Synthetic studies of the Ionians or other east-Aegean Greeks are rare and hardly up-to-date, especially when we take into consideration the mass of archaeological data that has become available in recent decades. In this respect, Greaves’s book is very welcome. G. himself characterizes it as “the prolegomena to a new history of Ionia” (xi), during the period ca. 700–494 BC. Inspired by the Annales School, he adopts a perspective that integrates landscape, archaeology and history and works with three main time scales (p. xiii; also 36–44). His main aim is to provide a critical review of the available archaeological evidence through an examination of key socio-economic themes that are constructed from “the ground up” (xi–xii), that is, beginning with landscape (ch. 3), which determines agriculture and thus trade (ch. 4), settlements (ch. 5), colonization (ch. 6), warfare (ch. 7), religion (ch. 8), art (ch. 9) and identity (ch. 10).

The book has many good qualities. One is the author’s cautious treatment of various categories of evidence (see e.g. chs. 1 and 9). Especially younger readers will benefit from G.’s analysis in ch. 2 of how traditions in scholarship have influenced current interpretations of the archaeology of Archaic Ionia. On the other hand, more advanced readers will be surprised to see that G. provides a critical review of how German and Turkish ‘Schools’ have constructed Classical archaeologies of Ionia (pp. 32–36), but remains silent about the contribution of the British scholarly tradition.2

A more important point that bears on our over-all assessment concerns the author’s treatment of the literary tradition. A continuous thread through G.’s book is his crusade against modern scholarship’s tendency towards “literary positivism” (30–1) and “fetishizing texts” (224). In his view, written sources often present biased, non-Ionian and post-Archaic viewpoints, or tend to be focussed on such ‘microhistorical’ details as wars, destructions or related events (xii, 11, 32, 39, 42, 277). G. maintains that scholarship has treated written information in a naive manner (2), and not be able to deconstruct biases or identify meta-narratives (226). The realization that written texts are consciously created artifacts (31) is for G. a reason to put them on a second plane; in his view, written and archaeological evidence «should be studied in isolation from each other» (26).

None of this, however, does justice to the recent historiography. Under the influence of the ‘new cultural history’ of the last fifteen years, classicists have come to realize that ‘words’ and ‘things’ are not opposed to each other but can be usefully studied in combination,3 and have been stimulated to look for meta-
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2 For this, see e.g. Emlyn-Jones op. cit., 7.
narratives\(^1\) or long-term developments of mentalities and identities.\(^2\) When G. complains about the lack of contemporary written documentation («ethno-historical texts» in his terminology; 39, 193, 225), and about the Athenocentrism that in his view dominates both the ancient tradition and current scholarship (see e.g. 10–11, 27, 216–8, 226), he seems to think especially of Herodotus and his sources, but at the same time overlooks two important things: first, that we do have a rich body of contemporary and ‘emic’ written source material in the shape of Ionian and Aiolian lyric poetry and, second, that in the studies just referred to East Greek lyric poetry takes centre stage in this new cultural historical approach. To give one example, although G. claims that «literary … references that refer to Ionian cloth are generally of later date and limited usefulness» (82), the fact is that contemporary lyric poetry discloses a lot about it, and appears to be extremely informative about the use and consumption of cloth, especially how dress figured in strategies of social distinction (e.g. Sappho fr. 573).\(^4\) It is, of course, the author’s right to attribute a secondary role to written information (10–14), but had he treated this evidence a little more carefully he would have avoided making some unfortunate mistakes. One might already feel a little uncomfortable to learn that Hesiod was «writing about eighth-century Euboea» (93), but things become more serious when the author boldly proclaims that contemporary sources do not tell us the ancient name of Al Mina (132–3)\(^5\) or what Greek ships brought to Egypt (168).\(^6\) It is also incorrect to state that «we know nothing about the use of Greek, or other languages current in Anatolia» (20, also 179); quite the contrary, as both Hipponax (frs. 92–1, 125) and *Hom. hymn Aphr.* (113–116) provide clear proof of bilingualism.\(^7\) Another instance of G.’s neglect of the contemporary sources concerns Ionian warfare. His starting point is that the «limited historical evidence» makes it «impossible to postulate how warfare may have been embedded in the socio-political structures of the Ionian poleis» (146). However, the mid 7\(^{th}\)-c. poet Kallinos of Ephesos is very explicit about attributing a key role in the organization of warfare to aristocratic sympotic groups, which were possibly subdivided in age groups (fr. 1; cf. Alkaios

\(^{3}\) Here and elsewhere, the numeration of the lyric fragments is that of M.L. West, Greek Lyric Poetry, Oxford 1991.
\(^{5}\) Ahta in Assyrian, perhaps Potamoi Karon in Greek; see R. Lane Fox, Travelling Heroes: Greeks and Their Myths in the Epic Age of Homer, London 2008, 126–7.
\(^{7}\) See further Crielaard op. cit., 45–46.
fr. 142¹). G. then goes on to hypothesize that ‘mainland’ hoplite warfare and associated codes and culture were alien to the Ionians, who supposedly practiced Anatolian-style siege warfare against «enemies using non-hoplite forces» (154, 162–3, 169–70). This, however, flies right in the face of Kallinos’ poetry and that of his near-contemporary, Mimnermos of Smyrna (esp. frs. 13a, 14); the correspondences between the exhortatory poems of Kallinos and Mimnermos, on the one hand, and the Spartan poet Tyrtaeus on the other, suggest that the Ionian poleis actually had a lot in common with what G. calls the ‘hoplite states of the mainland» (226)².

On other occasions, G. is prepared to rely on Atheno-centric, post-Archaic written sources not only in passing – for instance when he gives credit to the story about the Tartessian king Argant honios financing the walls of Phokaia (162), despite the topoi it contains – but also in a more fundamental way when he follows Herodotus’s account of the Ionian dodekapolis to confine his subject of study (xii, 218). One of the consequences of adopting the latter tradition is that Smyrna is virtually excluded from this study (it is mentioned only twice [156, 163], once to discredit its reputation as being the earliest fortified town in the eastern Aegean). Geography, landscape and location – which elsewhere in the book are important defining criteria – do not support this exclusion, nor does Herodotus himself seem to dispute Smyrna’s Ionian origin; for contemporary sources at any rate it was crystal clear that Smyrna was an Ionian city (e.g. Mimn. fr. 9). The result is that important evidence from one of the few extensively excavated sites in the region is set aside. It also means that for his archaeological narrative, the author has to rely more than is strictly necessary on data from Miletus, the other key site in this region.

G. is rightly critical of the literary tradition concerning the Ionian Migration as found in Herodotus (ch. 10), but cannot entirely free himself from thinking along similar lines (e.g. 227, 231–2). Again, it is incorrect to assume that there is a «total absence» of contemporary sources (225). Interestingly, these sources refer to links with the Peloponnese, not with Attica (e.g. Mimn. fr. 9; Sappho fr. 17; Alkaios fr. 70), and mention Aiolians (Mimn. fr. 7) rather than indigenous populations as the Ionians’ main antagonists. For the author, the topoi in the Herodotean version of the Ionian origo myth offer a welcome opportunity to apply to the archaeology of Ionia what is actually old-school, post-colonial thinking (e.g. 215–8), leading him to assume that Greek presence in Ionia was a result of the mass immigration of groups that already had a defined identity (‘Greek’ or ‘Ionian’) and were diametrically opposed to other pre-existing Anatolian or indeed «Phrygian» entities (195–97, 227) – groups that in some cities supposedly continued to live alongside each other, each with its own distinct and opposed value-sets and traditions (216–7). In this manner, G. creates a series of oppositions between Greek and Anatolians, mainland and East Greece, and «canonical» Greek art and East Greek art. I have already given some examples that suggest
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² For depictions of heavily armed Lydian and Phrygian foot soldiers, see e.g. I. Özgen–J. Öztürk, Heritage Recovered. The Lydian Treasure, Ankara 1996, 25, 45, 125.
that in the Archaic period these oppositions were not clearly articulated.\(^1\) Besides, the term «canonically Greek culture» (193, 216) is problematic, certainly for the Orientalizing and Archaic periods with their pronounced differences in local cultures.\(^2\) To take this a little further, if we are to regard Artemis of Ephesus as being «very un-Greek» (199), are we then to consider the cult of, for instance, Artemis Orthia at Sparta, as canonical? Indeed, to be able to speak in terms of an «Ionian society» (28), «Ionian States» (63), «the Ionian diet» (73) or «Ionian economy» (79) we need a more thorough comparative analysis both at an intra-regional and an inter-regional level.

This book contains much that is worth reading, but the overall impression is that the human aspect has not been fully integrated into the chosen approach. There is hardly any discussion of social structures, political institutions or the social organization of religion and cult. Nor is much attention paid to the dynamics of cult, cultural practices, burial customs, housing, etc. After a truly evocative description of the Sacred Way of Miletos, one expects the author to use the opportunity to comment that the «separate cult enclosure» on the summit of the Stephania (189) was where local aristocrats or even tyrants inspected the processions, or to explain what it means that Chares, who erected a seated statue in Didyma, called himself archon of Teichioussa (186–87, 189). There is also nothing about the ‘Chian Laws’ (c. 575–550 BC), which record early political divisions and perhaps even democratic institutions preceding those of Athens.\(^3\) This is all the more surprising as these examples seem to be exactly the elements of «agency and autonomy» that G. is looking for in order «to find new ways of ‘reading’ Ionian art, so that we can begin to view it by their own standards and not those of Athens or ourselves» (215).

But perhaps all this is asking too much from a book that is intended to provide only «the prolegomena to a new history of Ionia». It makes clear that landscape and geography had a large impact on the local and regional economies and societies (39–40), but it is also evident that these are not enough to understand how this became «one of the most important regions of the ancient Mediterranean» (xi). Readers should be aware that both the contemporary source material and recent scholarship are richer and more diverse and informative than this book may seem to suggest.\(^4\)
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1 Also J. Hall, Hellenicity: Between Ethnicity and Culture, Chicago 2002.
4 Not only is there not a single reference to lyric poetry in the book, but most of the titles mentioned above do not figure in G.’s footnotes or bibliography.