SEPARATING FACT FROM FICTION IN THE AIOLIAN MIGRATION

ABSTRACT

Iron Age settlements in the northeast Aegean are usually attributed to Aiolian colonists who journeyed across the Aegean from mainland Greece. This article reviews the literary accounts of the migration and presents the relevant archaeological evidence, with a focus on new material from Troy. No one played a dominant role in colonizing Aiolis, nor is such a widespread colonization supported by the archaeological record. But the aggressive promotion of migration accounts after the Persian Wars proved mutually beneficial to both sides of the Aegean and justified the composition of the Delian League.

Scholarly assessments of habitation in the northeast Aegean during the Early Iron Age are remarkably consistent: most settlements are attributed to Aiolian colonists who had journeyed across the Aegean from Thessaly, Boiotia, Akhaia, or a combination of all three.¹ There is no uniformity in the ancient sources that deal with the migration, although Orestes and his descendants are named as the leaders in most accounts, and are credited with founding colonies over a broad geographic area, including Lesbos, Tenedos, the western and southern coasts of the Troad, and the region between the bays of Adramyttion and Smyrna (Fig. 1). In other words, mainland Greece has repeatedly been viewed as the agent responsible for
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After this article went to press, a new book on a similar subject appeared: Hertel 2008.
the Aiolian settlements in Lesbos and northwestern Asia Minor, which were believed to have been founded after the Trojan War.

This feature of early Greek history has become so widely accepted by scholars that the evidence for it is rarely assessed anymore. The same has been true of my own work: during the past 18 years, in which I have served as head of Greek and Roman excavations at Troy, I never questioned the migration model, and assumed Aiolian colonization in all of my publications on the new excavations. In reexamining the Iron Age material from Troy in preparation for final publication, however, it became clear to me that a reassessment of the evidence for the Aiolian migration was essential, with the archaeological and literary evidence given equal weight, and with an eye toward historiography, both ancient and modern.

Assessing the evidence for the migration requires an analysis of ancient settlements on both sides of the Aegean, and it is worth noting how infrequently such analyses have been undertaken. Even though most archaeologists would claim that the modern political divisions between Greece and Turkey do not influence their evaluations of the historical evidence, the existing scholarship speaks otherwise. This holds true even for books produced recently: historians tend to focus on either Greece or Turkey, and publications that accord equal treatment to both areas are rare. In this article, I first review the literary accounts of the migration and then present the relevant archaeological evidence, focusing on new material from Troy. I next situate the evidence in its historical context, examining cases in which the promotion of east–west connections served some social or political purpose, and consider the extent to which the migration stories are borne out by the material record.

THE ANCIENT LITERARY SOURCES

The first appearance of the term “Aiolic” may be in the Linear B texts of Knossos, where one finds “ʔwruʔjs-” as a dative plural. This may be a form of “Aiwoleus,” or “Aiolians,” but the first sign is broken, and certainty is impossible. In later Greek, “αιόλος” (of uncertain etymology) means “rapid” and “shining, bright.” Nothing relating to either Aiolis or Greek colonization in western Asia Minor appears in the Homeric epics. Odysseus travels to Lesbos but establishes no settlement, and the king of the island is a non-Greek named Makar (Od. 4.342–344; Il. 24.544; Diod. Sic. 1.3; 5.57.2). The first use of the word as a geographical term comes in the Works and Days of Hesiod (lines 635–638), where the poet describes his father’s plight in Aiolian Kyme and eventual emigration to Boiotia. “Aiolic” was subsequently applied by Mimnermos to Smyrna as well, which means that the rubric’s link to part of the west central coast of

2. Cf. Snodgrass 1987, pp. 52–66, for the impact of Thucydides’ description of the Sicilian colonies on their excavators: the archaeological results were sometimes forced to conform to the literary accounts.
Asia Minor was in place by the 7th century. Nevertheless, in no part of Hesiod do we find mention of the foundation of colonies in the northeast Aegean by mainland Greeks.

The next relevant references occur in the Archaic poetry of Lesbos, in the works of Alkaios and Sappho. The ruling family of Lesbos bore the name Penthesilaidai, after Penthilos, the son of Orestes, who was named by Hellanikos, Strabo, and Pausanias, among others, as the man who led the Aiolians to Lesbos (Tzetzes, ad Lykophr. 1374; Strabo 13.1.3; Paus. 3.2.1; Pind. Nem. 11.33). By the later 7th century, then, the rulers of Lesbos appear to have claimed descent from the house of Atreus as a consequence of post-Trojan War migration. At more or less the same time, in the Homeric Hymn to Apollo, Makar, king of Lesbos, is named as a son of Aiolos who, in turn, is referred to as a Thessalian king and listed with Doros and Xouthos as sons of Hellen (Hymn. Hom. Ap. 37). Aiolos therefore enters into the family of Hellen; Makar and his Mytilenean descendants acquire mainland Greek origins; and Thessaly assumes a role in the Aiolian migration.

The island of Tenedos begins to figure in the migration accounts in the 5th century: Pindar’s 11th Nemean Ode celebrates Aristagoras, a citizen of Tenedos, whose Spartan ancestor Peisandros joined Orestes in leading an Aiolian force to the shores of Tenedos (Pind. Nem. 11.33). The implication is that one generation after the Trojan War, Tenedos, like Lesbos, had been seized by a group of men from the Peloponnese, which included the ancestor of Aristagoras. Up to this point, the authors dealing with the migration had provided no specific reason for its inauguration, but a religious motive is supplied by Demon of Athens (fl. ca. 300 B.C.), who records a prophecy that a plague in central Greece would end only if Orestes were to found colonies and restore shrines in areas that had been damaged during the Trojan War.

Not all of these authors agreed on what or where Aiolis actually was. By the 6th century, according to Herodotus, the original region of Aiolis lay between Pergamon and Smyrna along or near the coast, and was controlled by a league of 12 cities headquartered in the sanctuary of Apollo at Gryneion, between Elaia and Myrina. Herodotus separated this area from the Troad per se, the cities of which he links to Lesbos and Tenedos (Hdt. 1.149–151). By the 4th century B.C., however, the term had been applied to the western Troad in addition to the original cities (Strabo 13.1.4, 39). Both Herodotus and Thucydides also refer to parts of mainland Greece as having originally been called Aiolis—Thessaly, according to the former, and the part of Aitolia between Pleuron and Kalydon, adjacent to Ozolian Lokris, according to the latter (Hdt. 7.176.4; Thuc. 3.102.5; see also Diod. Sic. 4.67.2).

One of the fullest accounts of the migration is provided by Strabo, who includes under the rubric “Aiolis” the entire area from Kyzikos to Kyme, including Tenedos and Lesbos, with the first stage of the migration dating 60 years after the Trojan War (Strabo 9.2.3, 5; 13.1.1–4, 58; 13.2.1; 13.3.2–3; 13.3.5). The settlers depart from Aulis in Boiotia, like the forces of Agamemnon, and proceed to Thrace, under Orestes’ son Penthilos; then to Daskyleion, under his grandson Archelaos or Echelas; and finally to the

11. FGrH 382 F20.
12. Leaf 1923, pp. 43–45.
Granikos area and Lesbos, under his great-grandson Gras, after whom the
Granikos River is named. A second team, contemporary with the expedition
of Penthilos, departed from Lokris and founded Kyne. In Strabo's account,
then, the colonization is spread across four generations, from Orestes to
his great-grandson Gras, and the route differs from earlier accounts in that
Lesbos is the last to be occupied.

These sources for the Aeolian migration need to be examined in
connection with those for Ionian colonization further south, since they
function as two sides of the same coin. Strabo dates the Aeolian coloniza-
tion four generations earlier than that of the Ionians, in which mainland
Greeks fleeing the Dorians established colonies on the west central coast
of Asia Minor, as well as on Samos and Chios, ultimately marrying the
native women of Caria (Hdt. 1.146.2–3). The name “Yaw(a)nay” in the
late-8th-century Assyrian texts is usually interpreted as a reference to
the Ionians, although it seems to apply to all residents of western Asia Minor,
whether Greek or not.

Homer says nothing of Greek colonies in Ionia, although an ancestral
connection between Ionia and Athens was acknowledged by ca. 600 B.C.,
when Solon referred to Attica as the oldest land in Ionia (cited in Arist.

Ath. Pol. 5). The names of the four pre-Kleisthenic tribes are attested in
inscriptions from several Ionian cities, and the Apatouria festival, the pri-
mary public manifestation of Ionian identity, was celebrated in both Ionia
and Athens. Whether the tribal names and Apatouria festival traveled from
east to west or vice versa is not entirely clear, although recent scholarship
favors the former. By the end of the 7th century the Ionian cities appear
to have formed a league (the Panionion) centered on the sanctuary of
Poseidon at Mykale, across from Samos, thereby complementing the Aeolian
League headquartered to the north at Gryneion.

During this period Ionia's Athenian origins were increasingly empha-
sized, primarily through the genealogical manipulation of the family of
Ion, the eponymous founder. In the pseudo–Hesiodic Catalogue of Women,
written sometime in the first half of the 6th century, Ion was presented as
the son of Xouthos by Kreousa, daughter of Erekhtheus, and grandson of
Hellen. Hekataioi of Miletos, probably writing in the late 6th century,
makes Ion the brother of Lokris, eponymous founder of the Lokrians, and
great-grandson of Orestes (Hekataioi of Miletos 1). By the time of Eurip-
ides' Ion in the 5th century, Xouthos was dropped as father and replaced
by Apollo, although Kreousa, as the link to Erekhtheus, remained intact
(Eur. Ion 57-75, 1589-1594). Herodotos and Thucydides, among others,
regarded the Athenian colonization of Ionia as certain, although Messenian
Pylos, Boiotian Thebes, Phokis, and Peloponnesian Akhaia were all cited as
potential founders.

There is clearly no uniformity in these descriptions of the Aeolian and
Ionian migrations, and the temporal and spatial components of the stories
vary widely among the authors who describe them. But by the end of the
Archaic period, a general belief in ancestral links between mainland Greece
and Asia Minor certainly existed, and the stories of migrations from west to
east were firmly in place following the Persian Wars. One striking feature
in all of these narratives is the continued prominence of the royal family of


the Dorian invasion, see Mountjoy and Hankey 1988, pp. 30–32; Sakellariou
pp. 73–82.


2002, p. 70. For the attitude toward Ionians among elite Athenians in the
Archaic period, see Connor 1993.

17. Hdt. 1.148; Roebuck 1959, pp. 28–31; Kleiner, Hommel, and
Müller-Wiener 1967; Hall 2002,
pp. 67–68; Lohmann 2004. The Ar-
chaic Panionion has recently been iden-
tified on the slopes of Mount Çatallar and excavated by Hans Lohmann


Mycenae over the course of seven generations: Pelops allegedly journeyed from Asia Minor to the Peloponnesian, having been raised between Phrygia and Lydia;\(^{20}\) his grandsons Menelaos and Agamemnon were the leaders in the war against Troy; and the latter’s son Orestes was credited with the subsequent Aiolian migration, as were his descendants, among whom Ion himself was occasionally counted.\(^{21}\)

**MODERN INTERPRETATIONS**

The Aiolian/Ionian migrations have rarely been doubted in contemporary scholarship, although interpretations of the evidence are as diverse as the relevant ancient sources, and at one time they were addressed in tandem with Indo-European migrations. Already in the 18th century, linguists had sought an Indo-European origin for the Greeks while simultaneously embracing the account in Genesis (10:2–5) wherein Japheth, son of Noah, repopulated the west in the course of his travels.\(^{22}\) This was the approach adopted by Schliemann in his first book on Troy, in which he assumed that northwestern Asia Minor had been a way-station in the east–west migrations, and a similar approach was followed by Ernst Curtius in *Die Ionier vor der Ionischen Wanderung.*\(^{23}\) This historical interpretation, however, was still linked to Greek and Roman literary accounts of the migrations, which resulted in an historical reconstruction whereby the ancestors of the Ionians traveled from Anatolia to Greece, and then returned several centuries later, along with the Aiolians, to found colonies on the west coast of Asia Minor.\(^{24}\)

Schliemann was hard-pressed to find any actual evidence of an Aiolian colonization, and in the end he placed it between his Lydian (Sixth) Settlement, which he dated to the Late Bronze Age, and the Archaic Greek levels.\(^{25}\) Dörpfeld’s historian Alfred Brückner recognized the problems inherent in this placement, and made Aiolian colonization contemporary with Lydian control of the Troad, and so of Early Archaic date.\(^{26}\) Since there was no clear evidence for continuous habitation between the Bronze and Iron Ages, the issue of a temporal hiatus began to be linked to colonization. Carl Blegen, Dörpfeld’s successor at Troy, argued that the hiatus extended for nearly 400 years (ca. 1100–700 B.C.), ending only with the arrival of Greek settlers.\(^{27}\)

Later scholars divided the migration among several periods due to the increasingly frequent discoveries of Mycenaean, Protogeometric, and

---

\(^{20}\) This explains why Pelops was shown wearing a Phrygian cap in Greek art: *LIMC* IV, 1994, pp. 282–287, s.v. Pelops (I. Triantis).

\(^{21}\) There were other heroic sagas involving Asia Minor in which the growing primacy of mainland Greece was readily apparent. The hero Telephos, who began life as the Hittite god Telepinu, acquired Greek parents (Herakles and Auge) in the 6th century, and his birthplace shifted from Mysia to Arkadia a century later: Stewart 1997. In the poetry of Pindar, the Aiginetan hero Aiakos became one of the builders of the walls of Troy: *Ol.* 8.31–46; *LIMC* I, 1981, pp. 311–312, s.v. Aiakos (J. Boardman).

\(^{22}\) Smith 1886, pp. 463–472; Curtius 1892, pp. 41–46; Cassola 1957, pp. 1–2; Hall 2002, pp. 36–45.

\(^{23}\) Schliemann 1881, pp. 131–132; Curtius 1855.

\(^{24}\) For an assessment of Curtius’s theories regarding the origins of Greek culture, see Ulf 2004.


\(^{26}\) Dörpfeld 1902, p. 573.

\(^{27}\) Dörpfeld 1902, pp. 200–201; *Troy* IV, pp. 147–148. Blegen proposed that during this interval the Trojans had retreated to the nearby hill of Bağ, although no supporting evidence from Bağ has been discovered: Aslan et al. 2003, pp. 176–177.
Geometric pottery in the northeast Aegean. Walter Leaf, writing shortly before the Blegen excavations commenced, believed that there were two main waves: a Protogeometric settlement, subsequently destroyed by a Thracian invasion, and a migration from Lesbos ca. 700 B.C. 28 This marked the beginning of a long-lasting trend in scholarship whereby the presence of Mycenaean or Protogeometric pottery was regarded as proof of mainland Greek inhabitants. Four decades later, Nicholas Bayne, for example, assumed that the existence of Mycenaean pottery on Lesbos indicated the presence of Mycenaean refugees from the Dorian invasion, at the end of LH IIIB (ca. 1200 B.C.), with the first “Aiolic” expedition leaving central Greece at the end of LH IIIC (12th century). 29 He also proposed that an additional group of colonists from central Greece subsequently founded the southern Aiolic cities, around the beginning of the Protogeometric period (ca. 1000), with yet another wave of Greeks from Lesbos arriving in the Troad ca. 700 B.C. In other words, each major change in the style of Late Bronze/Early Iron Age pottery was interpreted as evidence for population change, with four distinct colonizations over the course of 500 years.

The absence of archaeological evidence for colonization in northwestern Asia Minor has occasionally been noted, as has the lack of change in the ceramic assemblages at many of the sites that were allegedly colonized. One of the most distinctive types of pottery used in the northeast Aegean during the Iron Age was wheelmade gray ware, often referred to as “Aiolic.” Bayne reluctantly admitted the dependence of these Iron Age gray wares on their local Bronze Age predecessors, but he linked colonists to the gray ware by pushing the Aiolian migration back to the Late Mycenaean period, using the presence of Mycenaean pottery as proof of the first Greek settlements. As a consequence, gray ware became the product of Greek invention, albeit with some local influence:

I feel it unlikely that this new pottery style [gray ware] could have developed and spread so rapidly, without apparently any external impetus, at the end of a period remarkable for the absence of any substantial change in the pottery. . . . While on Lesbos, the Aiolian settlers developed the gray ware which became typical of them, using as a basis not only the local Lesbian ware, but also the pottery which crossed to Lesbos from the neighboring mainland, and, in particular, preserving the gray colour and metallic appearance of the mainland in preference to the rather degenerate ware of the Lesbian sites. Later, when the gray ware was fully developed, further parties of Aiolians crossed to the Anatolian coast and founded cities there, in places making contact with Ionians as at Phocaea and Smyrna. 30

More recently, Dieter Hertel has argued that the presence of Protogeometric pottery at Troy reflects the arrival of mainland Greeks, who, in turn, were responsible for the conquest of the local inhabitants at the end of Troy VIIIb2 (ca. 1050 B.C.). 31 This is one of the few reconstructions to link the migration accounts with a war between Greeks and Trojans, although many assume that ethnic conflict was a by-product of the colonization.

To support their reconstructions of the migration, archaeologists have often turned to the research of linguists, who have divided the ancient

28. Leaf 1923, p. 45. In his scheme, the Protogeometric settlement would have been the one to which the Lokrians originally sent their maidens (see below, nn. 110, 111). Leaf believed that the citadel was then seized by Thracian invaders, to whom he linked the Cimmerians. In order for this scheme to work, VIIIb2 Knobbled ware needs to be dated later than Protogeometric pottery, which is what he proposed.

29. Bayne 2000. Bayne’s dissertation was completed in 1963 but remained unpublished until 2000. See also Béard (1959, p. 21), who believed that the migration had already begun by the end of the Bronze Age.

30. Bayne 2000, pp. 266–267. Penelope Mountjoy has pointed out to me that the Mycenaean pottery in question dates to LH IIIA1–2, not LH IIIB2, so Bayne’s argument is unfounded. See Mountjoy 1999a, p. 1156.

Greek dialects into Doric, Ionic, and Aiolic, following Hesiod’s three branches of the Hellenes. Thessalian, Boiotian, and Lesbian are placed under the Aiolic rubric, and since the first two are, in several respects, more conservative than the last, it has usually been assumed that Thessalian/Boiotian is older than Lesbian, with the migration cited as the explanation. This remains the standard interpretation in nearly all handbooks on Greek history and archaeology.

The Aiolan migration is also frequently discussed in tandem with the development and transmission of the Homeric epics, especially with regard to linguistics. Some words can be traced back to Linear B, and there are also Aiolic forms in an otherwise Ionic dialect. Each of the components in this configuration has therefore been tied to colonization, usually in the following sequence: after the Dorian invasion there was an exodus of Mycenaeans, together with their bards, from Thessaly and Euboia to Lesbos, which, on the basis of the Protogeometric pottery discovered in Lesbian cities, is thought to have occurred ca. 1050 B.C. This exodus would, according to the theory, have accounted for the mixture of Linear B and Aiolic forms, subsequently influenced by the Ionic dialect once the epics traveled further south along the coast of Asia Minor. Recent work dealing with Homeric epics has therefore, by necessity, reinforced the legitimacy of an Aiolan migration in the Early Iron Age.

It is only comparatively recently that scholars have begun to examine these migration stories as evolving symbols of ethnic identity and civic propaganda. The first serious attempt occurred in 1958, when M. V. Sakellariou’s examination of the relevant literary sources led him to conclude that the Ionian migration was essentially a creation of Athenian propaganda following the Persian Wars. The subsequent studies of Jonathan Hall and Irad Malkin on early Greek ethnicity have expanded this approach considerably by demonstrating the extent to which accounts of ancestry are tied to the systematic construction of regional identities, formulated over time and driven by political agendas. In general, the Aiolan migration has received far less scrutiny than the Ionian, probably due to the greater prominence of Athens in the latter tradition, nor has the archaeological record of “Aiolis” really been examined in conjunction with the literary accounts. This I propose to do here, focusing in particular on Troy and the Troad, since there is now an abundance of evidence for Late Bronze/Iron Age habitation, and contact between both sides of the Aegean can be more easily monitored.

32. See, e.g., Chadwick 1956. Cf. Thuc. 3.2, who refers to the Boiotians as parents of the Lesbians. For a thorough analysis of the linguistic arguments, see the accompanying article by Holt Parker in this issue (Parker 2008).
33. See, e.g., Janko 1992, pp. 15–19. West (1988, p. 172) argues that the treatment of the gods in the Homeric epics was influenced by Near Eastern poetry, and transmitted to Greece, especially Euboia, during the Orientalizing revolution. He appears to make the earliest part of the colonization contemporary with Troy VIIib2 (1988, p. 164).
34. For discussion of the dialect itself, see García-Ramón 1975; Hodot 1990.
35. Sakellariou 1958; 1990, pp. 133–149. A similar approach has been followed by John Papadopoulos (2005, pp. 580–588), who has questioned the validity of the literary accounts relating to Euboian colonization of Torone.
36. Hall 1997, 2002, 2004; Malkin 1998, 2001. It is worth noting that the recent conflicting interpretations of the significance of late Bronze Age Troy have been linked to political and cultural changes in German society: Haubold 2002.
THE ARCHAEOLOGY OF THE NORTHEAST AEGEAN

The Late Bronze Age

Determining the political position of the Aiolian/Ionian areas during the Late Bronze Age is now easier due to the discovery and decipherment of a relatively large number of Hittite documents, both in the capital of Boğazköy (Hattuša) and in western Asia Minor. Between the 15th and 13th centuries B.C., the western coastal areas of Asia Minor formed part of the kingdom of Arzawa, subdivided into four vassal states: Wilusa, which occupied the Troad; Mira, which encompassed Ionia; the Seha River Land, which lay between them, from Adramyttion to Smyrna, including Lazpa (Lesbos); and Hapalla, which encompassed parts of Pisidia and Phrygia.37

The inhabitants of Arzawa were sometimes allies of the Hittites, but not considered of equal status or as part of the same social group, as the Hittite laws unearthed in Boğazköy demonstrate. This zone was continually a locus of struggle between the Hittites and a kingdom referred to in the Hittite texts as Ahhiyawa, often identified as the Greek Akhaia. Ahhiyawa had a great king whose power was analogous to that of the Hittite king, and his realm clearly lay somewhere to the west of Asia Minor, across the water.38 Ahhiyawan links with the port city of Millawanda (Miletos), which lay within Mira, were extremely strong, and Miletos was certainly under Ahhiyawan protection by 1264.39

The Hittite texts record the frequent conflicts and shifting alliances throughout western Asia Minor during the Late Bronze Age. Ahhiyawan attacks on western Anatolia had certainly begun by the early 14th century, when a commander named Attarissiya brought 100 chariots into Asia Minor.40 Toward the end of that century, during the reign of Mursili II, Arzawa and Miletos formed an alliance with Ahhiyawa against the Hittites, which prompted Hittite military intervention in Arzawa. The loyalties of the Seha River Land were also clearly changeable, and they alternated at various times among Arzawa, Ahhiyawa, and the Hittites.

The association of Ahhiyawa with the Mycenaean Greeks is becoming increasingly difficult to dispute.41 The Hittite texts clearly indicate that Ahhiyawa was not located on the Anatolian mainland, but was reachable by ship from there. Moreover, at least during the 13th century, Miletos was under the protection of Ahhiyawa, and the Late Bronze Age remains from that site reveal extensive Mycenaean influence: approximately 95% of the 14th- and early-13th-century ceramics are of Mycenaean type, although much was locally made.42 This fact, coupled with the discovery of Mycenaean chamber tombs, has led Wolf-Dietrich Niemeier to conclude that Miletos was a Mycenaean colony during the Late Bronze Age.43 The settlements on the adjacent islands do not appear to have been colonies per se, from what one can tell, although they also evince a high level of Mycenaean acculturation. As several scholars have noted, if Ahhiyawa does not refer to the Mycenaean-affiliated areas, then we have to assume that the Hittites did not mention the Mycenaeans in their documents—which would be
very surprising considering the new evidence from Miletos—and that the
kingdom of Ahhiyawa to which the texts do refer has thus far remained
undetected in the archaeological record.44

Whether Ahhiyawa consisted of a group of Aegean islands, sites on the
Greek mainland, or both cannot at this point be determined. Both Mycenae
and Thebes have been suggested as potential capitals, as has Rhodes, and all
of the arguments have some points in their favor.45 Here too Greek legend-
ary figures now form part of the discussion, since versions of their names
have been identified in several Hittite texts. In one of them, which dates to
the reign of Hattusili III (mid-13th century), the Ahhiyawan king mentions
an agreement made with the Arzawans by his predecessor, whose name has
been interpreted by some as "Kadmos."46 A contemporary letter referring to
"Tawagalawa," the brother of the Ahhiyawan king, has been interpreted
as a Hittite form of the Linear B "E-te-wo-ki-le-we," or Eteokles, and the
early-14th-century Ahhiyawan commander "Attarissiya" has been linked
to Atreus.47 But whatever the geographic configuration of Ahhiyawa was,
the dominant culture must have been that of the Mycenaean.48

There was certainly considerable traffic across the Aegean during this
period. One of the Linear B tablets from Pylos, dating to the 13th
century, speaks of women seized as slaves from western Asia Minor and
taken to Pylos, where they were assigned to textile production.49 Another
document, this one in Hittite from Boğazköy, describes the revolt of
the Arzawan prince Piymaradu against the Hittite king Hattusili III. Large
numbers of prisoners were reportedly seized in Hittite territory and
presumably taken to Ahhiyawa, Piymaradu’s ally in the revolt, although this
may have involved transport only to the Aegean islands.50 In any event,
the western regions of Asia Minor clearly constituted a liminal zone that
was exposed to both Mycenaean and Hittite culture and politics over the
course of several centuries.

We should now turn to Wilusa, the furthest north of the Arzawan
states. Wilusa is mentioned several times in Hittite texts of 13th-century
date, and it reportedly lay within view of the land of Lazpa. At one point in
the late 15th century, Wilusa had joined with other vassal states in western

44. Cline 1994, p. 69; Bryce 2005, p. 58.
45. The dominance of the Myce-
naean royal family in the migration
accounts is one of the reasons why My-
cenaes has been regarded as the capital
of Ahhiyawa and the seat of the Great
King: Niemeier 1998, p. 44; 1999,
pp. 143–144; 2002b; Hope Simpson
2003, pp. 233–235. Thebes has also
been considered a viable candidate,
since a cache of Linear B tablets dis-
covered there refer to sites on Euboia,
thereby suggesting (to some) that the
latter was subject to the former: Mount-
joy 1998, p. 50; Niemeier 2002b, p. 295;
Some of these tablets include names
that probably refer to Asia Minor:
mi-ra-ti-jo (Milesios); to-ro-wo (possi-
ibly Troes); and si-mi-te-u (Smintheus,
the epiteth of Apollo in his sanctuary at
Chryse, in the southern Iroa): Benzi
2002, pp. 365–366. For a more skepti-
cal analysis, see Hall 2002, pp. 50–52.
For Rhodes, see Cassola 1957, pp. 334–
337; Benzi 2002, pp. 368–381; see also
Mountjoy 1998, pp. 50–51 (Rhodes
together with Miletos).
46. Latacz 2004, p. 244. Katz (2005,
p. 424) has shown, however, that the res-
toration of "Kadmos" cannot be correct.
47. For Eteokles, see Niemeier
1999, p. 152; Bryce 2005, pp. 290–293,
395; for Atreus, see Niemeier 2002b,
p. 296; West 2003.
Hawkins 1998, pp. 2, 30; Mountjoy
1998, pp. 47–51; Hope Simpson
2003.
49. Hiller 1975; Chadwick 1988,
pp. 90–93; Efkleidou 2002–2003. For
Hittite resettlement in Mycenaean
areas, see, in general, Bryce 2002,
pp. 261–262.
Asia Minor (the Assuwa Coalition) against the Hittites, but the region’s long alliance with the Hittite king was signaled in an early-13th-century text from Bogazköy that mentions Alaksandu, ruler of Wilusa. A slightly later letter between the Hittite and Ahhiyawan kings appears to indicate that Wilusa was a cause of conflict between them, although the exact nature of the animosity is unclear. The final reference occurs in a letter written during the reign of Tudhaliyas IV (1227–1209), wherein Walmu, ruler of Wilusa, has been deposed and has sought shelter in another region, probably Millawanda.

There is now agreement among most Hittitologists that “Wilusa” refers to the Troad, of which Troy/Iliion was the center of power, whereas “Lazpa” denotes the nearby island of Lesbos. The cause of the Ahhiyawan–Hittite contention over Wilusa may have been the site’s strategic position at the entrance to the Dardanelles, adjacent to the easiest crossing point between continental Europe and Asia, which would have made it an especially attractive ally.

Until recently, it has been generally assumed that traffic between Troy and Mycenaen Greece was extensive during the Late Bronze Age, largely due to the existence of so much Mycenaen pottery in the later-2nd-millennium levels of Troy. But the pottery has recently been subjected to neutron activation analysis (NAA) and reexamined by Penelope Mountjoy, who has determined that a large amount of it is locally produced, imitation Mycenaen wares. Troy’s decision to imitate Mycenaen decoration so extensively on shapes associated with dining suggests that the residents attached an elevated status to the decoration. Whether the imitation was a by-product of direct interaction between the Trojans and the Mycenaens, or was received via contact with other cities on the western Asia Minor coast, cannot currently be determined. Nor is there evidence that the destruction of Troy VIIa shortly after 1200 B.C. was caused by a force of Mycenaens, although the city was severely damaged in the attack, and in some areas the destruction deposit is nearly 1.5 m high.

The next generally recognized phase of habitation, Troy VIIb1, is not as clear-cut as earlier publications indicate. Blegen believed that the damaged walls and houses of the citadel were repaired, and that Handmade Burnished ware now began to enter the ceramic record. From what we can judge,
however, only a few of the houses were rebuilt after the attack; many were filled with trash, and there was probably a decrease in population. Few pure VIIb1 deposits can be distinguished in the archaeological record, and it is by no means certain that handmade coarse wares began to be a feature of Trojan life. In any event, there is no sign of cultural change.

Troy VIIb2 (ca. 1130–1050), however, is a different case. In these levels Blegen recorded striking changes in the assemblages, including a preference for stone orthostats in house construction, and molds for tools and weapons that can be paralleled in southeastern Europe. There are also changes in the ceramic record: it seems likely that handmade coarse ware was introduced only at this time, and with it came Knobbed ware, another handmade ware with projecting knobs on a dark burnished surface. The shapes and decoration of Knobbed ware vessels find their best parallels in the eastern Balkans, like the weapon/tool molds. Blegen, therefore, concluded that they signaled a new element in the local population, while he noted that there appeared to have been no attack, and most of the wares and shapes used in VIIb1 continued.

Indeed, the handmade Knobbed ware is found in domestic contexts with local wheelmade Gray and Tan ware, and the shapes in both categories are functionally similar; in other words, there are wheelmade and handmade cups and pitchers, although the forms are not identical. Handmade Burnished ware is found at a large number of Mediterranean sites in the 12th century B.C., and its appearance has been ascribed to the movement of slaves, merchants, mercenaries, and guest workers. The percentage of these handmade wares in VIIb2 assemblages is not consistent over time: they make up between a quarter and a third of the sample in Blegen’s trenches, and between 50% and 60% in recent excavations of VIIb2. By the Protogeometric period (VIIb3), the percentage of handmade wares reaches a level as high as 70% in some areas.

It has usually been assumed that Trojan handmade ware was locally produced in VIIb2 by migrants who arrived there from Thrace, and recent neutron activation analysis has verified its local origins. But within the

58. I thank Pavol Hnila for this information.
60. Troy IV, pp. 141–148. See also Sams 1992; Koppenhöfer 2002; Chiai 2006. At least one of the VIIb1 houses was destroyed by fire (Mountjoy 1999b, p. 324), but there is no sign of a systematic destruction.
61. Guzowska et al. 2003, p. 239. Usage of the two categories was presumably determined by diet or ritual.
63. For this information I thank Pavol Hnila, who is publishing the Troy VII handmade coarse ware. This represents a modification of Guzowska et al. 2003.
64. Troy IV, p. 143; Koppenhöfer 1997, pp. 305–306; Aslan 2002, p. 84; Guzowska et al. 2003, p. 236. Carolyn Aslan has informed me that the percentage of Handmade Burnished ware in Protogeometric levels in the West Sanctuary is approximately 30%, whereas in trench D9, on the southern side of the citadel, the percentage is about 70%.
65. Guzowska (Guzowska et al. 2003, pp. 241–248) has argued that handmade coarse ware was probably produced in Thrace and imported to Troy, but NAA by Parkas Pinter has demonstrated that it was all locally produced. See Pinter 2005, p. 177: “I was not able to identify any vessel fragment [of handmade coarse ware] in Troia which could certainly be of foreign origin.”
area of northwestern Asia Minor, these wares were traveling only to Troy and to Daskyleion: the recent surveys of Mehmet Özdoğan have shown that Knobbed ware is notably absent from other sites on the Gallipoli peninsula, as well as the southern and eastern Marmara region.66

The other VIIb2 feature traditionally regarded as a sign of foreign occupation, orthostat construction, is also not as straightforward as one might expect. No parallels in the Balkans have been identified, although Magda Pieniak-Sikora has suggested that several sites in the northwest Pontic area may supply relevant comparanda.67 In his final publication, Blegen noted that orthostats were used in earlier construction at Troy, although not as extensively as would be the case in VIIb2, and we should not rule out a local development.68 The situation would undoubtedly be clearer if we could assess changes in mortuary customs among phases VIIa, VIIb1, and VIIb2, but no cemeteries of those periods have yet been identified.

Nevertheless, a few conclusions do emerge from the evidence that can be assembled. The collapse of the Hittite empire seems to have prompted the opening of a commercial corridor stretching from southeastern Europe to central Anatolia, thereby facilitating contact between Thrace and Troy.69 The Handmade Burnished/Knobbed ware may have been one of the by-products of this new network, which increased in scale during phases VIIb2 and 3 (ca. 1130–900 B.C.) and may ultimately have involved a demographic change.70 Migrants do tend to settle in regions with which they are already familiar, often due to preexisting trade links with their homelands, so such a reconstruction would make sense.71

It is worth noting that the demographic shift posited for Troy during the 12th century appears to have occurred also at Gordian. To quote Robert Henrickson and Mary Voigt:

There is no stratigraphic break to indicate a significant hiatus in settlement at Gordian after the fall of the Hittites, so that time alone cannot account for the observed changes in architecture, domestic features, ceramics, and animal remains between the Late Bronze and the Early Iron Age. These ceramic data do not support a gradual transition from the Late Bronze Age into the Early Iron Age. Instead, the archaeological evidence strongly suggests a population change at this time, rather than simply a shift in political and economic organization.72

66. Özdoğan 1993, pp. 160–162.
For variants of Knobbed ware at Daskyleion, see Bakr-Akbasoglu 1997, p. 231. Handmade Burnished ware begins to be found at Gordian in Phrygia around 1000 B.C., and also at Kaman Kalehuyuk (Kirsehir), although the shapes and decoration of the pottery at the latter sites are not duplicated at Troy: Omura 1991; *Gordion IV*, pp. 20–22.
68. *Troy IV*, p. 142; see also Dörpfeld 1902, p. 194.
71. MacGaffey 2000, pp. 72–76.
The Protogeometric and Geometric Periods

The end of the VIIIB2 phase at Troy may have been caused by an earthquake, judging by the tumbled stones covering nearly all of the occupation areas, after which several of the houses were rebuilt. It is in this level, now christened VIIIB3, that painted Protogeometric sherds begin to be found, although otherwise there is no substantive change in the ceramic assemblages. Recent examination by Carolyn Aslan has determined that the majority of the rim fragments are Handmade Burnished Ware (either "Barbarian" or Knobbed ware, both of which continue to be produced), or wheelmade gray ware (17%), which in shape, fabric, and decoration is nearly indistinguishable from the gray ware of Late Bronze Age date. The earliest painted Protogeometric sherds (group I), which belong to neck amphoras, comprise only 3% of the assemblages and seem to have been produced somewhere in coastal Lokris or southeast Thessaly. Neck amphoras of the same type, also of 10th-century B.C. date, have been found in Euboea, Phokis, and Macedonia, thus leading Richard Catling to propose that these areas once formed part of a Mycenaean trade route that continued into the Protogeometric period. An Early Protogeometric cup from Troy is a gray-ware imitation of a type found in the Thessalian-Euboian area, which also suggests contact between the two regions, as does the appearance of wheelmade gray wares in Protogeometric levels at Lefkandi that feature the same decorative schemes as those originating in Troy.

The presence of these sherds in VIIIB3 levels at Troy has, not surprisingly, been linked to Aiolian migration—originally by Leaf, who interpreted them as an indication of the first of two waves of Greek colonization, and most recently by Hertel, who believed that they signaled the takeover of Troy and the surrounding areas by Aiolian settlers. But the ceramics in these levels do not support such an interpretation: a survey of the painted vessels reveals that only one shape, the neck amphora, is represented. It is more likely that the amphoras, which held wine or oil, were components of an exchange system that involved both sides of the Aegean. Mutual influence is likely, but there is no evidence for the movement of people from one region to another.

The following phase, which one should probably call Late Protogeometric/Early Geometric in the absence of a Trojan numerical designation, dates to the late 10th/9th century and is harder to characterize. Activity

76. Catling 1998; see also Mommersen, Hertel, and Mountjoy 2001, pp. 194, 196, 203; Lemos 2002, pp. 211–212. Papadopoulos (2005, p. 585) has cast some doubt on Catling’s proposed links between Macedonia and Troy during the Protogeometric period, pointing out that the neck-handled amphoras at Torone differ in fabric, shape, and decoration from those at Troy.
78. See above, nn. 28 and 31.
79. For a similar approach with reference to Greeks in the Levant, see Waldbaum 1997.
80. Aslan 2002, pp. 84–85. In general, the most valuable assessments of settlement at Troy during the Iron Age are those of Catling 1998 and Aslan 2002. See also Korfmann 2002;
clearly continued at the site, but we have secure evidence for it in only two areas: a votive deposit in the West Sanctuary, and a dump in quadrant D9, on the south side of the mound, into which sherds and stones had clearly fallen or been thrown from the citadel. The vessels in the West Sanctuary deposit are unique within contemporary votive assemblages, both east and west, although the forms and decoration, such as the fenestrated base of a thymiaterion, vertical handles topped by cylindrical knobs, and crosshatched triangles, appear to have been derived from Late Bronze Age ceramic traditions at Troy. AsLAN has noted, "the Trojan shapes and decoration have parallels at nearby sites such as Assos and Lesbos, although the differences in fabric and shape popularity suggest an independent tradition at Troy." The percentage of handmade coarse ware and wheelmade gray ware in this phase is essentially the same as in VIIb3, although Protogeometric pottery now makes up 8% of the assemblage. Most of it represents a later development of group I, described above. One sherd, however, belongs to group II of Protogeometric amphorae, which feature a shorter neck, a larger, more bulbous body, and a change in fabric from that of group I. Judging by the distribution patterns of sherds in this group, Catling has suggested that the center of production shifted from the Thessalian-Euboian area to south-central Macedonia. There are additional painted wares in the Late Protogeometric/Early Geometric deposits at Troy whose shape and decoration are comparable to pottery from Lefkandi, Gordian, Rhodes, and Thasos, but there are no exact parallels.

In the Late Geometric period (8th century B.C.), we begin to find more evidence for occupation: a house with hearth and oven was constructed in front of the Troy VI fortification wall on the south side of the mound, and a building probably intended for hero cult was set up in the West Sanctuary, also in the shadow of the Troy VI wall. The construction date of the building is difficult to pinpoint, but it appears to have been in place by the end of the Bronze Age and was subsequently modified in the 8th century, with benches inside and out as well as a stone base that may have supported an image. There was also an interior apsidal structure filled with burned...
bones and ash, a coarse-ware pot containing more burned animal bones (fallow deer and bovine), and several bronze fibulas.87

Shortly after the West Sanctuary structure was modified, ca. 700 b.c., a series of stone-paved circles were constructed ca. 20 m to the east, along the Troy VI fortification wall. Blegen found 28 such circles in all, with an average diameter of 2 m, although not all of them were contemporary.88 Some were surrounded by orthostats and each was clearly the locus of a fire, judging by the layer of black earth on top. The ceramic assemblages associated with these circles suggest feasting (cups, dinoi, kraters, etc.), and these too may have been associated with hero cult.89

The amount of painted wares now increases to 37%, with parallel types found in Samothrace, Samos, Lefkandi, and Athens, although some of these wares appear to have been locally produced, judging by recent neutron activation analyses.90 Included in this category is an early version of G2/3 fine ware found at other northeast Aegean sites, including Thasos, Samothrace, and Lemnos, and commonly decorated with vertical zigzags, step patterns, and hooked spirals.91 Almost half of the rim fragments in the Early Archaic assemblages are wheelmade gray ware, higher in quality than what had been produced in the past, although clearly derived from earlier local forms.

I have focused primarily on Troy in the previous section, since the Late Bronze/Iron Age evidence is relatively abundant yet still not well known. Apart from Troy, Lesbos is the only other region in the area where a discernible amount of Iron Age material has been found, and with which the Trojan archaeological record can be compared. Bronze Age Lesbos clearly lay within the cultural orbit of the Troad and western Asia Minor, and this appears to be true for the Iron Age as well. During the 10th and 9th centuries there is a little evidence for habitation on Lesbos: apsidal buildings have been excavated at Mytilene and Antissa, and occupation is attested at Methymna and Pyrrha as well, although Mytilene is the only site that has yielded painted Protogeometric ceramics.92 No pottery of the Trojan group I has been discovered, but there are representative sherds from group II, and some that can be placed in a transitional phase between the two groups. On Lesbos, as at Troy, no substantive change can be seen in the gray-ware vessels from the Bronze to the Iron Age; in fact, the Iron Age pottery of Lesbos, even through the 8th century, has far more parallels in the eastern Aegean and in Anatolia than in mainland Greece.93

In assessing the extent of east–west contact in the northeastern Aegean, we would probably be on firmer ground if the evidence for pre-Archaic burial customs in the region were more substantial. Until the early 1990s,

87. For the development of the apsidal plan during the Protogeometric period, see Lemos 2002, pp. 149–150. Compare the situation in the 7th-century “Temple A” at Prinias, with internal hearth: Carter 1997, pp. 87–89.
88. Troy IV, pp. 274–275. Hertel (2007, p. 118, nn. 94, 96) interprets the apsidal structure and stone circles as indicative of colonization, but supplies no mainland Greek examples as potential models.
89. Troy IV, pp. 274–279; Rose 1997, p. 89; Basedow 2006, pp. 89–90. Feasting also occurred in the vicinity of similar stone circles at Mycenae.
90. Aslan 2002, pp. 85–86. For the production site of G2/3 ware, now acknowledged to be Troy, see Mommersen, Hertel, and Mountjoy 2001, pp. 196, 203.
graves had been excavated only at Troy and on Lesbos, but the recently excavated Iron Age cemetery on Tenedos provides welcome new data. 94 The one relevant grave at Troy, dating probably to the Late Geometric period, is the poorest of the group, with a contracted skeleton covered by a large pithos sherd. 95 Adult Geometric burials on Lesbos tend to be inhumations in cists or large jars, although in the Archaic period clay sarcophagi begin to be used on Lesbos, as at western Asia Minor coastal sites further to the south, with earthen tumuli and ring walls often set above them. 96 The 8th- to 7th-century B.C. graves on Tenedos are stone-lined pits featuring both cremation and inhumation, with children inhumed in amphoras. 97

The material recovered from all of these graves, primarily pottery and fibulas, can be paralleled most easily in western Asia Minor and on the eastern Aegean islands, especially Lemnos and Rhodes. The fibulas in the Lesbos tombs, in particular, find their closest stylistic parallels with those from Anatolia (Gordion, Alishar, Cilicia), and several of the tomb gifts from Tenedos maintain a distinct Anatolian iconography as late as the 6th century B.C. 98 None of this is particularly reminiscent of contemporary burial practices in mainland Greece, although we are, of course, dealing with a limited number of settlements, and varying levels of wealth at the sites in question.

The Archaic Period

During the later 8th and 7th centuries B.C., a considerable number of new settlements were established in the Black Sea as well as in western and northern Asia Minor. Judging by the pottery from Kyme, from which Hesiod’s father had reportedly come, a settlement there was in operation by the middle of the 8th century, while in the course of the 7th and early years of the 6th century, Miletos founded colonies at Kyzikos, Prokonnesos, Abydos, and Lampsaikos, within the sphere of the Troad, and at least 10 colonies in the Black Sea, including Pantikapaion, Histria, Sinope, and Olbia. By the end of the 7th century, Athens had established colonies at Sigeion and Elaios, near the mouth of the Hellespont, and Methymna at Assos, on the southwestern side of the Troad. 99

98. Spencer 1995, p. 293; Arslan and Sevinc 2003; Arslan 2003. This is especially apparent in the case of three semicircular sheaths of hammered gold of 6th-century date whose style and iconography are easily paralleled in central and western Anatolia: Arslan 2003. A similar range of imports is evinced in the West Sanctuary of Troy, where the votive fibulas, of late-8th- to early-7th-century date, are paralleled in the Aegean islands and western coast of Asia Minor: Sapouna-Sakellarakis 1978, pp. 45–47, type IIb; pp. 57–59, type IIIb; Caner 1983, pp. 41–42, type IVd; pp. 44–45, type Va; Rose 1995, p. 91; Kopenhagen 1997, pp. 310–312.
99. Ehhardt 1983; Osborne 1996, pp. 121–125; Der Neue Pauly VI, 1999, pp. 646–666, s.v. Kolonisation (W. Eder). For the pottery from Kyme, see Frasca 1998; Bayne 2000, p. 310; Hertel 2007, p. 104; Lemos 2007, p. 717 ("no material earlier than late Geometric"). Elaia, near Pergamon, was reportedly founded by the Athenians at the time of the Trojan War, although there is no evidence that habitation at the site occurred before the 7th century (Pasinli 1976), and it was not one of the cities included in the Aiolian League by Herodotos (1.149). The earliest gray ware from Assos dates to the second half of the 7th century: Gebauer 1992, p. 71; Ulii 1999, pp. 78–82; Bayne 2000, pp. 309–310. Gebauer’s reference to a 9th-century sherd (1992, p. 87, no. 54) appears to be an error. Sites within the Ida Mountains, such as Kebren and Neandria, also appear to have been settled for the first time in the 7th century: Leaf 1923, pp. 223–240; Bayne 2000, pp. 310–311.
To what extent did the settlements in northwestern Asia Minor construct an identity for themselves, distinct from that of other regions, and what role did mainland Greece play in that identity? The earliest sign of a regional consciousness is tied to the formation of the Aiolian and Ionian leagues, each of which originally included 12 constituent cities. The date at which these leagues were established is unclear: the sanctuary of Apollo at Gryneion, which served as the Aiolian League’s headquarters, has not been excavated, although Geometric pottery has been found on the surface.100

Excavations in the Panionion at Mykale, however, have revealed a naïskos of late-7th-century B.C. date, subsequently replaced (ca. 560–550 B.C.) by a much larger temple with an assembly hall, 100 Attic feet in length, which was set within a fortified precinct of ca. 7 ha.101 The leagues’ foundations and early development were probably stimulated by a variety of factors, but among them would have been the extraordinary ethnic and linguistic diversity of western Asia Minor during the Archaic period, which would have included Lydian, Phrygian, Aramaic, and perhaps a derivative of Luwian, in addition to Greek.102 Conflict with Lydia, which controlled both Aiolian and Ionian areas during the 7th and early 6th centuries B.C., was no doubt also a contributing factor, as was, perhaps, the battle between the two leagues over Smyrna (Hdt. 1.149–150).103

There is no evidence during the Archaic period that stories of mainland Greek colonization formed an integral component of either league’s identity. The physical environment of the Aiolian cities, in fact, would have argued against such an association: toward the end of the 7th century, public buildings in northwestern Asia Minor began to feature a distinctive style, usually called Aiolic, that was characterized by capitals with vertically rising volutes set above a leaf echinus.104 The earliest examples come from Smyrna and Larisa, but by the 6th century the style had spread to Neandria, Lesbos, Troy, and Ainos.105 Based on the surviving evidence, it looks as if Ionia followed the same course several decades later, when the Ionic order began to characterize temples in the region, beginning with Samos and Ephesos.106

One can find examples of Aiolic and Ionic architectural styles in Athens and the Peloponnese during the Archaic period, although they are later

102. Our earliest sign of written Greek in Aiolis does not appear until the last quarter of the 7th century, in the form of graffito on sherds; stone inscriptions and coins were produced by the middle of the following century: Jeffery 1990, pp. 359–362; Blümel 1996, pp. 10–11. In Ionia, the only site that has yielded Greek graffito of 7th-century date is Smyrna, and only two examples have been uncovered: Jeffery 1990, p. 345, no. 69 (end of 7th century?); p. 473, no. 68a (ca. 650 B.C.). The earliest coins with Greek legends were struck on Lesbos and Tenedos in the 6th century B.C.: BMC Troad, pp. xiv, bxi. There has been speculation that the entire region of northwestern Asia Minor was under Phrygian control during the 8th century, primarily due to the number of legends that mention a link between the two: the Phrygian king Midas reportedly married the daughter of the king of Kyne (Arist. fr. 611; Poll. 9.83), and Ilos, son of Dardanos, entered a wrestling match hosted by the king of Phrygia, ultimately winning a cow that led him to the hill of Hisarlik (Apollod. 3.12.3). A few Geometric sherds at Troy are decorated with stamped circles and triangles set in alternating rows, which one also finds at Gordion (Gardon IV, p. 129), although the forms at each site are different, as is the decoration, and there appears to be no direct link between them.
in date than the Asia Minor examples and confined primarily to votive columns and the minor arts rather than buildings. In other words, the ancestral links between mainland Greece and Lesbos featured in Archaic poetry would not have been apparent in the monumental architecture of either area, at least prior to the 5th century.

If we turn the situation around, what kind of identity was projected by cities that claimed to have been colonizers, and what role did Aiolis and the Troad play in that self-presentation? Such civic advertisements have to be viewed in the context of 7th-century B.C. power politics, which were directly tied to colonization. The plethora of Milesian colonies in the Hellespont, the southern shore of the Propontis, and the northern and southern coasts of the Black Sea have already been noted. These constituted components of a commercial network, and the Megarian settlements in or around the Bosporos—at Khalkedon, Selymbria, and Byzantium—were undoubtedly competitive responses to those establishments.\(^{107}\) As this competition among the colonizers gathered momentum, one of the by-products was the construction of increasingly distinctive identities, in which charter myths articulated the city-states’ heroic heritage and justified their territorial expansion.\(^{108}\) Within the geographical sphere of the Troad, such myths generally involved the Trojan War and, by extension, the settlement of Ilion itself, which had probably been identified as the site of legendary Troy by the beginning of the Archaic period.\(^{109}\)

An excellent case in point is supplied by the custom of the Lokrian maidens, which proved mutually beneficial to both Opountian Lokris and Ilion. Beginning in the 7th century, the Lokrian aristocracy sent two maidens each year to live in and clean the sanctuary of Athena Ilias, in atonement for their ancestor Ajax’s rape of Kassandra at the end of the Trojan War.\(^{110}\) One of the most intriguing features of the custom was that the Lokrian maidens could be attacked, even killed, by the Trojans if they were caught outside the confines of the sanctuary.\(^{111}\) In light of the fact that Ilion was hardly a military force at this time (nor at any time in the future), one has to ask why the Lokrians would allow two of their aristocratic children to be subjected to such mistreatment annually on the opposite side of the Aegean. The only sensible explanation is that Lokri was promoting a link to the Homeric tradition that Troy now embodied, and to their local hero, Ajax, by making the custom a fixed component of their civic identity.\(^{112}\) The later

110. The custom probably lasted for nearly 600 years, with a break only in the Late Classical/Early Hellenistic period. The large number of ancient historians who comment on this custom agree in general on the basic form of the tribute, but disagree on the date when it originated, with some placing it shortly after the Trojan War, and others to the period of Persian domination. According to Polybius (12.5.7), whose account is usually regarded as the most authoritative, the custom had begun before 673, when the colony of Lokri Epizephyroi in southern Italy was founded (see also Lykop. Alex. 1141–1173; Aen. Tact. 31.24; Strabo 13.1.40).
112. According to Philostratos (Her. 53.8–21), the Thessalians traveled annually to Troy to make sacrifices at the tomb of Achilles. This should probably be viewed as a status-building device in the same spirit as the custom of the Lokrian maidens.
construction in Lokris of a temple to Athena Ilias endowed the custom with a kind of bilateral symmetry, and it conferred upon the Lokrians a level of prestige far more potent than wealth.  

The construction of similar charter myths promoting a Trojan connection is especially apparent during the second half of the 7th century, when Athens founded its first colony in the eastern Aegean. The colony in question was Sigeion, only a few kilometers northwest of Troy on the Aegean coast. This was an area under Lesbian control during the 7th century, but it was won by Athens ca. 625 B.C. following a battle in which Alkaios lost his armor. Herodotos reports on the competing territorial claims of Athens and Lesbos, in which each region’s involvement with the Homeric tradition played a significant role. By this point, the rulers of Lesbos had already traced their descent from the royal family of Mycenae, and Orestes in particular. Athens, in turn, argued that any of the mainland Greek cities providing aid to Menelaos during the Trojan War had as much right to the territory as Lesbos (Hdt. 5.95).

Even though Ilion was not a wealthy settlement in the late 7th century, the legendary identity with which the site had been stamped was in itself a source of power, and its link to the foundation of Sigeion should not be underestimated. Scholars have often questioned why Athens would have chosen the site of Sigeion for its first colony in the Troad, since it was situated on the Aegean rather than the Dardanelles, and was therefore not in a position to control traffic into the Propontis and Black Sea. But such a choice makes perfect sense in light of Athens’ attempt to co-opt a heritage to which she had only a questionable connection. Sigeion was the closest site to Troy with an excellent harbor, and it was adjacent to a series of tumuli identified as burials of Homeric heroes, including Achilles, Patroclus, and Ajax. Establishing a colony there allowed Athens, through her colonists, to exercise greater control of Troy and its legendary associations than any other city. The same point was made by the later Athenian colony at Elaious, opposite Ilion at the northern side of the Dardanelles, in that it was situated next to the Tomb of Protesilaos.

The foundation of this particular colony should also be viewed in conjunction with contemporary politics in and around Attica. Toward the end of the 7th century, Athens and Megara disputed the ownership of Salamis, and in the course of the argument both cities exploited their connection to Telamonian Ajax, king of Salamis. The foundation of Sigeion should probably be considered a complementary development, in that it brought

113. For the temple to Athena Ilias at Physkeis in West Lokris, see Lerat 1952, pp. 156–158. For the tumulus of Achilles, now usually identified as Sivritepe, near Bejik Bay, see Cook 1973, pp. 173–174; Rose 2000, pp. 65–66; Korfmann 2000, pp. 41–43; Hertel 2003, pp. 161–175, 200–203; Burgess 2007. Excavation has shown it to have been a small Late Neolithic tumulus that was monumentalized in the 3rd century B.C.


117. Leaf 1923, p. 163. The elder Miltiades established a tyranny in the Chersonese (Hdt. 6.36–38), but this was not a colony per se.

The Athenian migration to Tenedos, as well as to Minor, would have complemented the city’s claims of kinship with the Ionians, already in operation by the time of Solon.

The Classical and Hellenistic Periods

During and after the Persian Wars, both sides of the Aegean had a vested interest in acknowledging the migration accounts and using them to foster a common Hellenic identity. In so doing, mainland Greek cities fortified their ancestral connection to western Asia Minor, and Aeolian cities strengthened their links to the principal opponents of the Persians, who still controlled most of this area from their provincial capital at Daskyleion, near the eastern edge of the Troad.121

It is during this period that the actual accounts of the Aeolian migration begin to appear—most prominently in Pindar, Herodotos, and Thucydides, as well as Hellanikos of Lesbos (see p. 402, above). By the end of the 5th century, we find an established tradition involving movement from mainland Greece to northwestern Asia Minor after the Trojan War, albeit with variations in time, routes of passage, and cast of characters. Most of the authors shaped their migration narratives in accordance with their own political agenda: thus, Pindar’s ode has Orestes travel directly to Tenedos, since the ode that describes the migration was intended to honor a Tenedian; Hellanikos of Lesbos, on the other hand, gives his own island pride of place in the migration.

Not surprisingly, the pivotal role played by Athens in both the Ionian and Aeolian migrations became increasingly prominent as the 5th century progressed. The parentage of Ion was continually reshaped until he emerged as a descendant of Apollo and Erekhtheus,122 and toward the end of the Eumenides, Athena essentially transfers her territories in the Troad to Athens (Aesch. Eum. 397–402). A scholiast of Euripides’ Andromache reports that Akamas, son of Theseus, founded 12 cities in the Troad, including Skepsis, Chryse (Smintheion), and Daskyleion, although he allowed Askarios and Skamandrios, the sons of Aeneas and Hector, respectively, to claim the credit for it.123 Athens’ aggressive promotion of these revised traditions is not at all surprising, since it justified the cities’ inclusion in the Delian League, and ensured the financial and commercial benefits that stemmed from that inclusion.

120. Hind 1998. A settlement was established at Achilleion, above Beşik Bay, ca. 570–560, when it was presumably controlled by Lesbos; but it lasted only until 530, ending for no particular reason that we can discern, since the final deposits do not coincide with the takeover by Peisistratos (Kossatz 1988).
121. The Ionians’ annual contribution of oxen to Athens’ Panathenaic festival also reinforced this connection: Barron 1964, p. 47.
By the Hellenistic period, mainland Greece and northwestern Asia Minor even began to resemble each other architecturally: nearly all of the temples in the Troad were Doric, and the same was probably true for the Aeolian area to the south, although fewer pre-Imperial temples survive there. A new league formed of 12 Troad cities was centered on the sanctuary of Athena Ilias, which appears to have featured the same themes on its metopes as the Athenian Parthenon, and the primary visual manifestation of their identity was a Panathenaic festival, clearly modeled on the one in Athens. Panathenaia were also established at Priene, Sardis, and Pergamon, and the library at Pergamon even featured a copy of the Athena Parthenos. Although the Panionion, the Aeolian league, and the Troad league had initially been established to create a distinctive identity for their affiliated cities, subsequent political and military developments pulled the configurations of those identites closer together, with Athens as a common denominator.

CONCLUSIONS

Two different but interrelated sets of conclusions arise from this analysis of the Aeolian migration—one archaeological, and one related to intellectual history. An examination of both sides of the Aegean during the Late Bronze Age demonstrates the commercial and political links between the two areas, with Miletos perhaps functioning as a Mycenaean colony in the 13th century. Whether or not we associate the Ahhiyawans in the Hittite texts with the Mycenaean Greeks, it is clear that Aiolis/Ionia functioned as a peripheral region contested by forces associated with both the Hittites and the Aegean.

The 12th-century deposits at both Troy and Gordion indicate substantial interaction with Thrace, although whether this was the result of increased commerce or the influx of a new population group is not certain. A trading network involving Troy and Thessaly/Lokris was in place by the 10th century, and the custom of the Lokrian maidens may have emerged as a by-product of this relationship once the site of Ilion had been linked to the Homeric tradition. By the 7th century, Lesbos had established a claim to part of the Troad, as had Lydia, although the vast majority of colonies in Aiolis were Milesian, none of which dates earlier than the mid-7th century.

At no time during the early 1st millennium 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 amphorae, produced in central Greece (10th/9th century) and Macedonia (8th century), the ceramic assemblages at these sites remained remarkably consistent, with very few imports until the 6th century B.C., when Greek also begins to appear in inscriptions.

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

124. For the Troad temples, see Rose 2003, p. 76, n. 182. The notable exception is the Ionic Smintheion. In Aiolis per se, the only Hellenistic temples that survive are those in Aigai and Pergamon, both of which are Doric. For Pergamon, see Koenigs 1991, pp. 61–64, 69–71; for Aigai, see Bohn 1889, pp. 36, 38, 40; Koenigs 1991, pp. 85–86.


126. For the Panathenaia at Pergamon, see Hansen 1971, pp. 7, 448; for the Athena Parthenos: Weber 1993. For the Panathenaia at Sardis and Priene, see Paus. 1.4.6; Welles 1934, pp. 110–114, no. 23 (Eumenes II); Hansen 1971, pp. 7, 124, 448, 458.


128. See Hdt. 1.146.2–3.
the Aiolian/Ionian cities would have been a continually changing blend of Luwian, Lydian, Phrygian, and Greek. One witnesses the same kind of gradual cultural interaction in the western and southern Mediterranean during the Roman Republic, where Punic, Nuragic, and Berber traditions, among others, coexisted with those of Rome.129

In confronting this lack of evidence for widespread Greek colonization in northwestern Asia Minor during the Iron Age, we need to ask whether such colonization can actually be detected in the archaeological record, and if so, what evidence we should expect to find. In some cases there are clearly perceptible changes in material culture following the arrival of colonists: the Parians on Thasos, the Corinthians at Syracuse, or the Phoenicians on Sardinia would be cases in point.130 But it has also been argued that migrations can occur without leaving traces in the archaeological record.131 Among the ancient examples frequently cited are the Celts in central Asia Minor and the Slavs in Greece during the Early Byzantine period, although neither supports the point.132 The archaeological record at Gordion, to which the Celts migrated in the 3rd century B.C., reveals traces of new occupation in the architecture, material culture (grinding stones, loomweights, Celtic graffiti), and mortuary customs. The evidence for the Slavic invasion is said to be exclusively literary, attested only by the Slavic names of the towns in which they settled; but the majority of these towns have not yet been excavated, and it seems likely that traces of Slavic culture may still appear in the archaeological record, as was the case at Gordion following a more judicious examination of the Celtic record. Absence of evidence is not evidence of absence, but the missing traces of mainland Greek colonization in the Iron Age levels of Aiolis are striking in light of the ancient historical tradition, and should no longer be ignored.133

If we examine again the ancient literary accounts of the migration in conjunction with the archaeological evidence from Aiolis and Ionia, there are several points of correspondence. The accounts, taken as a whole, stress the roles played in the migrations by Myccene, Thessaly, Euboia, Lokris, Thrace, and Lesbos. As the archaeological record demonstrates, all of these regions interacted commercially and/or politically with western Asia Minor at various points during the Bronze and Iron Ages, which probably explains why so many different groups were featured in the literary accounts. But no one area played a dominant role in colonizing Aiolis, nor is such a widespread colonization supported by the material record. It does seem

129. Woolf 1998; Keay and Terrenato 2001. For Greek colonization on Sicily, see also Antonaccio 2001. The recently formulated models of Romanization could, in fact, be profitably applied to scholarly assessments of the early migrations.
133. One of the few scholars to highlight the disconnect between the literary and archaeological record was Nigel Spencer, who examined occupation on Lesbos during the transition from the Bronze to the Iron Age (Spencer 1995, p. 305): “In short, the literary sources for the Archaic period do indeed reveal Lesbos to be a flourishing island in the East Aegean with an Aiolian Greek element in the population and culture, but it is an element which one would hardly have believed existed at all if the literary sources had not survived and one was making a judgment from the material record alone.”
certain, however, 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.

With such a clear corpus of evidence arguing against an Aiolian migration, it strikes one as somewhat surprising that it has been so readily embraced in scholarship, but here too one needs to examine the political context. Archaeologists began to work in northwestern 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. One can find a similar bias in early surveys of the Iron Age and Archaic period, where “Orientalizing” influence on Greece was either denied, disputed, or undervalued.

Our attempts to analyze these and other migrations will undoubtedly always be shaped by the larger political environment in which we live, and this was certainly true for the second half of the 20th century: Sakellariou’s presentation of the Ionian migration as post-Persian War Athenian propaganda was no doubt partially a response to the European fascist movements of World War II, not unlike the scholarship of his Italian contemporary, R. Bianchi Bandinelli. More recent monographs on the construction of ethnicity have similarly been stimulated by the collapse of the Soviet Union, which prompted the rearrangement of a multitude of geographical boundaries and national identities, many of which are still in formation.

We may never have enough evidence to judge the existence or extent of cultural convergence in the Troad during the Iron Age, but more progress can be made if archaeologists working in Greece and Turkey increase their level of collaboration. Analyses of ancient settlements on both sides of the Aegean are surprisingly rare, and they have become even rarer in the wake of the 1974 separation of Cyprus into Greek and Turkish zones. Dismantling these political barriers to intellectual discourse is essential to achieving a more balanced diagram of cultural interaction in the early Aegean, as is the acknowledgment that cultural change rarely proceeds along a one-way street.

135. Boardman 1990, pp. 185–186; Burkert 1992, pp. 1–8. This attitude has been traced back to the Homeric period with reference to the Phoenicians: Winter 1995.
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