (1982); Crielaard (2009).

failings by nature. First, no matter how exhaustive it can never be complete, owing to the selectivity of our sources. We will never have a full or rigorously representative sense of the social world of the ancient Greeks, and particularly not of the Aiolians, who in the Archaic and Classical Periods lived much of their lives away from prying historians. These case studies instead represent comparatively well-attested instances where some form of ethnic solidarity *might* become apparent. The first case demonstrates precisely the narrowing perspective of an ancient historiographer: an extended, shared traumatic experience which that author treats entirely from the outside.

The second methodological issue with a comprehensive survey of Aiolian interactions is the question of motivations. In the preceding chapters I have argued that the Aiolians recognized one another as ethnic kinsmen, and that they structured and rationalized their kinship through myth, music and language over the course of centuries. One would like now to see that these expressions extended into political and/or economic support for one another, although that is never a given result of ethnicity. As I suggested in chapter 1, ethnic solidarity involves two aspects: the sense and the action; as I argued in my discussion of kinship myth, the connection between presumed ethnic identity and attested actions (in the form of a particular mythically articulated relationship) is a historical quagmire. To collect every possible moment of ethnic interaction would assume that ethnic identity was not only the most important identity but the most important motivator for any individual or group. The second case derives from an author who is quite aware of the complexities of historical motivation.

8.1 Herodotus' disappearing Aiolians

Herodotus is clear and specific about the Aiolians who lived in Asia Minor and the neighbouring islands; having introduced them, however, their importance as a group is

largely dismissed for the rest of the *Histories*.[700] His careful exegesis of the poleis which existed in the Aiolian area at the moment of Persian conquest is fulsome for a region which was neither especially important, wealthy, or well-populated; it is also quite functional in comparison with the descriptions of Ionia and Doris which immediately precede it, with almost none of the religious history or firm rebukes of ethnic propaganda which he engages in earlier.[701] It has been suggested that his list of eleven (formerly twelve) Aiolian poleis is inflated to match the Ionian dodecapolis.[702] Several of the poleis are undoubtedly small, two of them otherwise unknown, though given that the Lesbian cities and the cities of Ida were also available it seems unlikely that he need to go to the trouble. It is possible that his description derives from Hecataeus' *Geography*, at least in part, or from the traditional accounts of the Ionian occupation of Smyrna.

The tale of the loss of Smyrna, as Herodotus puts it, is the high point of the discussion. The Aiolians act *en masse*. It would seem from the story's position between the description of the southern Aiolian hendecapolis (1.149) and the other Aiolian cities (1.151) that he suggests that it was just the eleven cities which came to the defence of Smyrna when it had been captured by a Kolophonian trick. Asheri suggested that Herodotus likely found the cunningness of sneaking in while the Smyrnaians were at a festival appealing;[703] it certainly does not make the Smyrnaians look good. The Aiolian defence itself does not result: they came, and then immediately left, taking the Aiolian Smyrnaians with them: βοηθησάντων δὲ πάντων Αἰολέων, ὁμολογίῃ ἐχρήσαντο τὰ ἔπιπλα ἀποδόντων τῶν Ἰώνων ἐκλιπεῖν Σμύρνην Αἰολέας.[704] The other sources do not

---

[700] See Apostolou (2019) 125–29 for a parallel discussion of Aiolian absences.
[701] Hdt. 1.149–51. See below, section 8.3, for the significance of the silence on Aiolian religion.
[702] Asheri, A.B. Lloyd, et al. (2007) 179.
[703] Asheri, A.B. Lloyd, et al. (2007) 179.
[704] Hdt. 1.150.2.

confirm whether the Aiolians' effort was really so poor. Herodotus in fact homogenizes the Aiolians: the list of poleis though long is largely undifferentiated, they move in tandem and then are able to simply divide the former population of Smyrna across the eleven remaining cities.

The effect of this homogeneity becomes more apparent when we look to the context. The disappearance of the Aiolians into the Ionian response, and then into Persian servitude (which amounts to the same thing), is worth taking point by point; it has received very little attention, which is perhaps a sign of Herodotus' success. The profile of Asiatic Greeks is introduced by their panicked response to the victory of Kyros over Kroisos. Herodotus' treatment of this subordinates the Aiolian reaction entirely to the Ionians. At 1.76, the Aiolians had not been party to the earlier embassy from Kyros about revolt from Kroisos. At 1.141, the Aiolians are named twice alongside the Ionians as treating with Kyros. The response and its reasons are however addressed solely to the Ionians, and the Aiolians suffer guilt by association. At 1.151, the end of the Greek profile, it is affirmed that the Aiolian islanders had no fear of the Persians. The rest of the Aiolians decide to follow the Ionians' lead: τῇσι δὲ λοιπῇσι πόλισι ἔαδε κοινῇ Ἴωσι ἕπεσθαι τῇ ἂν οὗτοι ἐξηγέωνται. The use of ἀνδάνω implies that this was a formal decision, the mechanisms of which are completely unknown to us. In the following chapter, the Aiolians send ambassadors with the Ionians for Spartan aid, but do not contribute anything to the plans. At 1.160, the initial refusal to hand over Paktyes to Harpagos is the only active decision which the Aiolians make. Even this involves consultation of the oracle at Didyma, which the Aiolians shared in, but Miletos dominated.[705] At 2.1, we hear that Kambyses considers the Aiolians and Ionians inherited

[705] Hdt. 1.157; Morgan (1989) 26.

slaves; at 3.1, that he took them to Egypt. At 3.13, we discover that at least one Mytilenean boat is with Kambyses on the Nile. Given that Darius enjoys both the advice of the tyrant Koes of Mytilene and Lesbian ships, as Asheri put it, 'Lesbos is supposed to have been under Persian hegemony during this period' – perhaps even at the same time as the Ionian surrender, 1.169.[706]

Aiolians of any kind do not make much of a mark on the rest of the *Histories*. It is not strictly a modern phenomenon to use the term 'Ionian revolt', for Herodotus often seems to use 'Ionian' to mean all Greeks. This is understandable when Herodotus puts words in the mouths of Persian characters (cf. *Yauna*). Less so is the native Greek use of the term – as, for example, when Aristagoras at the beginning of the revolt dismantled the tyrannical government in Miletos and 'the rest of Ionia'.[707] The two tyrants mentioned are Koes and Aristagoras of Kyme, neither city Ionian. Such a generic use is not limited to the territory: although Dareios' fleet against Scythia were led by Ionians, Aiolians and Greeks of the Hellespont, including Koes as the general (not tyrant) of the Mytileneans.[708] When Koes offers advice to Dareios on destroying the bridge over the Danube, he does so just as the Ionians are about to cross; his advice and Dareios' response are clearly not concerned with just part of the force. Although Herodotus never seems to directly refer to the Aiolians as Ionians *per se*, the Ionians are the dominant group in his narrative, to the point that he seemingly uses the name as a collective for Aiolians and Ionians together.

---

706 Asheri, A.B. Lloyd, et al. (2007) 411. On Koes, 4.97.2, 5.11.1–2; Cawkwell (2005) 40.
707 Hdt. 5.37–38: μετὰ δὲ καὶ ἐν τῇ ἄλλῃ Ἰωνίῃ.
708 Hdt. 4.89.1, 4.97.

Herodotus never adduces any tie between Aiolian peoples beyond the associations of each polis with its neighbours. In particular it is unremarked that they were overwhelmingly Medizing, and Herodotus' description of the Persian forces makes no attempt to associate the Thessalians, Boiotians and Aiolians.[709] So too the list of those who gave earth and water to Xerxes is given a very north-west to south-east organization, from Thessalians to Boiotians.[710] Perhaps the most indicative passage for such a neutral position is the Theban surrender after Thermopylai; the Thessalians corroborate their claim to never have done wrong to the Persians.[711] Herodotus gives no particular view why the Thessalians would be aware of Boiotian actions. This particular case was the source of the famous complaint in *On the Malice of Herodotus* that Herodotus had deliberately abused the Thebans (*Mor.* 866d–67a).[712]

8.2 Thucydides' opposed Aiolians

In the general introduction to his commentary on Thucydides, Simon Hornblower suggests that the Boiotians in Thucydides were especially alert to the kind of relationship between communities which the Greeks called συγγένεια, 'kinship'.[713] He adduces three different examples of Boiotian kinship links in Thucydides' narrative, each of them based on a slightly different form of relation: with Megara, based on the supposed Boiotian origins of its eponymous founding hero Megareus;[714] with Aigina, based on the sisterhood of the eponymous nymphs Thebe and Aigina;[715] and with the Lesbians. In

[709] Hdt. 9.31.
[710] Hdt. 7.132.
[711] Hdt. 7.233.
[712] Hershbell (1993).
[713] Hornblower, *CT* 2:72–73.
[714] Thuc. 4.72; see Hellanicus, *FGrH* 4 F 78, Hornblower, *CT* 2:67–69.
[715] Thuc. 3.64; see Hdt. 5.79 ff. and Hornblower, *CT* 1:459.

each of the first two cases Hornblower seeks to offer rationale for unexplained Boiotian actions by adducing evidence for συγγένεια from elsewhere; Thucydides himself does not explicitly mention kinship. This is not the case for the Lesbians, who are called the συγγενεῖς of the Boiotians three times in Thucydides. These merit fuller consideration:

> **1)** 3.2.3, 428 BCE: the Lesbians, led by Mytilene, plot their revolt from Athens with the help of the Lakedaimonians and their kin the Boiotians (μετὰ Λακεδαιμονίων καὶ Βοιωτῶν ξυγγενῶν ὄντων); the Tenedians, who were Aiolians too but persistently loyal to the Athenians, informed on them.[716]
> **2)** 7.57.5, 413 BCE: the catalogue of Syracusan and Athenian allies before the final battles in the harbour at Syracuse. The Aiolian Methymnians, Tenedians and Ainians fight their Aiolian founders (κτίσασι) the Boiotians out of obligation (κατ᾽ ἀνάγκην).
> **3)** 8.100, 411 BCE: Methymnian exiles brought over partisans from Kyme, who were led by the Theban Anaxandros κατὰ τὸ ξυγγενές.

Hornblower notes two other historical events which are, as with the cases of Megara and Aigina, better elucidated by an awareness of the kinship connection between Lesbos and Boiotia. Hornblower unquestioningly takes these as further instances of Aiolian ethnicity despite Thucydides' silence on the matter.

Perhaps most indicative of the way in which Thucydides incorporates ethnic thinking into his historiography is the passage at 7.57.5. In chapter 2 I quoted the text of this passage (as Hornblower reads it) as basic evidence that the term 'Aiolian' could be applied broadly. Thucydides does not hesitate to juxtapose different meanings of the same term; a similar instance is the criticism of the Plataians by the Theban speakers in book 3: Boiotians who do not wish to pay their dues to the Boiotoi (3.61; cf. Hdt.

---

[716] Aiolian Tenedos: see chapter 3.2.1; Tenedos' relations with Athens: Tod's commentary on no. 175 (RO 72, 339 BCE).

6.108).[717] Thucydides begins the description of Syracusan and Athenian allies by drawing our attention to ethnic concerns, with an assertion that neither justice nor kinship (οὐ κατὰ δίκην … οὐδὲ κατὰ ξυγγένειαν) decided the alliances.[718] The list makes several juxtapositions of related peoples on opposing sides of the conflict, but only for the Boiotians and Aiolians does Thucydides add that they were fighting one another under compulsion:

> πρὸς δ᾽ αὐτοῖς Αἰολῆς, Μηθυμναῖοι μὲν ναυσὶ καὶ οὐ φόρῳ ὑπήκοοι, Τενέδιοι δὲ καὶ Αἴνιοι ὑποτελεῖς. οὗτοι δὲ Αἰολῆς Αἰολεῦσι τοῖς κτίσασι Βοιωτοῖς τοῖς μετὰ Συρακοσίων κατ᾽ ἀνάγκην ἐμάχοντο, Πλαταιῆς δὲ καταντικρὺ Βοιωτοὶ Βοιωτοῖς μόνοι εἰκότως κατὰ τὸ ἔχθος.
>
> Thuc. 7.57.5

It is clear here that Thucydides wishes to underscore the unexpected or regrettable failure of ethnic identity: the words for Aiolians abut one another. The Plataians are apparently ranked directly across from the other Boiotians; the word to express this is moved forward, allowing the same abutment of 'Boiotian' and further entangling the Βοιωτοὶ in the space where they are supposed to oppose, although Thucydides considers their quarrel just (εἰκότως). There is the strong implication that the Boiotians and Aiolians should be on the same side. Maria Fragoulaki, in particular, has explored the way in which Thucydides juxtaposes the Plataians with the Mytileneans in Book 3, to demonstrate that on many occasions ethnic solidarity did not constitute a good result.[719]

---

[717] Hammond (1992).

[718] This catalogue responds to the catalogue of allies at the beginning of the war (2.9); Thucydides is much less overt about ethnic relations there, but the roughly east–west circle he employs for both sides nevertheless contains some potentially meaningful juxtapositions: Megara and Boiotia, Lesbos and Plataia.

[719] Fragoulaki (2013), chapter 4.

8.3 Aiolian ethnic religion

It is sometimes asserted that the oracular sanctuary of Apollo at Gryneion served as a common sanctuary for the Aiolians. This has become an accepted fact in scholarship so much that it is often cited as though it were based in a direct statement of Herodotus.[720] In fact the historian has almost nothing to say about Gryneion. He names it as the last of eleven Aiolian poleis in the survey of Asiatic Greece which I discussed in the previous section (1.149), but he does not even mention the sanctuary.[721] Obviously we would like to imagine something parallel to the Panionion and the Dorian sanctuary which are mentioned by Herodotus. Textual evidence for the sanctuary at Gryneion is however overwhelmingly late and unedifying.[722] Strabo's statement that Apollo was worshipped as Sminthian, Cillaean or Gryneian (13.2.5) can hardly suggest that Gryneion was exceptional amongst the various Apolline sanctuaries; moreover it implies that Gryneion was a strictly regional sanctuary. We must look elsewhere for the performance of Aiolian rites. An apparently parallel cult of Athena aim Thessaly and Boiotia can be explained by migration which took the cult to Boiotia, but the explanation is largely modern, and there is not much sign of this as an ethnic meeting place for Thessalians and Boiotians.[723] Erika Simon has investigated some parallels between the cult of Hera, Zeus and Dionysos at the *Daidala* of Plataia and the sanctuary of Messon on Lesbos. Although this is an unusual triad of gods, the cults are clearly quite different – and much of the evidence

---

720 E.g. Rubenstein (2006), Beck (2019) following *IACP*.

721 The polis itself was not entirely autonomous; it is said to have fallen to Myrina, given over by Persians to Gogylus of Eretria (Xen. *Hell.* 3.1.6) and Alcibiades (Nep. *Alc.* 9–perhaps, *in Phrygia castrum*?), and its occupants sold into slavery by Parmenion (Diod. Sic. 17.7.9).

722 Paus. 1.21.9; Verg. *Ecl.* 6.72, *Aen.* 4.345.

723 See p. 68 for references.

comes from opposite ends of history: Messon best attested in Sappho and Alkaios; the *Daidala* in Plutarch.[724]

We may profitably look in the intervening periods. Hellenistic festival culture provides substantial insight into the cultural performances of the Greek (and Hellenized) élite.[725] Often the epigraphic record of such festivals provides clear evidence only for individual contestants at individual sanctuaries – a fragmentary picture, but one which is fruitful grounds for scholarly speculation about personal motivations and wider regional concerns, following John Ma's influential application of 'peer polity interaction' to such evidence. Occasionally a wider perspective is captured. For the renovation of Aiolian cult, with a strong local character, we may turn to an interesting text discovered in 2004.[726] This is apparently a decree of some Thessalians, republished by unknown agents in the mid-third century at the southern Aiolian city of Aigai. The precise reason for which a copy of the text was set up at Aigai is probably lost in the mostly illegible first eight lines, which do seem to be in Aiolic dialect. We may surmise that they took some pride in the acknowledgment offered in the Thessalian portion of the text, a precursor to the interest in Aiolian history demonstrated by Bombos of Alexandreia in the following century.[727] The Thessalians had established or renewed a cult of an eponymous hero Thessalos, attached in some way to the Thessalian festival for Zeus Olympios. A theoric expedition was presumably dispatched, perhaps headed by the priest Speudon named in this text,[728] which obtained recognition of the festival from the residents of Aiolis,

---

724 Simon (1997).

725 For an overview of Hellenistic festivals, see Chaniotis 1995, Parker 2004 (New Panhellenic Festivals in Hellenistic Greece)

726 Malay and Ricl (2009) no. II, *SEG* 59 1406 B.

727 See chapter 3.

728 Helly (2010), Malay and Ricl (2009) 51.

Magnesia on the Maiander, and Kos. In return for that recognition the Thessalians granted sweeping honours within Thessaly:

> Σ̣π̣εύδ̣ο̣υ̣ν ὁ λ̣έ̣ιτορας τ̣ὰ̣ν εὐχ̣αριστίαν Π̣ε̣τ-
> θ̣α̣λ̣ο̣ῦν ἐ̣ν̣ Ὀ̣λ̣υ̣μ̣π̣ίοις τ̣ο̣ῖ̣ς Πετθαλοὶ ἄγουνθι·
> ὀ̣π̣ε̣ι̣δ̣ὲ̣ι̣ ἐ̣ξ̣ά̣γ̣γ̣ε̣λ̣λε Σπεύδουν ὁ λ̣έ̣ιτορας τ-
> οῖ Δ̣ι̣ὸ̣ς τοῖ Ὀλυμπίοι τὰν ε̣ὔ̣νοιαν τ̣ὰ̣ν εἴχ̣ο̣ι̣ε-
> ν̣ π̣οτὶ Πετθαλ̣ὸ̣ς Αἰολεῖε̣ς, Κ̣ο̣ῦ̣οι, Μάγνειτες
> ο̣ἱ ἀπὺ Μαιάνδροι – τοῦ τε γὰρ Δὶ τοῦ Ὀλυμπίου
> κ̣αὶ εἴρ̣ο̣υ̣ϊ Πετθαλο̣ῦ̣ καὶ τοῖς ἄλλ̣ο̣ι̣ς θεοῖς
> τ̣ελετὰ̣ν κ̣α̣ὶ θυσίαν π̣ε̣π̣οεῖσθαι τὰς πόλις π-
> ά̣ν̣σ̣ας καὶ εὔξασθαι Πετθαλοῖς πάντεσσι καὶ
> τοῦ δ̣ά̣μ̣ο̣υ τοῦ ἑαυτοῦν κοινᾶ σουτειρίαν, εὐ-
> τ̣υ̣χίαν, ε̣ὐ̣γ̣ο̣ν̣ί̣α̣ν̣ –, ἐψάφισαν οἱ Πετθαλοὶ ἀτέ-
> λ̣ε̣ι̣α̣ν̣ ἔμμεν αὐτοῖς πάντουν πλὰν εἰ̣ πόσσα κ-
> ε ἐπ ἐμπορία ἄγουνθι εἰ̣ ἐ̣ξ̣ά̣γ̣ουνθ̣ι̣, κ̣αὶ πολι-
> τείαν πάντεσσι π̣ᾶ̣ ν̣ά κε βέλλουνθαι Πετθαλί-
> ας καὶ ἔμμεν αὐτοῖς καὶ πόλις καὶ ἱερὰ κοιν-
> ὰ καὶ τὰ ἄλλα πάντα καττάπερ Πετθαλοῖς ἔνθι·
> καὶ ἐπιγαμίαν ἔμμεν Αἰολείεσσι, Κ̣ούοις, Μα-
> γνείτεσι τοῖς ἀπὺ Μαιάνδροι π̣ᾶ̣ ν̣ά κε βέλλο-
> υνθαι Πετθαλί̣α̣ς̣·Ε ὀνγράψαι μὰ τὸ ψάφισμα Σπ-
> εύδουνα τὸν λείτοραν ἐν σ̣τάλας λιθίας καὶ
> [. .]Τ̣ΕΘ̣Ε̣ΙΜ̣ΕΝ ἐ̣ν̣ Ὀ̣λ̣ύ̣μ̣π̣ι̣ο̣ν καὶ ἐν Ἴτουνον καὶ
> ἐν Λ̣ά̣σ̣σ̣α̣ν ἐν [τὸ ἰε]ρὸν τ̣ο̣ῖ̣ Ἄπλουνος τοῖ Κερδ-
> οίοι· ἐγγράφειμεν αὐτ[εῖ] καὶ π̣ο̣λ̣ί̣ο̣υ̣ν τὰ ὀνύ-
> ματα πανσᾶν τᾶν κ̣οινανεν̣σᾶν τᾶς θ̣υ̣σ̣ί̣α̣ς Δι-
> ὸς τοῖ Ὀλυμπίοι καὶ τοῖ ἀγοῦνος· ἐγράφει τὸ
> ψάφισμα ἐν Ὀλυμπίοις, λειτορεύοντος δὶς τ-
> οῖ Ὀλυμπίοι Σπεύδουνος, ταγευόντουν ἐν Λά-
> σσα Τιμουνίδα Ἀλεξία, Ἀστονόοι Λαγέτα, Ἱππ-
> άρχοι Σουκράτεος, Ἱπποδρόμοι Πανταπόνοι,
> Κ̣λεάρχοι Δεινίπποι
>
> Speudoun the priest (proposes a decree expressing) the gratitude of the Thessalians at the Olympia which the Thessalians conduct. Since Speudoun the priest of Zeus Olympios reported the goodwill which the Aiolians, Coans and Magnesians from the Maeander displayed towards the Thessalians – for all the cities performed a rite and sacrifice to Olympian Zeus and the hero Thettalos and the other gods and invoked in common for all the Thessalians

> and for their own people safety, good fortune, good offspring – the Thes-salians have voted them freedom from duties on everything except on what they bring or export by way of trade, and citizenship for all of them wherever they wish in Thessaly, and that cities and cults and every-thing else be shared by them as they are by Thessalians. And the Aiolians, Coans and Magnesians from the Maeander shall have marriage rights wherever they wish in Thessaly. Speudoun the priest shall write up the decree on stone stelai and (set them up) in the Olympion and in Itounos and in Lassa [i.e. Larisa] in the shrine of Apollon Kerdoios. And let there be inscribed there also the names of all the cities participating in the sacrifice to Zeus Olympios and the competition. The decree was proposed at the Olympia, when Speudoun was priest of the Olympian for the second time, and in Lassa Timounidas son of Alexias, Astonoos son of Lagetas, Hipparchos son of Soukrateis, Hippodromos son of Pantaponos, Klearchos son of Deinippos were *tagoi*.
>
> *SEG* 59 1406 B 9–38 (corr. & trans. Parker [2011])

The central figure Thessalos here clearly drew on the Homeric Herakleid Thessalos, who was father of the Koan generals at Troy; as I discussed in chapter 3, the Thessalians had already adopted him in the fourth century.[729] That explains the appearance of Kos now, but the Aiolians and Magnesians must have been drawn in not by the Herakleid hero but by a more general ethnic association. Bruno Helly suggests that this Thessalos may not have been the father of Thessalian founding heroes *per se* but 'hypostases d'un héros dans lequel les peuples —, Thessaliens, Éoliens, Coiens et Magnètes, pouvaient reconnaître un archégète commun'.[730]

The significance of Thessalos is demonstrated by the procedural oddities of the decree and the strength of the honours given to those who recognized Thessalos. The

[729] On Koan *theoroi* to Thessaly, see Graninger (2011) 140–142.
[730] Helly (2010).

precise date of the decree is uncertain. The editors suggests the second half of the third century. Robert Parker preferred a much earlier date, while Bruno Helly favours the very end of the third century, contemporaneous with other major establishments such the Leukophryenia at Magnesia on the Maiander, to which we will turn shortly. As Parker notes, evidence for Thessaly in the third century is minimal and this is the earliest evidence for Thessalians as a decision-making body.[731] The decree lacks a verb in the preface, which leaves Speudon's role less than clear. He does not seem to have any office beyond the priesthood. The dating formula at the end of the text names only the board of *tagoi* from Larissa and not any Thessalian federal officials. Aside from the delayed dating formula there are other signs of haphazard composition – games are mentioned only at line 33 – and the orthography in places is not standard Thessalian, though we should not exclude the possibility that the copyist at Aigai struggled with the dialect. These are all indications that the Thessalians involved established Thessalos and sent out theoroi independently of any new federal structures which demanded an ethno-religious framework. Helly suggests that this was a purely religious affair.[732] Thessalian identity in a more general sense may have been at stake. The Koans, Aiolians and Magnesians nevertheless received full rights throughout Thessaly, including the right to become a citizen wherever they pleased. Either Larissa held the rest of Thessaly in a very firm grip, or there was widespread enthusiasm for kinship ties with Eastern Greeks. Similar privileges were offered at some point in the third century to the Mytileneans.[733] Thessalian acknowledgement of ties with the Aiolians and Magnesians in particular is novel.

---

731 Parker (2011) 2–4.
732 Helly (2010) 835.
733 *IG* XII Suppl. p. 7 no. 3; Labarre (1996) no. 14; Tziafalias and Helly (2004) no. 1.

The kinship of Magnesians and Thessalians separately from the other Aiolians may suggest that the Thessalian Olympia were arranged before the propagation of Magnesia's own history,[734] in the course of one of the most wide-ranging theoric embassies known from the Hellenistic Period. It seems that before the Hellenistic period the Magnesians had been considered distinct from their Aiolian neighbours.[735] In the late third century the Magnesians sought to establish new games for Artemis Leukophryene. Although such an initiative was not uncommon for Greek cities, the ambition with which Magnesia sought international recognition of *asylia* for the games, and thus the city's own place within the Hellenic world, was remarkable. The Magnesians preserved the evidence of their efforts in the west stoa of the Magnesian agora, at the entrance to Artemis' sanctuary. They collected the acknowledging decrees and royal rescripts which were fetched from Sicily, the Persian Gulf and many places in between; the collection is often called a 'dossier' or 'archive', but it is more precisely an exhibition.[736] The inscriptions were carefully arranged on the back wall of the stoa to be visible from the *prytaneion* in the south-western corner of the agora, where foreign dignitaries were received. Given the number of states which responded to Magnesia, the initiative has been discussed mostly as an example of Hellenistic universal diplomacy, not in terms of the complex claims in Magnesia's civic narrative to more specific ethnic affiliation within the Greek world.[737] The decree of the Epidamnians suggests that more recent history, the Gallic sack of Delphi and the Lyttian War in Crete, was raised (*I. Magn.* 46.9–12) along with the general probity of the Magnesians, but kinship and the narrative

---

[734] *Pace* Helly (2010).

[735] Hdt. 3.90.1, n. 87.

[736] Rigsby (1996) collects the various diplomatic responses.

[737] Rigsby (1996); Thonemann (2007). Gehrke (2001) offers an interesting study of the 'intentional history of the Magnesians'.

of Magnesian migration was clearly in several ways an important part of the diplomacy. At the head of the exhibition, on the so-called *Pfeilerwand* at the southern end of the stoa, were two Magnesian documents.[738] The first recorded the divine epiphany which (supposedly) prompted the promotion of Artemis Leukophryene (*I. Magn.* 16). The second records Magnesian history (*I. Magn.* 17), apparently an official version which was briefed to Magnesia's representatives.

The surviving section of the Magnesian origin myth is brief, yet it is clear that the Magnesians told a complex story of their sojourn to Asia Minor; literary accounts corroborate the modern interpretation of the official history as a reconciliation of several different elements of Magnesian foundation stories. Roughly half of the legible lines are instructions in verse from Delphi. In literary versions of the foundation of Magnesia, the Magnesians are described as Delphian colonists, or a human tithe from Delphi.[739] In the official version it seems that Apollo instructed the Magnesians to leave their homeland in Thessaly and move to Crete. At the beginning of the legible text, they are waiting for instruction regarding their return; in the meantime they established a city in the Messara Plain (5–10). After eighty years, they consult Delphi again. They will not return to Thessaly:

> ἀλλὰ χρεὼγ γαίης ἀπ[ὸ π]ατρίδος ἄλλοθι ν̣εῖσθα[ι·]
> πατρὶ δ' ἐμῶι καὶ ἐμοὶ [καὶ] συγγόνωι ὧδε μ[ελ]ήσει
> μή τι χερειοτέραμ βῶ̣λ̣[ο]μ Μ[ά]γνητα δάσασθαι
> χώρας ἧς Πηνειὸς ἔχει κα[ὶ] Πήλιον α̣ἰπύ.
>
> *I. Magn.* 16.20–23

---

[738] Two other documents are a decree supposedly of the Archaic Cretan *koinon* (*I. Magn.* 20), written in the diplomatic language of Hellenistic decrees, and a list of Cretan poleis putatively involved (*I. Magn.* 21); the decree is clearly a Magnesian forgery related to the other two histories on the *Pfeilerwand*.

[739] See Carless Unwin (2017) for a recent text and translation of *I. Magn.* 16 (app. I).

The Magnesians should naturally identify with the south eastern periphery of Thessaly which was home to the Magnetes.[740] The geographic descriptors here, curiously, refer to the Peneios and Mount Pelion, features of the northern plains. There seems to be an attempt thus not to present themselves as the descendants of one of the lesser Thessalian perioecic tribes, but as Thessalian Aiolians who once lived in the heartland of the Aiolians. This claim likely goes back to the fourth or early third century.[741] Although the text seems to end with Apollo's instructions to find the site of Magnesia, it is possible that the Magnesian envoys continued with stronger claims about what happened then: a much later inscription from the reign of Antoninus Pius notes that the Magnesians were Thessalian colonists (ἄποικοι) and the *first* Greeks to settle in Asia; and again emphasizes that the Magnesians considered themselves Aiolian.[742] The story of Thessalian origin and Aiolian identity was clearly older; there is no reason to assume that their claim to primacy in migration was not equally old.

From the inscribed responses to this, it is clear that many *poleis* were more than receptive to the Magnesians' claim of Aiolian identity. The display of responses at Magnesia was not only to be expected; republication was, it seems, an active part of the negotiations.[743] A number of texts not only affirm συγγένεια, sometimes giving details of Aiolian or Aiolid kinship. The Phokian league spoke of a renewed relationship through ancestors (ἀνενεώσαντό τε τὰν διὰ προγόνων ὑπάρχουσαν οἰκειό|τατα καὶ φιλίαν, *I. Magn.* 34); Same on Kephallenia notes their eponymous hero Kephalos was a descendant of Deion, son of Aiolos, and thus kin to Magnes. It is possible that the kinship between

---

740 The ethnonym for Magnesians-on-the-Maiander is of course also Magnetes.

741 *SEG* 14 459.8–9, a victory monument at Delphi for a Magnesian boy, refers to 'horse-rearing Thessaly' as Magnesia's metropolis.

742 *IG* II^2 1091 = *OGIS* 503.

743 Rigsby (1996) no. 114.21.

Magnes and Makedon was outlined to Philip V, for he refers to it in his letter to the Chalkidians quoted in their response; the *Catalogue of Women* had these two as brothers outside of the Aiolid stemma (fr. 7 M–W), but Makedon like Magnes is also depicted as a son of Aiolos. For the residents of a Thessalian city, which Kern identified as Larissa, the relationship was valorized with the very rare word ὁμογένεια, 'exact kinship';[744] they speak in very approving terms of the plan:

> [--------ο]ὐ μόνον κὰτ τὰν ὁμογένειαν
> [-----ἀ]λλὰ καὶ κὰτ τὰν ὅλαν ἄνγρασιν ἑ . ης
> [--ψάφις]μα ἐν στάλλαν <λ>ιθίναν καὶ θ[έμ]ε[ν--]
>
> *I. Magn.* 26.25–27

Such statements give cities the opportunity to affirm their ethnic identity to all who attended the Leukophryenia. Only one Aiolian region seems to have been more reserved about its kinship: although the Lesbian city (Mytilene?) of *I. Magn.* 52 mentions συγγένεια, it does not give any more details. It is possible that the shared Aiolian identity of close neighbours Magnesia and Lesbos did not demand any elaboration, or perhaps the cities of Lesbos preferred not to acknowledge Magnesia's claim to be the first and oldest Greek settlement in Asia over their own primacy in the Aiolian migration.

Finally, we may turn to Nikolaos Papazarkadas' recent study of the victory lists from first-century Boiotian agonistic festivals for some indication of the reciprocal nature of ethnic ties.[745] Across four different festivals, and lists from several different years, a clear pattern emerges in the origins of the listed victors. Almost without exception the participants at the *Ptoia* of Akraiphion, the *Basileia* of Lebadeia, the *Mouseia* of Thespiai, and the *Charitesia* of Orchomenos (at least the victorious ones) come from

---

744 Rigsby (1996) 202 (n. 54, other uses).
745 Papazarkadas (2016).

cities with close kinship ties to the Boiotians. It was of course possible for almost any Greek of the Hellenistic period to affirm a kinship through some myth if it was required – for example even by appeal to descent to the general Greek eponymous hero Hellen. The Boiotian festivals suggest a more defined corpus of kinship myths. What is particularly valuable about these inscriptions, in contrast with the two festivals considered earlier, is the clear indication that Aiolians continued to engage, to travel together and compete together in performances of their Aiolian identity.

Concluding Remarks

The Aiolians have repeatedly disappeared from historical sight in this thesis. However, this cannot be attributed to a singular narrative of disintegrating Aiolian identity, because disappearances in certain areas occur at the same time as a strong sense of identity is apparent elsewhere: the brief initial use of the Aiolian mode in the late sixth and early fifth century disappears, but then Boiotians and Lesbians in the late fifth century express strong ethnic sympathies. Kinship mythology based on Aiolos, son of Hellen, appeared in the Archaic period, but its significance for Aiolian interactions did not really develop until the Hellenistic period.

It is important to consider the Aiolians' identity alongside their peers in the Greek world. I made the case (see introduction & chapter 2) that the Aiolians were generally understood to be an important ethnic group when such comparisons were made in antiquity. If the Dorians and Ionians receive much more attention in modern scholarship, this is not only because certain cities – Sparta and Athens – notably announced and even manipulated their ethnic identity to political ends. Their power surely contributed to the success of this strategy, and thus these are also the poleis for which we have the best evidence. It is clear too that this trumpeted identity was fostered, for example, amongst Athens' Ionian cousins and allies from an early period, as reflected in Solon's mournful reference to Athens' state as the diminished oldest land of Ionia (fr. 28a) and extensively exercised within the Athenian Empire. The emotional draw of Aiolian identity did seem to be in effect at about this time, and there was some curiosity in the Hellenistic Period too. Why did Aiolian ethnic identity seem to be salient, in the way in which we have traditionally studied identity in antiquity, only intermittently (chapter 8)? Perhaps the most important factor here is the level of internal conflict within each of the regions which we can clearly describe as Aiolian: Thessaly, Boiotia and Aiolis each had their

own regional ethnic identities. Thessaly was the firm setting for Aiolian migration and kinship myths; but these are more often taken up by Boiotians and Aiolians than the Thessalians themselves (chapters 3 & 4). I have suggested that the unifying strategies of Larissan potentates involved formulating new traditions in contrast to those which acknowledge Aiolian identity, but it is difficult to confirm the salience of Aiolian identity in this region at any point before the Hellenistic period.

There is some validity to scholarly criticism of Barth's assertion that ethnicity was the 'basic, most general identity' for any group, competing successfully with regional identities. We have seen that the problems of regional identity likely often detracted from Aiolianism. The Thessalian *tageia* passed around its dynasts, altering Thessalian foreign policy as it went. The problematic coherence of early Thessalian identity still needs more attention;[746] it seems that Aiolian identity did not begin to return to Thessaly before the fourth century and was constructed out of the traditions of the Boiotian and Aiolian diaspora. Boiotia was more fractious than many other Greek regions, the epitome of Thucydides' correlation of fertile land and febrile politics. Cooperation between the Boiotian poleis usually becomes apparent in the historical record precisely at the moment when unity has broken down.[747] Unsuccessful attempts to launch the Boiotian League, and the secessionist identities of Orchomenos and Plataia etc., made the regional identity of Boiotia more salient than interregional ties for much of the Classical period. Powerful states employed Dorian and Ionian identities at expedient moments to develop their relationship with other poleis. In contrast, however, all three Aiolian regions suffered political setbacks in international relations, particularly

---

[746] Mili (2015) chapter 5 makes good headway on the cultic aspects.

[747] Larson (2007); Beck and Ganter (2015).

as a consequence of Medism during the Persian Wars, but none more so that Aiolis and Lesbos. This region was dominated by Athens, Persia, or both, from the mid-sixth century until Alexander's arrival, with only brief intervals of full autonomy.[748] It may be that external stimulus, in the form of the ethnic economy of kinship diplomacy which arose after Chaeroneia, helped to reestablish Aiolian identity in the context of the other Greek identities. Thus we find Aiolian interactions such as Bombos of Alexandreia Troas' trip to Larissa (chapter 3) and Aiolians attending certain small but international festivals (chapter 8). Such stimulus is generally visible, too, in Heraclides of Pontus' revival of the ethnic salience of music (chapter 4), especially the apparently latent Aiolian mode.

One of the goals of this thesis has been to reconsider the cultural content of ethnicity, which I argue is as important for understanding what Aiolians thought of themselves as the kinship structures which helped them relate to others. The 'situationalist' readings of Greek ethnicity scholars, with their focus on the immediate contingencies and the development of boundaries, often offer the impression that ethnic identity rears its head largely at moments of conflict and contact, as though the performative script offered by ethnicity was largely a matter of international legal procedure which demanded elaboration and justification. This is the conclusion of a theory that rightly asserts that identities cannot form in isolation, but are formulated at their boundaries and in relation to other developments. It is clear, though, that Aiolian identity had less of an (advertized) conflictual component. In the fifth century, when the conflict between Greek states took on some of the appearance of ethnic conflict in the

[748] See Ellis-Evans (2019) chapter 4 on the internal politics of Mytilene, Lesbos and Aiolis in the fifth century BCE.

antipathy of Dorians and Ionians, not only did Aiolian poleis fall on both sides of the conflict, but the firmest indication of Aiolian ethnicity is the regret apparently felt that they find themselves on opposing sides (Thuc. 7.57, chapter 8). Surely it is an indication of the strength of Aiolian culture that Aiolian identity persisted in any sense against the centripetal ethnic manipulation of Sparta's and Athens' imperial peripheries. I have argued therefore that performativity offers a means to understand how music and dialect, by means of their basic position in Greek social life, had the potential to develop as a form of ethnic discourse. It is in these cultural 'indicia' that we can see the evidence of Aiolian identity which is otherwise somewhat lacking in the supposed 'criteria'. This is not an argument for a revival of modern ethnography of ancient people's cultural traits, but a revindication of the subjective and individual experience of ethnicity. Put another way, it highlights the acts of maintenance rather than the boundary which they maintained. Certain forms of culture, particularly Archaic poetry, could be revisited in their ethnic context, although ethnic identity will not always be found. Many scholars now accept the idea of an Aiolian phase of Homeric poetry. The idea that the Epic Cycle combines Thessalian myth with Asiatic Aiolian curiosity about the recent history of their new homeland, i.e. giving a pan-Aiolian core to the *Iliad*, needs to be revisited for its assumptions about the cultural connection between Thessaly and Aiolis in the Early Iron Age.

At one point, it was considered that the distribution of ethnic identities could be demonstrated by the presence of certain institutional features at the polis level, e.g. tribal structures and month-names, as the legacy of migrants who brought their political structures with them to new areas. That wide-scale view of intra-Hellenic identities has been largely overturned; certainly, it is neither particularly accurate nor particularly sound to suggest that the absence of civic subdivisions defines the Aiolians. The absence

of a pan-Aiolian institution, whether a sanctuary or a shared festival, is nevertheless quite pertinent. If, as I have suggested, ethnicized cultural practices provided a way to develop and maintain ethnic identity at the individual level, it must be the case that certain situations emphasized the ethnic situation. It is important that dialect had the potential to affirm one's sense of ethnic identity (chapter 6), but it seems unlikely that speaking one's native dialect was always ethnically important to Aiolians (dialectical creep notwithstanding, we cannot call Boiotian or Aiolian minority dialects within their regions), and it is surely the case that music was not always played in one mode or another to evoke ethnic meanings. The literary remains on which we rely for evidence of ethnic identity were sometimes active attempts at reformulation and sometimes passive reflections of ideas developed elsewhere. In either case, we might ask about the venues where cultural practices and literary performances took on an ethnicized and performative aspect. Constantakopoulou and Vlassopoulos have expressed hesitations about whether the identity of an ethnic group such as the Ionians or Aiolians truly found expression at shared festivals and sanctuaries, but they are worth further exploration as centres of identity and performance.[749] It is clear that these sanctuaries did function on some level as ethnic meeting places. Some Ionians or Dorians were excluded from them, as we know, but this is evidence of careful management of the ethnic politics of religion, not the absence of ethnic religion. The invisibility of Aiolian religious institutions, however, or even of parallel Aiolian civic divisions with their associated social elements, may reflect the low levels of Aiolian ethnic identification. It also ensured that Aiolians had few places in which to meet and explore their common cultural and ethnic identity.

[749] See section 8.3.

Bibliography

Abu El-Haj, N. (2012) *The Genealogical Science* (Chicago)

Adams, W.Y., Gerven, D.P.V. and Levy, R.S. (1978) 'The Retreat from Migrationism', *Annual Review of Anthropology* 7, 483–532

Adank, P., Stewart, A.J., Connell, L. and Wood, J. (2013) 'Accent Imitation Positively Affects Language Attitudes', *Frontiers in Psychology* 4,

Allen, S.H. (1994) 'Trojan Grey Ware at Tel Miqne-Ekron', *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 293, 39–51

Alty, J. (1982) 'Dorians and Ionians', *JHS* 102, 1–14

Anderson, J.K. (1998) 'The Geometric Catalogue of Ships', in E. Vermeule, J.B. Carter and S.P. Morris (eds), *The Ages of Homer* 181–91

Anderson, W.D. (1994) *Music and Musicians in Ancient Greece* (Ithaca, NY)

Angour, A.J. (1999) 'Archinus, Eucleides and the Reform of the Athenian Alphabet', *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 43, 109–30

Anson, E.M. (2009) 'Greek Ethnicity and the Greek Language', *Glotta* 85, 5–30

Anthias, F. (2001) 'New Hybridities, Old Concepts: The Limits of "Culture"', *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 24, 619–41

Anthony, D.W. (1990) 'Migration in Archeology: The Baby and the Bathwater', *American Anthropologist* 92, 895–914

----- (1997) 'Prehistoric Migration as Social Process', in J. Chapman and H. Hamerow (eds), *Migrations and Invasions in Archaeological Explanation* (BAR International Series 664) (Oxford) 21–32

Antonaccio, C.M. (2001) 'Ethnicity and Colonization', in I. Malkin (ed.), *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity* (Cambridge, MA) 113–57

Antonetti, C. (2005) 'La tradizione eolica in Etolia', in A. Mele, M.L. Napolitano and A. Visconti (eds), *Eoli ed Eolide: tra madrepatria e colonie* (Naples)

Apostolou, S. (2018) The Importance of Being Aeolian: Shaping Aeolian Identity in Ancient Asia Minor (PhD thesis, University of Nottingham)

Aravantinos, V.L. (2014) 'The Inscriptions from the Sanctuary of Herakles at Thebes: An Overview', in N. Papazarkadas (ed.), *The Epigraphy and History of Boeotia: New Finds, New Prospects* (Leiden) 149–210

Armstrong, J.A. (1982) *Nations Before Nationalism* (Chapel Hill, NC)

Asheri, D., Lloyd, A. and Corcella, A. (2007) *A Commentary on Herodotus Book I-IV*, edited by O. Murray and A. Moreno (Oxford)

Aslan, C. (2002) 'Ilion before Alexander: Recent Finds of Protogeometric, Geometric, and Archaic Pottery from Area D9', *Studia Troica* 12, 81–129

----- (2019) 'Troy and the Northeastern Aegean', in I.S. Lemos and A. Kotsonas (eds), *A Companion to the Archaeology of Early Greece and the Mediterranean* (Hoboken, NJ) 217–46

Aslan, C. and Hnila, P. (2015) 'Migration and integration at Troy from the end of the Late Bronze Age to the Iron Age', in N.C. Stampolidēs, Ç. Maner and K. Kopanias (eds), *Nostoi: Indigenous Culture, Migration and Integration in the Aegean Islands and Western Anatolia during the Late Bronze and Early Iron Ages* (İstanbul) 267–83

Aslan, C., Kealhofer, L. and Grave, P. (2014) 'The Early Iron Age at Troy Reconsidered: The Early Iron Age at Troy Reconsidered', *OJA* 33, 275–312

Aslan, C. and Pernicka, E. (2013) 'Wild Goat style Ceramics at Troy and the Impact of Archaic Period Colonisation on the Troad', *Anat. St.* 63, 35–53

Banton, M. (2007) 'Max Weber on "Ethnic Communities": A Critique', *Nations and Nationalism* 13, 19–35

Barker, A. (ed.) (1984) *Greek Musical Writings* 1 (Cambridge)

----- (ed.) (1989) *Greek Musical Writings* 2 (Cambridge)

----- (2007) *The Science of Harmonics in Classical Greece* (Cambridge)

Barth, F. (1969) 'Introduction', in F. Barth (ed.), *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organization of Culture Difference* (Oslo) 9–38

----- (1994) 'Enduring and Emerging Issues in the Analysis Of Ethnicity', in H. Vermeulen and C. Govers (eds), *The Anthropology of Ethnicity: Beyond 'Ethnic Groups and Boundaries'* (Amsterdam) 11–32

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* (Bonn)

Beck, H. (2019) 'The Aiolians - A Phantom *Ethnos*?', in H. Beck, K. Buraselis and A. McAuley (eds), *Ethnos and Koinon: Studies in Ancient Greek Ethnicity and Federalism* (Stuttgart) 385–404

Beck, H. and Ganter, A. (2015) 'Boiotia and the Boiotian Leagues', in H. Beck and P. Funke (eds), *Federalism in Greek Antiquity* (Cambridge) 132–57

Benhabib, S. (1995) 'Feminism and Postmodernism', in *Feminist Contentions: A Philosophical Exchange* (New York) 17–34

Bentley, G.C. (1987) ‘Ethnicity and Practice’, *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 29, 24–55

Bérard, J. (1959) ‘La migration éolienne’, *Rev. Arch.* 1, 1–28

Bhabha, H.K. (ed.) (1990) *Nation and Narration* (London and New York)

Bielohlawek, K. (1924) ‘Μέλπεσθαι und Μολπή’, *Wiener Studien* 44–45, 1–18, 125–43, 1–11

Bile, M., Hodot, R. and Brixhe, C. (1984) ‘Les dialectes grecs, ces inconnus’, *Bulletin de La société de linguistique de Paris* 79, 155–203

van Binsbergen, W.M.J. and Woudhuizen, F. (2011) *Ethnicity in Mediterranean Protohistory* (Oxford)

Bommeljé, S. (1988) ‘Aeolis in Aetolia: Thuc. 3.102.5 and the Origins of the Aetolian “Ethnos”’, *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte* 37, 297–316

Bourdieu, P. (1990) *The Logic of Practice* (Cambridge)

----- (1991) *Language and Symbolic Power*, J.B.T.G. Raymond and M. Adamson (eds) (Cambridge)

Brancaccio, I. (2005) ‘Aioleis, Aiolos, Aiolidai: ampiezza di una tradizione’, in A. Mele, M.L. Napolitano and A. Visconti (eds), *Eoli ed Eolide: tra madrepatria e colonie* (Naples)

Brillante, C. (1981) *La leggenda eroica e la civiltà micenea* (Rome)

Brillante, C. (1993) ‘Pilo e i Neleidi in un frammmento di Mimnermo’, in R. Pretagostini (ed.), *Tradizione e innovazione nella cultura greca da Omero all’età ellenistica: scritti in onore di Bruno Gentili* (Roma) 267–78

Britain, D. (2013) ‘Space, Diffusion and Mobility’, in J.K. Chambers, N. Schilling-Estes and S. Edition (eds), *The Handbook of Language Variation and Change* (Chichester and Malden, MA) 471–500

Brixhe, C. and Vottéro, G. (2006) *Peuplements et genèses dialectales dans la Grèce antique* (Etudes anciennes 31) (Nancy)

Brown, C.G. (1992) ‘The Hyperboreans and Nemesis in Pindar’s “Tenth Pythian”’, *Phoenix* 46, 95–107

Brown, M.K. (2002) *The Narratives of Konon* (Munich)

Brubaker, R. (2004) *Ethnicity Without Groups* (Cambridge, MA)

----- (2015) *Grounds for Difference* (Cambridge, MA)

----- (2016) *Trans: Gender and Race in an Age of Unsettled Identities* (Princeton, NJ)

Bryce, T. (2006) *The Trojans and their neighbours* (London and New York)

Buck, C.D. (1955) *The Greek Dialects: Grammar, Selected Inscriptions, Glossary* (Chicago)

Buck, R.J. (1979) *A History of Boeotia* (Edmonton)

Buckler, J. (2003) *Aegean Greece in the fourth century BC* (Leiden)

Burmeister, S. (2000) 'Archaeology and Migration: Approaches to an Archaeological Proof of Migration', *Current Anthropology* 41, 539–67

Butler, J. (1988) 'Performative Acts and Gender Constitution: An Essay in Phenomenology and Feminist Theory', *Theatre Journal* 40, 519

----- (1990) *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity* (New York)

----- (1993) *Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits of 'Sex'* (Abingdon and New York)

----- (1994) 'Gender as Performance: An Interview with Judith Butler', *Radical Philosophy: A Journal of Socialist and Feminist Philosophy* 67, 32–39

----- (1995) 'For a Careful Reading', in *Feminist Contentions: A Philosophical Exchange* (New York) 127–44

----- (1999) *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity* (10th anniversary edition) (New York)

Cabana, G.S. (2011) 'The Problematic Relationship between Migration and Culture Change', in *Rethinking Anthropological Perspectives on Migration* (Gainesville, FL) 16–28

Cabana, G.S. and Clark, J.J. (2011) 'Introduction. Migration in anthropology: Where we stand', in G.S. Cabana and J.J. Clark (eds), *Rethinking Anthropological Perspectives on Migration* (Gainesville, FL) 3–15

Camera, M. (2018) 'Nuovi dati sulle fasi più antiche di Kyme eolica', *Annuario della Scuola archeologica di Atene e delle missioni italiane in Oriente* 97, 161–83

Carless Unwin, N. (2017) *Caria and Crete in Antiquity: Cultural Interaction between Anatolia and the Aegean* (Cambridge)

Casanova, A. (1973) 'Un frammento trascurato e il problema della divisione in libri del Catalogo esiodeo', *Studi italiani di filologia classica* 45, 3–27

Casevitz, M. (1991) 'Hellenismos. Formation et fonction des verbes en –IZŌ et de leurs dérivés', in S. Saïd (ed.), *Hellenismos: quelques jalons pour une histoire de l'identité grecque: actes du Colloque de Strasbourg, 25-27 octobre 1989* (Leiden and New York) 9–16

Cassio, A.C. (1986) 'Continuità e riprese arcaizzanti nell'uso epigrafico dei dialetti greci: Il caso dell'eolico d'Asia', in *AION: Annali del Dipartimento di studi del mondo classico e del Mediterraneo antico - Sezione linguistica* 8 131–45

Càssola, F. (1953) ‘Le genealogie mitiche e la coscienza nazionale greca’, *Rendiconti della Accademia di archeologia lettere e belle arti n.s.* 28, 279–303

Catling, R. (1998) ‘The Typology of the Protogeometric and Sub-Protogeometric Pottery from Troy and its Aegean Context’, *Studia Troica* 8, 151–87

Cawkwell, G. (2005) *The Greek Wars: The Failure of Persia* (Oxford)

Chadwick, J. (1996) *Lexicographica Graeca: Contributions to the Lexicography of Ancient Greek* (Oxford)

Chaniotis, A. (2009) ‘Travelling Memories in the Hellenistic world’, in R. Hunter and I. Rutherford (eds), *Wandering Poets in Ancient Greek Culture* (Cambridge) 249–69

Chantraine, P. (1991) *Morphologie historique du grec* (3rd edition) (Paris)

Childe, V.G. (1950) *Prehistoric Migrations in Europe* (Oslo)

Chrisomalis, S. and Trigger, B.G. (2004) ‘Reconstructing Prehistoric Ethnicity: Problems and Possibilities’, in J.V. Wright and J.-L. Pilon (eds), *A Passion for the Past: Papers in Honor of James F. Pendergast* 419–33

Cingano, E. (2005) ‘A Catalogue Within a Catalogue: Helen’s Suitors in the Hesiodic Catalogue of Women (frr. 196–204)’, in R. Hunter (ed.), *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women: Constructions and Reconstructions* (Cambridge) 118–52

Clackson, J. (2015) *Language and Society in the Greek and Roman Worlds. Key Themes in Ancient History* (Cambridge)

Clammer, J. (2015) ‘Performing Ethnicity: Performance, Gender, Body and Belief in the Construction and Signalling of Identity’, *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 38, 2159–66

Clark, J.J. (2001) *Tracking Prehistoric Migrations: Pueblo Settlers among the Tonto Basin Hohokam* (Tucson, AZ)

Cline, E.H. (2014) *1177 B.C.: The Year Civilization Collapsed* (Princeton, NJ)

Cohen, A. (1974) ‘Introduction’, in A. Cohen (ed.), *Urban Ethnicity* (New York) ix–xxiv

Cohen, B. (2001) ‘Ethnic Identity in Democratic Athens and the Visual Vocabulary of Male Costume’, in I. Malkin (ed.), *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity* (Cambridge, MA) 235–74

Collinge, N.L. (1973) ‘The Dialectology and Prehistoric Development of Greek’, in R.A. Crossland and A. Burchall (eds), *Bronze Age Migrations in the Aegean* (Park Ridge, NJ) 293–304

Collins, B.J., Bachvarova, M.R. and Rutherford, I.C. (eds) (2008) *Anatolian Interfaces: Hittites, Greeks and Their Neighbours* (Oxford)

Colvin, S. (1999) *Dialect in Aristophanes: The Politics of Language in Ancient Greek Literature* (Oxford)

----- (2004) 'Social Dialect in Attica', in *Indo-European Perspectives: Studies in Honour of Anna Morpurgo Davies* (Oxford) 95–108

----- (2010) 'Greek Dialects in the Archaic and Classical Ages', in E.J. Bakker (ed.), *A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language* (Chichester) 200–212

Conversi, D. (1995) 'Reassessing Current Theories of Nationalism: Nationalism as Boundary Maintenance and Creation', *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics* 1, 73–85

Cook, J.M. (1975) 'Greek Settlement in the Eastern Aegean and Asia Minor', in *The Cambridge Ancient History* II.2 773–804

Coppola, G. (2005) 'Makareus tra Eoli e Pelasgi', in A. Mele, M.L. Napolitano and A. Visconti (eds), *Eoli ed Eolide: tra madrepatria e colonie* (Naples)

Cramer, J. (2016) *Contested Southerness* (Durham, NC)

Crielaard, J.P. (2009) 'The Ionians in the Archaic Period: Shifting Identities in the Changing World', in T. Derks and N. Roymans (eds), *Ethnic Constructs in Antiquity: The Role of Power and Tradition* 37–84

Curet, L.A. (2011) 'Irving Rouse's Contribution to American Archaeology: The Case of Migraiton', in L.A. Curet and M.W. Hauser (eds), *Islands at the Crossroads: Migration, Seafaring, and Interaction in the Caribbean* (Tuscaloosa, AL) 13–21

Dale, A. (2011) 'Alcaeus on the Career of Myrsilos: Greeks, Lydians and Luwians at the East Aegean-West Anatolian Interface', *JHS* 131, 15–24

D'Alessio, G.B. (2005) 'The *Megalai Ehoiai*: a Survey of the Fragments', in R. Hunter (ed.), *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women: Constructions and Reconstructions* (Cambridge) 176–216

D'Angour, A. (2011) *The Greeks and the New: Novelty in Ancient Greek Imagination and Experience* (Cambridge)

David, A.P. (2006) *The Dance of the Muses: Choral Theory and Ancient Greek Poetics* (Oxford)

Davies, A.M. (1987) 'The Greek Notion of Dialect', *Verbum* 10,

Davies, J. (1994) 'The Tradition about the First Sacred War', in S. Hornblower (ed.), *Greek Historiography* (Oxford) 193–212

Davies, J. (2014) *The Welsh Language: A History* (2nd edn) (Cardiff)

Debnar, P.A. (1996) 'The Unpersuasive Thebans (Thucydides 3.61-67)', *Phoenix* 50, 95–110

Decourt, J.-C., Nielsen, T.H. and Helly, B. (2004) 'Thessalia and Adjacent Regions', in M.H. Hansen and T.H. Nielsen (eds), *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis* (Oxford) 676–731

Deger-Jalkotzy, S. (2008) 'Decline, Destruction, Aftermath', in C.W. Shelmerdine (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Aegean Bronze Age* (Cambridge) 387–416

Díaz-Andreu García, M. (2005) *The Archaeology of Identity: Approaches to Gender, Age, Status, Ethnicity and Religion* (London)

Dickinson, O.T.P.K. (2006) *The Aegean from Bronze Age to Iron Age: Continuity and Change Between the Twelfth and Eighth Centuries BC* (London and New York)

Dommelen, P. (2014) 'Moving On: Archaeological Perspectives on Mobility and Migration', *World Archaeology* 46, 477–83

Dougherty, C. (1993) *The Poetics of Colonization: From City to Text in Archaic Greece* (New York)

Duhoux, Y. (1972) 'Le scellé Ws 1707 de Cnossos', *Nestor* 178, 810

Edwards, A.T. (2004) *Hesiod's Ascra* (Berkeley)

Einarson, B. (1952) 'Plutarch's Ancestry', *CPh* 47, 99–99

Ellis-Evans, A. (2019) *The Kingdom of Priam: Lesbos and the Troad Between Anatolia and the Aegean* (Oxford)

Emlyn-Jones, C.J. (1980) *The Ionians and Hellenism: A Study of the Cultural Achievement of Early Greek Inhabitants of Asia Minor* (London and Boston, MA)

Eriksen, T.H. (2004) 'Place, kinship and the Case for Non-Ethnic Nations', in M.M. Guibernau and J. Hutchinson (eds), *History and National Destiny: Ethnosymbolism and Its Critics* (Oxford)

Feldman, M., Master, D.M., Bianco, R.A et al. (2019) 'Ancient DNA Sheds Light on the Genetic Origins of Early Iron Age Philistines' *Science Advances* 5.7

Filotico, F. (2011) 'Reinhard Wenskus and the Concept of Ethnicity in the Age of Barbarian Invasions', *Nuova rivista storica* 95, 787–826

Finglass, P.J. (2012) 'Ethnic Identity in Stesichorus', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 182, 39–44

Finkelberg, M. (2011) 'Dorians', in M. Finkelberg (ed.), *The Homer Encyclopedia* (Malden, MA, Oxford and Chichester) 1:217–18

Fishman, J. (1980) 'Social Theory and Ethnography', in P.F. Sugar (ed.), *Ethnic Diversity and Conflict in Eastern Europe* (Santa Barbara, CA) 69–100

Flower, M.A. (2000) 'From Simonides to Isocrates: The Fifth-Century Origins of Fourth-Century Panhellenism', *Classical Antiquity* 19, 65–101

Fowler, R.L. (1999) ‘Genealogical Thinking, Hesiod’s *Catalogue*, and the Creation of the Hellenes’, *CCJ* 44, 1–19

---- (2000–13) *Early Greek Mythography*, 2 vols (Oxford)

---- (2016) ‘The Nostoi and Archaic Greek Ethnicity’, in S. Hornblower and G. Biffis (eds), *The Returning Hero:* Nostoi *and Traditions of Mediterranean Settlement* (Oxford) 43–64

Fragoulaki, M. (2013) *Kinship in Thucydides: Intercommunal Ties and Historical Narrative* (Oxford)

Frasca, M. (2017) ‘Scavi e ricerche sulla Collina Sud di Kyme eolica’, in A. La Marca (ed.), *Studi su Kyme eolica VI* (Calabria) 75–94

Gagné, R. (2009) ‘Atreid Ancestors in Alkaios’, *JHS* 129, 39–43

Gantz, T. (1993) *Early Greek Myth: A Guide to Literary and Artistic Sources* (Baltimore and London)

García-Ramón, J.L. (1975) ‘Les origines postmycéniennes du groupe dialectal éolien: étude linguistique’, (PhD thesis, Universidad de Salamanca)

García-Ramón, J.L. (2010) ‘On the Genetic Classification of Ancient Greek Dialects: Comparative Reconstruction versus Hypercriticism and Atomism at Work’, *Studies in Greek Linguistics* 30, 219–36

Garrett, P. (2010) *Attitudes to Language* (Cambridge and New York)

Geertz, C. (1963) ‘The Integrative Revolution: Primordial Sentiments and Civil Politics in the New States’, in *Old Societies and New States: The Quest for Modernity in Asia and Africa* (New York) 105–57

Gehrke, H.-J. (2001) ‘Myth, History, and Collective Identity: Uses of the Past in Ancient Greece and Beyond’, in N. Luraghi (ed.), *The Historian’s Craft in the Age of Herodotus* (Oxford) 286–313

Gera, D.L. (2003) *Ancient Greek Ideas on Speech, Language, and Civilization* (Oxford)

Giles, H. (1970) ‘Evaluative Reactions to Accents’, *Educational Review* 22, 211–27

Giles, H. and Ogay, T. (2006) ‘Communication Accommodation Theory’, in B.B. Whaley and W. Samter (eds), *Explaining Communication: Contemporary Theories and Exemplars* (London)

Gillett, A. (ed.) (2002) *On Barbarian Identity* (Turnhout)

Gilroy, P. (1993) *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness* (Cambridge, Mass)

Graninger, D. (2011) *Cult and Koinon in Hellenistic Thessaly* (Leiden)

Gray, V. (2007) ‘Herodotus 5.55–69: Structure and Significance’, in E. Irwin and E. Greenwood (eds), *Reading Herodotus: A Study of the* Logoi *in Book 5 of Herodotus’* Histories (Cambridge and New York) 202–25

Greenblatt, S. (2010) *Cultural Mobility: A Manifesto* (Cambridge)

Greppin, J.A.C. (1997) ‘Greek Verbs in -azō and -izō’, *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientarum Hungaricae* 50, 107–9

Grummond, N. (2014) ‘Ethnicity and the Etruscans’, in J. McInerney (ed.), *A Companion to Ethnicity in the Ancient Mediterranean World* (Oxford) 405–22

Guibernau, M.M. (2004) ‘Anthony D. Smith on Nations and National Identity: A Critical Assessment’, in M.M. Guibernau and J. Hutchinson (eds), *History and National Destiny: Ethnosymbolism and Its Critics* (Oxford) 125–41

Hagel, S. (2009) *Ancient Greek Music: A New Technical History* (Cambridge)

Hainsworth, J.B. (1967) ‘Greek Views of Greek Dialectology’, *Transactions of the Philological Society* 66, 62–76

Hakenbeck, S. (2008) ‘Migration in Archaeology: Are We Nearly There Yet?’, *Archaeological Review from Cambridge* 23, 9–26

Hall, E. (1991) *Inventing the Barbarian: Greek Self-Definition Through Tragedy* (Oxford)

Hall, J.M. (1996) ‘The Role of Language in Greek Ethnicities’, *PCPS* 41, 83–100

----- (1997) *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity* (Cambridge)

----- (2001) ‘Contested Ethnicities: Perceptions of Macedonia within Evolving Definitions of Greek Identity’, in I. Malkin (ed.), *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity* (Cambridge, MA) 159–86

----- (2002) *Hellenicity: Between Ethnicity and Culture* (Chicago)

----- (2003) ‘The Dorianization of the Messenians’, in N. Luraghi and S.E. Alcock (eds), *Helots and Their Masters in Laconia and Messenia: Histories, Ideologies, Structures* (Washington, DC, and Cambridge, MA)

Hall, S. (1996) ‘Who Needs “Identity”?’, in S. Hall and P. Du Gay (eds), *Questions of Cultural Identity* (London) 1–17

Hamilakis, Y. (2017) ‘Who are you calling Mycenaean?’ [Online] Available at: https://www.lrb.co.uk/blog/2017/august/who-are-you-calling-mycenaean [Accessed: 14 January 2020]

Hamm, E.-M. (1957) *Grammatik zu Sappho und Alkaios* (Berlin)

Hammond, N.G.L. (1992) ‘Plataea’s relations with Thebes, Sparta and Athens’, *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 112, 143–50

Harding, P. (2008) *The Story of Athens: The Fragments of the Local Chronicles of Attika* (London and New York)

Harman, R. (2013) 'Looking at the Other: Visual Mediation and Greek Identity in Xenophon's Anabasis', in E. Almagor and J. Skinner (eds), *Ancient Ethnography: New Approaches* (New York) 79–96

Hawkins, J.D. (1998) 'Tarkasnawa King of Mira "Tarkondemos", Boğazköy Sealings and Karabel', *Anat. St.* 48, 1–31

Heath, J. (2005) *The Talking Greeks: Speech, Animals, and the Other in Homer, Aeschylus, and Plato* (Cambridge)

Helly, B. (1995) *L'État thessalien: Aleuas le Roux, les tétrades et les 'Tagoi'* (Lyon)

----- (2004) 'Glosses thessaliennes et realia', in G. Rocca (ed.), *Dialetti, dialettismi, generi letterari e funzioni sociali. Atti del V colloquio internazionale di linguistica greca (Milano, 12-13 settembre 2002)* (Alessandria) 265–302

----- (2006) 'Décret de Larisa pour Bombos, fils d'Alkaios, et pour Leukios, fils de Nikasias, citoyens d'Alexandrie de Troade (ca 150 av. J.-C.)', *Chiron* 36, 171–203

---- (2007) 'Le dialecte thessalien: un autre modèle de développment', in I. Hajnal (ed.), *Die altgriechischen Dialekte* (Innsbruck) 177–222

----- (2010) 'Bulletin épigraphique', *Revue des études grecques* 2, 832–36

Henrichs, A. (1999) 'Demythologizing the Past, Mythicizing the Present: Myth, History, and the Supernatural at the Dawn of the Hellenistic Period', in R. Buxton (ed.), *From Myth to Reason?* (Oxford) 223–48

Henry, W.B. (2005) *Pindar's Nemeans: A Selection* (Munich)

Hershbell, J.P. (1993) 'Plutarch and Herodotus - the Beetle in the Rose', *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 136, 143–63

Hertel, D. (1991) 'Schliemanns These vom Fortleben Troias in den "Dark Ages" im Lichte neuer Forschungsergebnisse', *Studia Troica* 1, 131–44

----- (2008) *Das frühe Ilion: die Besiedlung Troias durch die Griechen (1020-650/25 v. Chr.)* (Munich)

Hirschberger, M. (2004) *Gynaikōn Katalogos und Megalai Ēhoiai: Ein Kommentar zu den Fragmenten zweier Hesiodeischer Epen* (Munich)

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 (PhD thesis, Universität Tübingen)

Hobsbawm, E.J. and Ranger, T.O. (eds) (2012) *The Invention of Tradition* (Cambridge)

Hodot, R. (1990) *Le dialecte éolien d'Asie: la langue des inscriptions, VIIe s. a.C.-IVe s. p.C* (Paris)

Hofmann, B. and Mueller, M. (eds) (2016) *Performing Ethnicity, Performing Gender: Transcultural Perspectives* (London)

Hogarth, D.G. (1909) *Ionia and the East* (Oxford)

Hooker, J.T. (1977) *The Language and Text of the Lesbian Poets* (Innsbruck)

Horden, P. and Purcell, N. (2000) *The Corrupting Sea: A Study of Mediterranean History* (Oxford and Malden, MA)

Hornblower, S. (2013) *Herodotus:* Histories*, Book V* (Cambridge)

----- (2015) *Lykophron:* Alexandra (Oxford)

Horowitz, D. (1975) 'Ethnic Identity', in N. Glazer and D.P. Moynihan (eds), *Ethnicity: Theory and Experience* (Cambridge, MA) 111–40

Hutchinson, J. and Smith, A.D. (eds) (1996) *Ethnicity* (Oxford and New York)

Huxley, G.L. (1969) *Greek Epic Poetry* (London)

Huxley, G.L. (1975) *Pindar's Vision of the Past* (Belfast)

İren, K. (2008) 'Dark Age Pottery from Southern Aeolis', in D. Brandherm and M. Trachsel (eds), *A New Dawn for the Dark Age? Shifting Paradigms in Mediterranean Iron Age chronology = L'âge obscur se fait-il jour de nouveau? Les paradigmes changeants de la chronologie de l'âge du fer en Méditerranée* (Oxford)

Isaac, B.H. (2004) *The Invention of Racism in Classical Antiquity* (Princeton, NJ)

Janko, R. (1982) *Homer, Hesiod, and the Hymns: Diachronic Development in Epic Diction* (Cambridge)

Jenkins, R. (2008) *Rethinking Ethnicity* (2nd edn) (Thousand Oaks, CA)

Jones, C.P. (1996) 'ἔθνος and γένος in Herodotus', *The Classical Quarterly* 46, 315–20

Jones, S. (1997) *The Archaeology of Ethnicity: Constructing Identities in the Past and Present* (London and New York)

Jones, S. (1998) 'Ethnic Identity as Discursive Strategy: The Case of the Ancient Greeks (Review of Hall's *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity*)', *Cambridge Archaelogical Journal* 8, 271–73

Joseph, J.E. (2004) *Language and Identity: National, Ethnic, Religious* (Basingstoke & New York)

Kalliontzis, Y. and Papazarkadas, N. (2013) 'Tritopatreis in Boeotia', *ZPE* 184, 165–71

Kasperski, R. (2015) ‘Ethnicity, Ethnogenesis, and the Vandals: Some Remarks on a Theory of Emergence of the Barbarian *Gens*’, *Acta Poloniae Historica* 112, 201–42

Keaveney, A. (1995) ‘The Medisers of Thessaly’, *Eranos* 93, 30–38

Kerschner, M. (2006) ‘On the Provenance of Aiolian pottery’, in A. Villing and U. Schlotzhauer (eds), *Naukratis: Greek Diversity in Egypt: Studies on East Greek Pottery and Exchange in the Eastern Mediterranean* (London)

Kim, R.I., Mynářová, J. and Pavúk, P. (eds) (2020) *Hrozný and Hittite: The First Hundred Years: Proceedings of the International Conference Held at Charles University, Prague, 11-14 November 2015* (Leiden and Boston)

Kivilo, M. (2010) *Early Greek Poets’ Lives: The Shaping of the Tradition* (Leiden and Boston)

Konstan, D. (2001) ‘*To Hellenikon ethnos*: Ethnicity and the Construction of Ancient Greek Identity’, in I. Malkin (ed.), *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity* (Cambridge, MA) 29–50

Kotsonas, A. and Mokrišová, J. (2019) ‘Mobility, Migration, and Colonization’, in I.S. Lemos and A. Kotsonas (eds), *A Companion to the Archaeology of Early Greece and the Mediterranean* (Hoboken, NJ) 217–46

Kowalzig, B. (2007) *Singing for the Gods: Performances of Myth and Ritual in Archaic and Classical Greece* (Oxford)

Kristiansen, K. (1989) ‘Prehistoric Migrations: The Case of the Single Grave and Corded Ware Cultures’, *Journal of Danish Archaeology* 8, 211–25

Kurke, L. (1991) *The Traffic in Praise: Pindar and the Poetics of Social Economy* (Ithaca, NY)

Labarre, G. (1996) *Les cités de Lesbos, aux époques hellénistique et impériale* (Paris)

Labov, W. (2006) *The Social Stratification of English in New York City* (2nd edn) (Cambridge & New York)

Lambert, S.D. (2000) ‘Two Notes on Attic ‘Leges Sacrae’’, *ZPE* 130, 71–80

Lamberton, R. (1988) *Hesiod* (New Haven, MA and London)

Larson, S.L. (2007) *Tales of Epic Ancestry: Boiotian Collective Identity in the Late Archaic and Early Classical Periods* (Stuttgart)

Lehmann, G.A. (1983) ‘Thessaliens Hegemonie über Mittelgriechenland im 6. Jh. v. Chr’, *Boreas* 6, 35–43

Lemos, I.S. (2002) *The Protogeometric Aegean: the Archaeology of the Late Eleventh and Tenth Centuries BC* (Oxford)

Lenz, D., Ruppenstein, F., Baumann, M. and Catling, R. (1998) 'Protogeometric Pottery at Troia', *Studia Troica* 8, 189–222

Luraghi, N. (2008) *The Ancient Messenians: Constructions of Ethnicity and Memory* (Cambridge and New York)

Lynch, T. (2016) 'Why are Only the Dorian and Phrygian *Harmoniai* Accepted in Plato's Kallipolis? Lyre vs. Aulos', in L. Bravi, L. Lomiento, A. Meriani and G. Pace (eds), *Tra lyra e aulos: Tradizioni musicali e generi poetici* (Pisa & Bari) 267–84

Ma, J. (2004) 'You Can't Go Home Again: Displacement and Identity in Xenophon's *Anabasis*', in R. Lane Fox (ed.), *The Long March: Xenophon and the Ten Thousand* (New Haven, MA) 330–45

Mac Sweeney, N. (2009) 'Beyond Ethnicity: The Overlooked Diversity of Group Identities', *Journal of Mediterranean Archaeology* 22, 101–26

----- (2012) 'A Land without Autochthons: Anatolian Archaeology in the Early Twentieth Century', in R. Matthews, J. Curtis and M. Seymour (eds), *Proceedings of the 7th International Congress on the Archaeology of the Ancient Near East (12 April–16 April 2010, British Museum and UCL, London)* 2 (Wiesbaden) 63–72

----- (2017) 'Separating Fact from Fiction in the Ionian Migration', *Hesperia: The Journal of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens* 86, 379–421

Mackay, C.S. (2000) 'Damon of Chaeronea: The Loyalties of a Boeotian Town during the First Mithridatic War', *Klio* 82, 91–106

Malay, H. and Ricl, M. (2009) 'Two New Hellenistic Decrees from Aigai in Aiolis', *Epigraphica Anatolica* 42, 39–60

Malkin, I. (2001a) 'Introduction', in I. Malkin (ed.), *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity* (Cambridge, MA) 1–28

----- (ed.) (2001b) *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity* (Cambridge, MA)

----- (2011) *A Small Greek World: Networks in the Ancient Mediterranean* (Oxford)

Manning, P. (2013) *Migration in World History* (2nd edn) (London and New York)

McInerney, J. (1999) *The Folds of Parnassos: Land and Ethnicity in Ancient Phokis* (Austin, TX)

----- (2001) 'Ethnos and Ethnicity in Early Greece', in I. Malkin (ed.), *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity* (Cambridge, MA) 51–73

McNay, L. (2000) *Gender and Agency: Reconfiguring the Subject in Feminist and Social Theory* (Cambridge and Malden, MA)

Mee, C. (2008) 'Mycenaean Greece, the Aegean and Beyond', in C.W. Shelmerdine (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Aegean Bronze Age* (Cambridge) 362–86

Meillet, A. (1975) *Aperçu d'une histoire de la langue grecque* (7th edn) (Paris)

Melchert, C. (2003) *The Luwians* (Leiden)

Mele, A. (2005) 'Aiolos e gli Aiolidi: tradizione anatoliche e metropolitane', in A. Mele, M.L. Napolitano and A. Visconti (eds), *Eoli ed Eolide: tra madrepatria e colonie* (Naples)

Mellink, M. (1991) 'The Native Kingdoms of Anatolia', in *Cambridge Ancient History III.2* (2nd edn) (Cambridge) 619–43

Meyer, E. (1893). 'Aioles', in *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* I.1, 1030–32.

Mickey, K. (1981) 'Dialect Conciousness and Literary Language: An Example from Ancient Greek', *Transactions of the Philological Society* 79, 35–65

Mili, M. (2015a) *Religion and Society in Ancient Thessaly* (Oxford)

Mitchell, L.G. (2007) *Panhellenism and the Barbarian in Archaic and Classical Greece* (Swansea)

Moatti, C. (2004) *La mobilité des personnes en Méditerranée de l'Antiquité à l'époque modern: procédures de contrôle et documents d'identification* (Rome)

Morgan, C. (1989) 'Divination and Society at Delphi and Didyma', *Hermathena* 17–42

----- (1994) 'The Evolution of a Sacral "landscape": Isthmia, Perachora and the Early Corinthian state', in R. Osborne and S.E. Alcock (eds), *Placing the Gods: Sanctuaries and Sacred Space in Ancient Greece* (Oxford) 105–42

----- (2003) *Early Greek States Beyond the* Polis (London and New York)

Mountjoy, P.A. (1998) 'The East Aegean-West Anatolian Interface in the Late Bronze Age: Mycenaeans and the Kingdom of Ahhiyawa', *Anat. St.* 48, 33–68

----- (2015) 'The East Aegean-West Anatolian Interface in the 12th Century BC: Some Aspects Arising from the Mycenaean Pottery', in N.C. Stampolidēs, Ç. Maner and K. Kopanias (eds), *Nostoi: Indigenous Culture, Migration and Integration in the Aegean Islands and Western Anatolia During the Late Bronze and Early Iron Ages* (İstanbul) 37–80

Mouton, A., Rutherford, I. and Yakubovich, I. (eds) (2013) *Luwian Identities: Culture, Language and Religion Between Anatolia and the Aegean* (Leiden)

Mugglestone, L. (1995) *Talking Proper: The Rise of Accent as Social Symbol* (Oxford & New York)

Munson, R.V. (2005) *Black Doves Speak: Herodotus and the Languages of Barbarians*

Munson, R.V. (2014) 'Herodotus and Ethnicity', in J. McInerney (ed.), *A Companion to Ethnicity in the Ancient Mediterranean* (Chichester) 341–55

Murray, A.C. (2002) 'Reinhard Wenskus on "Ethnogenesis", Ethnicity, and the Origin of the Franks', in A. Gillett (ed.), *On Barbarian Identity* (Turnhout) 39–68

Nagy, G. (2009) 'Hesiod and the Ancient Biographical Traditions', in F. Montanari, A. Rengakos and C. Tsagalis (eds), *Brill's Companion to Hesiod* (Leiden and Boston) 271–311

Nettl, B. (1983) *The Study of Ethnomusicology: Twenty-Nine Issues and Concepts* (Urbana)

Niemeier, W.D. (2005) 'Minoans, Mycenaeans, Hittites and Ionians in Western Asia Minor: New Excavations in Bronze Age Miletus-Millawanda', in A. Villing (ed.), *The Greeks in the east* (London) 1–36

Olivier, J.-P. (1968) 'La série Ws de Cnossos', *Minos: Revista de filología egea* 9, 173–83

Onians, J. (1979) *Art and Thought in the Hellenistic Age: The Greek World View, 350-50 BC* (London)

Ormand, K. (2014) *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women and Archaic Greece* (Cambridge)

Østergård, U. (1992) 'What is National and Ethnic Identity?', in P. Bilde, T. Engberg-Pedersen, L. Hannestad and J. Zahle (eds), *Ethnicity in Hellenistic Egypt* (Aarhus) 16–38

Page, D.L. (1955) *Sappho and Alcaeus: An Introduction to the Study of Ancient Lesbian Poetry* (Oxford)

Panagiotopoulou, E. et al. (2018) 'Detecting Mobility in Early Iron Age Thessaly by Strontium Isotope Analysis', *European Journal of Archaeology* 21, 590–611

Papazarkadas, N. (2016) 'Festival Networks in Late Hellenistic Boeotia: From Kinship to Political Rejuvenation', in D.M. Savalli-Lestrade (ed.), *La cité interconnectée: transferts et réseaux institutionnels, religieux et culturels aux époques hellénistique et impériale. Actes du colloque international organisé à ANHIMA, Paris, 24-25 juin 2016* (Bordeaux) 205–21

Parker, H.N. (2008) 'The Linguistic Case for the Aiolian Migration Reconsidered', *Hesperia: The Journal of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens* 77, 431–64

Parmeggiani, G. (2011) *Eforo di Cuma: Studi di storiografia greca* (Bologna)

Patterson, L. (2010) *Kinship Myth in Ancient Greece* (Austin, TX)

Pavúk, P. (2010) ‘Minyan or Not? The Second Millennium Grey Ware in Western Anatolia and its Relation to Mainland Greece’, in A. Philippa-Touchais (ed.), *Mesohelladika: The Greek Mainland in the Middle Bronze Age* (Athens) 931–43

Pirenne-Delforge, V. and Pironti, G. (2014) ‘Héra et Zeus à Lesbos: Entre poésie lyrique et décret civique’, *ZPE* 191, 27–31

Pohl, W. (1998) ‘Telling the Difference. Signs of Ethnic Identity’, in W. Pohl and H. Reimitz (eds), *Strategies of Distinction: The Construction of Ethnic Communities, 300-800* (Leiden) 17–69

Pöhlmann, E. and West, M.L. (2001) *Documents of Ancient Greek Music: The Extant Melodies and Fragments Edited and Transcribed with Commentary* (Oxford)

Power, T.C. (2010) *The Culture of* Kitharôidia (Washington, D.C.)

Prauscello, L. (2012) ‘Epinician Sounds: Pindar and Musical Innovation’, in P. Agocs, C. Carey and R. Rawles (eds), *Reading the Victory Ode* (Cambridge) 58–82

Preston, D.R. (ed.) (1999) *Handbook of Perceptual Dialectology* (Amsterdam and Philadelphia)

----- (2013) ‘Language with an Attitude’, in J.K. Chambers, N. Schilling-Estes and S. Edition (eds), *The Handbook of Language Variation and Change* (Chichester and Malden, MA) 157–82

Quintela, M.V.G. (2009) ‘The Phonological Politics of Plato and the Myth of Protagoras’, *Mètis* 7, 247–76

Rampton, B. (1995) *Crossing: Language and Ethnicity among Adolescent* (London and New York)

Rhodes, P.J. (2019) *Herodotus:* Histories *Book V* (Liverpool)

Richardson, N. (2010) *Three Homeric Hymns* (Cambridge)

Rigsby, K.J. (1996) *Asylia: Territorial Inviolability in the Hellenistic World* (Berkeley, CA)

Robert, L. (1960) ‘Recherches épigraphiques. V. Inscriptions de Lesbos’, *Rev. Ét. Anc.* 62, 285–315

Roberts, B.W. and Vander Linden, M. (eds) (2011) ‘Investigating Archaeological Cultures: Material Culture, Variability, and Transmission’, in *Investigating Archaeological Cultures* (New York, NY) 1–21

Roosevelt, C.H. and Luke, C. (2017) ‘The Story of a Forgotten Kingdom? Survey Archaeology and the Historical Geography of Central Western Anatolia in the Second Millennium BC’, *European Journal of Archaeology* 20, 120–47

Rose, C.B. (2008) ‘Separating Fact from Fiction in the Aiolian Migration’, *Hesperia* 77, 399–430

Ross, S.A. (2005) ‘Barbarophonos: Language and Panhellenism in the Iliad’, *CPh* 100, 299–316

Rouse, I. (1986) *Migrations in Prehistory: Inferring Population Movement from Cultural Remains* (New Haven and London)

Rubenstein, L. (2004) ‘Aiolis and South-western Mysia’, in M.H. Hansen and T.H. Nielsen (eds), *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis* (Oxford) 1033–52

Ruijgh, C. (1991) *Scripta Minora* 1 (Amsterdam)

Rutherford, I.C. (2011). ‘Ionians’ in M. Finkelberg (ed), *The Homer Encyclopedia*, 2:415–16

Safran, W. and Laponce, J.A. (2005) *Language, Ethnic Identity and the State* (London)

Sakellariou, M.V. (1958) *La migration grecque en Ionie* (Athens)

----- (2009) *Ethne grecs à l’âge du bronze* (Athens)

Salih, S. (2002) *Judith Butler* (London and New York)

Salmon, J. (1984) *Wealthy Corinth: A History of the City to 338 BC* (Oxford and New York)

Sancisi-Weerdenberg, H. (2001) ‘*Yauna* by the Sea and across the Sea’, in I. Malkin (ed.), *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity* (Cambridge, MA) 323–46

Sapouna-Sakellaraki, E. (1998) ‘Geometric Kyme: The Excavation at Viglatouri, Kyme, on Euboea’, in M. Bats and B. D’Agostino (eds), *Euboica: L’Eubea e la presenza euboica in Calcidica e in Occidente* (Naples) 59–104

Scarborough, M.J.C. (2016) The Aeolic Dialects of Ancient Greek: A Study in Historical Dialectology and Linguistic Classification (PhD thesis, University of Cambridge)

Schachter, A. (2014) ‘Creating a Legend: The War Between Thebes and Orchomenos’, *QUCC* 106, 65–88

----- (2016) *Boiotia in Antiquity: Selected Papers* (Cambridge)

----- (2019) ‘The Boiotians: between Ethnos and Koina’, in H. Beck, K. Buraselis and A. McAuley (eds), *Ethnos and Koinon: Studies in Ancient Greek Ethnicity and Federalism* (Stuttgart) 65–81

Shils, E. (1957) ‘Primordial, Personal, Sacred and Civil Ties: Some Particular Observations on the Relationships of Sociological Research and Theory’, *The British Journal of Sociology* 8, 130–45

Sihler, A.L. (1995) *New Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin* (New York)

Simon, C.G. (1997) ‘The Archaeology of Cult in Geometric Greece, Ionian Temples, Altars and Dedications’, in *New Light on a Dark Age*, 125–43

Skelton, C.M. (2015) 'Borrowing, Character Weighting & Preliminary Cluster Analysis', *Indo-European Linguistics* 3.1, 84–117

Smith, A.D. (1986) *The Ethnic Origins of Nations* (Malden, MA)

Sordi, M. (1958) *La lega tessala fino al Alessandro Magno* (Rome)

Spencer, N. (1995) 'Early Lesbos between East and West: A "Grey Area" of Aegean Archaeology', *BSA* 90, 269–306

Sprawski, S. (1999) *Jason of Pherae: a study on history of Thessaly in years 431-370 BC* (Kraków)

Stamatopoulou, M. (2007) 'Thessalian Aristocracy and Society in the Age of Epinikian', in S. Hornblower and C. Morgan (eds), *Pindar's Poetry, Patrons, and Festivals: From Archaic Greece to the Roman Empire* (Oxford) 309–41

Stevens, B. (2006) 'Aeolism: Latin as a Dialect of Greek', *The Classical Journal* 102, 115–44

Thomas, R. (1989) *Oral Tradition and Written Record in Classical Athens* (Cambridge)

----- (2000) *Herodotus in Context: Ethnography, Science, and the Art of Persuasion* (Cambridge)

----- (2001) 'Ethnicity, Genealogy, and Hellenism in Herodotus', in I. Malkin (ed.), *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity* (Cambridge, MA) 213–33

----- (2019) Polis *Histories, Collective Memories and the Greek World* (Cambridge)

Thonemann, P. (2007) 'Magnesia and the Greeks of Asia (*I. Magnesia* 16.16)', *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 47, 151–60

Tribulato, O. (2010) 'Literary Dialects', in E.J. Bakker (ed.), *A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language* 388–400

Trigger, B.G. (2006) *A History of Archaeological Thought* (2nd edn) (Cambridge)

Tsagalis, C. (2009) 'Poetry and Poetics in the Hesiodic Corpus', in F. Montanari, A. Rengakos and C. Tsagalis (eds), *Brill's Companion to Hesiod* (Leiden and Boston) 131–78

Tullio-Altan, C. (1995) *Ethnos e civiltà: identità etniche e valori democratici* (Milan)

Tuvel, R. (2017) 'In Defense of Transracialism', *Hypatia* 32, 263–78

Tziafalias, A. and Helly, B. (2004) 'Deux décrets inédits de Larissa', *BCH* 128, 377–420

Vanschoonwinkel, J. (1991) *L'Égée et la Méditerranée orientale à la fin du IIe millénaire: Témoignages archéologiques et sources écrites* (Louvaine and Providence, RI)

Verdenius, W.J. (1988) *Commentaries on Pindar* 2 (Leiden)

Vlassopoulos, K. (2015) ‘Ethnicity and Greek history: Re-examining Our Assumptions’, *BICS* 58, 1–13

Vottéro, G. (2006) ‘Remarques sur les origines “éoliennes” du dialecte béotien’, in C. Brixhe and G. Vottéro (eds), *Peuplements et genèses dialectales dans la Grèce antique* (Nancy) 99–155

Wade-Gery, H.T. (1952) *The Poet of the Iliad* (Cambridge)

Walbank, F.W. (1972) *Polybius* (Berkeley, CA)

Wallace, R.W. (2005) ‘Performing Damon’s *Harmoníai*’, in S. Hagel and C. Harrauer (eds), *Ancient Greek Music in Performance: Symposion Wien 29. Sept. - 1. Okt. 2003* (Vienna) 147–57

Weber, M. ([1922] 1968) *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*, edited by G. Roth, 2 vols (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London)

Wenskus, R. (1961) *Stammesbildung und Verfassung: das Werden der frühmittelalterlichen Gentes* (Cologne)

Wernbe, J. (1991) ‘Das Lesbische als barbarische Sprache?’, *Philologus* 135, 55–62

West, C. and Zimmerman, D.H. (1987) ‘Doing Gender’, *Gender & Society* 1, 125–51

West, M.L. (1978) *Hesiod: Works & Days* (Oxford)

West, M.L. (1983) ‘The Hesiodic Catalogue: Xouthids and Aiolids’, *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 53, 27–30

West, M.L. (1985) *The Hesiodic* Catalogue of Women*: Its Nature, Structure, and Origins* (Oxford)

----- (1992) *Ancient Greek Music* (Oxford)

Westlake, H.D. (1935) *Thessaly in the Fourth Century B.C.* (London)

Will, É. (1956) *Doriens et Ioniens* (Paris)

Willi, A. (2003) *The Languages of Aristophanes: Aspects of Linguistic Variation in Classical Attic Greek* (Oxford)

Wyatt, W.F. (1970) ‘The Prehistory of the Greek Dialects’, *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 101, 557–632

Yelvington, K.A. (1991) ‘Ethnicity as Practice? A Comment on Bentley’, *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 33, 158–68

Zachos, G. (2017) ‘Ένα πρωτογεωμετρικό νεκροταφείο στη Μήθυμνα της Λέσβου (A Protogeometric Cemetery at Methymna, Lesbos)’, in *Το αρχαιολογικο εργο στα νησια του Αιγαιου: Διεθνες επιστημονικο συνεδριο, Ροδος, 27 Νοεμβρίου - 1 Δεκεμβρίου 2013* 2 (Mytilene) 91–11