

Mait KÕIV<sup>2</sup>

**Abstract.** *The article explores the cultural and political interaction between the Anatolian kingdoms and the elites of the Greek poleis on the Anatolian coast, with special attention to Archaic Ephesos for which relatively good evidence for the relations with Lydia is available. It demonstrates how the neighbouring hegemonic monarchies provided imitable examples for the Greek elite leaders and offered real opportunities for claiming, legitimating and entrenching their power. This shows, on the one hand, how the elites on the fringes of an empire could profit from imperial power, how the mild influence of an empire shaped the internal order of the communities in its sphere of influence by promoting the position of the local leaders. On the other hand, this sheds light on the strategies used by empires for attaining control of strategically important points on their outskirts.*

**Rezumat.** *Acest articol explorează interacțiunile culturale și politice dintre regatele din Anatolia și elitele orașelor grecești de pe coasta anatoliană, în special cu cele din vechiul Ephes, deoarece există mărturii solide ale relațiilor sale cu Lydia. Astfel, este demonstrată modalitatea prin care monarhiile hegemonice învecinate au furnizat exemple imitabile pentru liderii elitelor grecești și au oferit oportunități reale pentru a-și asuma, legitima și întări puterea. Aceasta arată cum, pe de o parte, elitele de la marginea unui imperiu puteau profita de puterea centrală, iar pe de altă parte cum influența moderată a unui imperiu putea modela ordinea internă a unor comunități și le putea dirija către sfera sa de influență prin promovarea în rang a liderilor locali. De asemenea, aceasta clarifică unele chestiuni cu privire la strategia utilizată de regimurile monarhice pentru a aduce sub control anumite puncte strategice importante.*

**Keywords:** *Ancient history, Archaic Greece, ancient Anatolia, early state formation.*

Greek city-states on the western Anatolian coast, evolving from the small settlements founded in the Early Iron Age by the immigrant groups from mainland Greece, developed in the neighbourhood of the great powers in the Anatolian interior. The Hittite empire dominating Anatolia during the Late Bronze had collapsed in the 12<sup>th</sup> century upheavals, and its domination was replaced by the Phrygian and Lydian kingdoms, and by the Persian empire, after the mid-6<sup>th</sup> century, with the whole of Anatolia under its control. At least from the 7<sup>th</sup> century the Anatolian states presented an almost constant threat to the Greek poleis on the coast, which did not, however, deny a close peaceful interaction in religious, cultural and even

---

<sup>1</sup> All the following dates will be BC.

\* The research has been supported by a scholarship of Gerda Henkel Foundation. I wish to thank the anonymous reviewer for his/her helpful comments, and Janusz Peters for his help with my English text.

<sup>2</sup> University of Tartu, Faculty of Arts and Humanities, Institute of History and Archaeology, Associate Professor of General History, [mait.koiv@ut.ee](mailto:mait.koiv@ut.ee).

political spheres. As the imperial kingdoms in Anatolia were enormously powerful and attractively rich in Greek terms, they served as enviable examples to be imitated for the ambitious elites in the Greek city-states, while the Anatolian rulers might have needed some support from the part of the ruling circles in the Greek poleis for achieving their hegemonic ends. The article explores the consequent political interaction between the Anatolian kingdoms and the elites of the Greek poleis, with special attention to Archaic Ephesos for which relatively good evidence for the relations with Lydia is available.

The kingdom of Phrygia arose as a major power in the central Anatolia during the 9<sup>th</sup> century. Its capital Gordion developed into a mighty fortified royal centre with big burial mounds – tumuli – the Phrygian elite erected around it. The biggest among these – Tumulus MM – rising 52 m from ground level and containing a wooden burial chamber of a ca 65 years old man dates from around the middle of the 8<sup>th</sup> century or slightly after that.<sup>3</sup> A Phrygian king Mita from the latter part of the 8<sup>th</sup> century is known from the documents of Sargon II of Assyria, appearing as a troublesome opponent of the Assyrian king, who eventually declared at least nominal loyalty to Sargon.<sup>4</sup> The Greek tradition remembered this Mita, and probably other Phrygian kings of the same name, as King Midas – a legendary figure who was conceived either as a completely mythological person from the distant past, or a semi-historical ruler from the early Archaic era.<sup>5</sup> According to the Greek tradition, Midas committed suicide when the Kimmerians, reputedly a nomadic people from the east-European steppes, invaded Anatolia and, we can presume, attacked the Phrygian kingdom.<sup>6</sup> The Assyrian sources date the Kimmerians' invasion to the Anatolia's central and western parts to around the middle of the 7<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> See especially VOIGT 2013, 186–199 and RÄTHEL 2019, 124–151; but also VOIGT, HENRICKSON 2000, 48, 51–52; VOIGT 2011; DE VRIES 2008, 30–33; VOIGT, DE VRIES 2011.

<sup>4</sup> The sources discussed in BERNDT-ERSÖZ 2008. See also HAWKINS 1997; FUCHS 2001; SAMS 2011, 611–612; RÄTHEL 2019, 197–206, 223–246.

<sup>5</sup> For the legendary Midas supposedly living during a distant Heroic Age see ROLLER 1983 who regards the mythological and the quasi-historical king as identical (roughly similar to DE VRIES 2011, 51–53). Some of the ancients surely identified them as such (Byzantine chroniclers: Kedrenos, 1.195; Symeon Logothete, 36; Georg. Hamart. Chron. Breve: 110.292 ascribed the ass ears to the 'historical' king), but in general, the mythological Midas reputedly lived in a very distant past, and was often located in Thrace in the Balkans (as for example Hdt. VIII 138.2–3 assuming that Midas lived in Thrace at some unspecified time before the foundation of the Macedonian dynasty) instead of Phrygia.

<sup>6</sup> See Strab. I 3.21; Eustath. Od. XI 14; Plut. Flamin. 20.20 and De superst. 8 (Mor. 168f) mention that the suicide was caused by some bad dreams. There could have been, in the reality, a number of Phrygian kings called Mita, but the Greek tradition lumped them into the figure of a single half-legendary king (see KÖIV 2021). For the summary and the discussion of the Greek and Roman evidence see especially RÄTHEL 2019, 112–123, 206–214; but also LEHMANN-HAUPT 1921, 412–419; IVANTCHIK 1993, 69–73, 105–114; SAUTER 2000, 82–93, 166–173; BERNDT-ERSÖZ 2008, 19–21, 25–27.

<sup>7</sup> In the Assyrian contemporary sources the first indications of the Kimmerians (Gimirrai) attacks against western Anatolia date from the time of Ashurbanipal (668–627) – see note 9.

During the second quarter of the 7<sup>th</sup> century, before the Kimmerians' intrusion, the kingdom of Lydia arose in the western part of Anatolia. Its capital Sardeis, protected by monumental walls, was situated less than 100 km from the Greek city of Smyrna on the Anatolian coast, thus much closer to the Greek settlements than the previously dominant Phrygia. Like the Phrygians, the Lydian elite buried its dead in massive tumuli built in the capital's neighbourhood. During the later 7<sup>th</sup> and the early 6<sup>th</sup> century the Lydian kings subjected the whole western and a good part of central Anatolia.<sup>8</sup> Like the Phrygians, the Lydians suffered from the Kimmerian attack, and the Assyrian sources report that their king Gyges (Gugu) – the founder of the hegemony according to the Greek tradition – perished in the course of this invasion. The Lydian kingdom however survived these upheavals and continued to flourish. The Greek tradition states that their king Alyattes (a great grandson of Gyges) expelled the Kimmerians from Asia.<sup>9</sup>

According to the Greek accounts given by Herodotos and Nikolaos of Damascus – the latter probably following the Lydian historian Xanthos, a contemporary of Herodotos – the Lydians were for a long period of time ruled by a dynasty descending from Herakles.<sup>10</sup> Hardly anything can be said about the historicity of this Herakleid dynasty. The more or less reliable history of Lydia begins with Gyges who, according to the Greek accounts, killed the last Herakleid king, married his wife and became the new ruler.<sup>11</sup> The Mermnad dynasty founded by him ca 680 governed until the 540s when the last Lydian king, the proverbially wealthy and powerful Kroisos, was overthrown by Kyros of Persia, and Lydia was included into the Persian empire.<sup>12</sup>

There is no indication in the sources that the Phrygians would have attempted to conquer the Greek poleis, or in any way attempted to subject them to their direct political control. The Mermnad kings of Lydia, however, became, from the very beginning of their rule, aggressive against the Greek poleis (see the map). Gyges allegedly conquered Magnesia,

---

<sup>8</sup> The main literary accounts, albeit of half-legendary character, are given by the Greek authors: Herodotos (I 6–94) and Nikolaos of Damascus (FGrH 90 F 44, 62–65) probably following the 5<sup>th</sup> century historian Xanthos of Lydia. For the archaeological evidence see RUSSIN, HANFMANN 1983; ROOSEVELT 2009; CAHILL 2010a; RATTÉ 2011.

<sup>9</sup> According to the Greek sources the Kimmerians attacked Lydia at the time when it was ruled by King Ardys the son of Gyges. They ravaged the Lydian capital Sardeis except the acropolis, attacked the Greek cities on the Anatolian western coast and burned down the famous sanctuary of Artemis at Ephesos (Hdt. I 15; Kallisthenes, FGrHist 124 F 29 (= Strab. XIII 4.8); Strab. I 3.21; XIV 1.40; Eustath. Od. XI 14; Kallim. Hymn. Artem. 251–258; Athen. XII 525c). Their expulsion by Alyattes is mentioned in Hdt. I 16.2; Polyæn. VII 2.1. For the Assyrian evidence see LEHMANN-HAUPT 1921, 416–419; COGAN, TADMOR 1977, 80–81; KUHRT 1987–90, 187; SAUTER 2000, 235–237; RÄTHEL 2019, 288–301, 304–311.

<sup>10</sup> Hdt. I 7.4; Nic. Dam. FGrH 90 F 44–46. For this tradition see RÄTHEL 2019, 273–277.

<sup>11</sup> Hdt. I 8–13; Nic. Dam. FGrH 90 F 47. See RÄTHEL 2019, 278–283.

<sup>12</sup> The principal account in Hdt. I 46–91; for the date see e.g. RÄTHEL 2015.

probably the Magnesia situated on the northern slope of the Siplyos mountain.<sup>13</sup> We are moreover informed that he attacked Smyrna, took the town (*asty*) of Kolophon (does it mean that the acropolis was left un-conquered?),<sup>14</sup> and even attacked Miletos fairly far southward of Lydia.<sup>15</sup> His successor Ardys conquered Priene and attacked Miletos again.<sup>16</sup> The next king Sadyattes began a new war against Miletos, which was continued by his son Alyattes. Miletos defended its independence and its ruler Thrasybulos concluded a treaty of friendship and alliance with Alyattes.<sup>17</sup> A war that Alyattes waged against Priene allegedly ended with a peace treaty negotiated by the famous Prienian sage Bias.<sup>18</sup> Alyattes however conquered and almost destroyed Smyrna, and although he apparently suffered a serious setback against Klazomenai,<sup>19</sup> he reputedly succeeded to beguile the knights of Kolophon to come as mercenaries to Sardeis where he treacherously had them killed, thus getting rid of the famously dangerous Kolophonian cavalry.<sup>20</sup> Kroisos the son of Alyattes started his career with an attack against Ephesos and conquered thereafter all the Greek poleis on the Anatolian mainland, subjecting them to the payment of tribute.<sup>21</sup> An exception was made for Miletos with whom Kroisos concluded (or rather renewed) the treaty of peace and alliance.<sup>22</sup>

When the Persians subjected the Lydian kingdom, they launched attacks against the Greek poleis, which were subsequently conquered one by one, all except Miletos with whom Kyros concluded a treaty of alliance as it had been between Miletos and the Lydian kings.<sup>23</sup>

This aggressiveness of the Anatolian rulers did not exclude close relations and intermarriages between the Greek and Anatolian elites (discussed below) and mutual cultural exchange.<sup>24</sup> The Anatolian elites were indeed very wealthy in Greek terms and therefore likely

---

<sup>13</sup> Nic. Dam. FGrH 90 F 62. Nikolaos does not state if this was the Magnesia on Siplyos or Magnesia on Maiandros further south. However, the attacks of Gyges were allegedly caused by an outrage of the Magnesians against a Smyrnaean favourite of his, which suggests a closeness of this Magnesia to Smyrna and thus its identification as the Siplyian polis. On the other hand, when Gyges invaded Miletos he must have passed Magnesia on Maiandros, and perhaps controlled this as well.

<sup>14</sup> Suggested by HUXLEY 1966, 53.

<sup>15</sup> Hdt. I 14.4.

<sup>16</sup> Hdt. I 15.

<sup>17</sup> Hdt. I 18–22: the Lydians ravaging the Milesian land accidentally burnt down the temple of Athena at Assesos, which caused the illness of Alyattes as divine revenge and forced the king to conclude peace and to build two temples dedicated to Athena instead of the previous one.

<sup>18</sup> Nic. Dam. FGrH 90 F 65.1; Diog. Laert. I 83 noting the peace concluded by Bias; the historicity of this incident may be doubted because the guile that Bias allegedly used for achieving the peace looks suspiciously similar to that used by the Milesian tyrant Thrasybulos in his war against Alyattes, as told by Herodotos (I 21–22).

<sup>19</sup> Hdt. I 16.2: the conquest of Smyrna mentioned also in Nic. Dam. FGrH 90 F 64.

<sup>20</sup> Polyainos VII 2.

<sup>21</sup> Hdt. I 26.

<sup>22</sup> Hdt. I 141.4.

<sup>23</sup> Hdt. I 141, 162–170.

<sup>24</sup> See now especially RÄTHEL 2019, 312–330.

to be exemplar for the Greek aristocrats. The influence of the Lydian elite lifestyle is confirmed by the Archaic poets – Sappho and Xenophanes – who clearly regarded the luxurious lifestyle as ‘Lydian’.<sup>25</sup> The Greeks quickly adopted the use of coinage invented by the Lydians, as demonstrated by the fact that the earliest attested examples have been found from the Artemision in Ephesos, and that the Greek poleis soon started to mint their own.<sup>26</sup> The Greek elites seem to have adopted elements of Anatolian funerary customs. The burial mounds (*tumuli*) at Kolophon, Smyrna and Klazomenai could have been inspired by the huge burial mounds of the Phrygian and Lydian elite,<sup>27</sup> and from Phokaia we know a rock-cut Lydian style tomb and a monolithic Persian-style tomb carved out of the bedrock.<sup>28</sup> The influence, however, was mutual. The Asian rulers made precious dedications to Greek sanctuaries, not only on the Anatolian coast but also on the Greek mainland. The Phrygian Midas was reputedly the first barbarian (non-Greek) potentate whose dedication – a throne from which the king had given his sentences – was shown in Delphi.<sup>29</sup> The power of the Lydian king Gyges was allegedly legitimated by the Delphic oracle, to which Gyges responded with precious dedications.<sup>30</sup> Alyattes consulted the Delphic oracle because of his illness during the war against Miletos, and built thereafter two temples dedicated to Athena in Assessos on Milesian land.<sup>31</sup> Kroisos was especially famous for his precious dedications to a number of Greek sanctuaries. These included the principal cult-places in Asia Minor, like the oracle of Apollo at Didyma controlled by Miletos and the Artemision of Ephesos where he erected a number of pillars, as stated by Herodotos and confirmed by an inscription preserved from his time.<sup>32</sup> Kroisos had indeed especially close relations with Delphi, and is reported to have made dedications also to the temple of Apollo Ismenios at Thebes and the sanctuary of Amphiaraos in northern Attika.<sup>33</sup>

In the terms of the power relations, however, the Anatolian kingdoms were clearly superior to the Greek city-states, and the fact that the Lydian kings attacked the Greek poleis and eventually reduced them into subjection must have affected the internal development of the Greek states. We can expect that the Greeks had much to learn from their eastern neighbours in the military and perhaps also political field; the effectively functioning

---

<sup>25</sup> Sappho fr. 16.20 (Lydian chariotry), 98a.10–11 (*mitra* fashionable among the ladies of Sardeis); Xenophanes fr. 3. West.

<sup>26</sup> See CARRADICE, PRICE 1988, 29–35; KROLL 2010; GREAVES 2010, 86–89; KONUK 2012.

<sup>27</sup> AKURGAL 1983, 58–59 (Smyrna); HURMÜZLÜ 2004, 78 (Klazomenai); MARIAUD 2011 and GASSNER *et al.* 2017, 54–76 (Kolophon on the comparative background).

<sup>28</sup> GREAVES 2010, 97, 198.

<sup>29</sup> Hdt. I 14.2–3.

<sup>30</sup> Hdt. I 13–14; see also Nic. Dam. FGrH 90 F 47.10.

<sup>31</sup> Hdt. I 19–22.

<sup>32</sup> Hdt. I 92.1. For the inscription on a pillar basis from the Ephesian Artemision, stating that ‘king Kroisos dedicated’ them, see KERSCHNER 2010, 257.

<sup>33</sup> Hdt. I 92; 52. The dedications to Delphi described in Hdt. I 50–51.

aggressive kingdoms could have served as examples which had to be imitated for the sake of their own survival.

In the field of military tactics and fortifications this influence seems obvious. When the Greek poleis on the Anatolian coast constructed the defensive walls around their cities during the Archaic period, of which the well-preserved walls of Smyrna provide a magnificent example (archaic city walls are recorded also from Miletos, Ephesos, Teos, Klazomenai and Phokaia), this was surely caused to a great extent by the Lydian threat.<sup>34</sup> Moreover, the massive fortification of the Lydian capital Sardeis provided an easily followable example.<sup>35</sup>

The rather widespread reliance on cavalry by the Greek Anatolian poleis is another possible example. The Lydians were indeed famous for their effective cavalry fighting,<sup>36</sup> and the Kolophonians also had a superior cavalry.<sup>37</sup> In Kyme a law was passed requiring every citizen to breed a war-horse,<sup>38</sup> and according to Aristotle the cavalry-based oligarchies had ruled 'in many other places in Asia'.<sup>39</sup> We can therefore suppose that this widespread use of cavalry by the Anatolian Greeks was at least partly caused by the need to face the attacks of the Lydian horsemen. This surely could not have been the only reason for the development of the cavalry tactics, because the possibilities for this depend on natural conditions – the existence of good pasture lands necessary for breeding horses. The board plain controlled by Kolophon indeed formed an ideal environment for this. The existence of cavalry was also connected to the social structure, since the maintaining of war-horses, expensive as it was, required a wealthy elite possessing big landholdings with the necessary pastureland. In Kolophon such an elite surely existed. According to Aristotle in this polis the rich formed, exceptionally, the majority of the citizen population.<sup>40</sup> According to the 6<sup>th</sup> century poet Xenophanes the wealthy Kolophonians numbered 'no less than a thousand'.<sup>41</sup> In all likelihood these citizens were wealthy enough to maintain horses, and there is hardly any doubt that Aristotle viewed the numerous rich forming the broad ruling class in Kolophon as the horse breeders fighting in the cavalry. In Kyme the cavalry was surely also connected with the ruling class which at some point in time was confined to a thousand, but the exact connection between the thousand wealthy citizens and the cavalry cannot be established.<sup>42</sup> However, as Aristotle noted the

---

<sup>34</sup> GREAVES 2010, 156–163.

<sup>35</sup> See CAHILL 2010b, 77–81; KERSCHNER 2010, 256–257.

<sup>36</sup> Note especially the story in Hdt. I 27, where Kroisos laughed at the alleged plan of the Greeks to prepare an adequate cavalry against the Lydians.

<sup>37</sup> Arist. Pol. 1289 b 35–41; Strabon XIV 1.28.

<sup>38</sup> Arist. fr. 611.39 Rose, quoted in note 42 below.

<sup>39</sup> Arist. Pol. 1289b35–41.

<sup>40</sup> Arist. Pol. 1290b15–18.

<sup>41</sup> Arist. Pol. 1290 b 8(15)–18; 1289b35–41; Xenophanes fr. 3 West.

<sup>42</sup> Arist. fr. 611.39 Rose states that a certain Pheidon first gave citizenship to 'a multitude' and legislated that everybody must breed a horse, while afterwards a certain Prometheus gave citizenship to a thousand (Φείδων ἀνὴρ δόκιμος

cavalry-based oligarchies in many places in Asia, we can be confident that Kolophon and Kyme were no exceptions in this respect. However, although the development of these cavalries is likely to have followed the Lydian, and perhaps Kimmerian, example, and caused by the Lydian threat, the social structure on which the cavalries were based, and the political systems they sustained, were different in the Greek poleis and Lydia. Kolophon, Kyme and the other poleis to which Aristotle referred were known as broad oligarchies, different from the monarchies of the Anatolian kingdoms.

The Anatolian monarchies, however, could have been exemplary models for power building by the Greek elites. The Lydian monarchy clearly impressed the Greeks and probably called for imitation. Gyges was, according to our evidence, the first ruler whose power was called *tyrannis*, thus introducing the term which soon became the usual signifier for the Greek monarchs. The *tyrannis* of Gyges was clearly connected to the wealth of the Lydian king, which was enviable for the Greek elite.<sup>43</sup> It is therefore clear that the eastern monarchies, not least the Anatolian kingdoms, provided an attractive example to be followed by the ambitious Greek leaders, but it can be debatable if, or in which way, this example, or the hegemony exercised by the Lydian kings, influenced the internal development of the neighbouring Greek poleis in practice, or how it shaped their political order.

From the period of the Persian hegemony in the second half of the 6<sup>th</sup> century a clear impact of the dominating power is obvious, as the Persians appointed tyrants from among the local elite to rule the cities as Persian vassals.<sup>44</sup> Tyranny had been of course fairly usual in Archaic Greek poleis, not least in the city-states on the Anatolian coast, which means that when choosing this form of domination the Persian monarchy relied on a traditional form of government among its new subjects. However, these tyrannies established by the Persians, directly forced upon the poleis, cannot illuminate a more subtle influence of the imperial power to the power relations in the Greek states.

Less direct influence can be perhaps observed in Kyme during the heydays of the Phrygian kingdom. A king Midas, perhaps the one who dedicated his throne at Delphi and/or perished in the Kimmerians' attack,<sup>45</sup> allegedly married a daughter of a king (*basileus*)

---

πλείοσι μετέδωκε τῆς πολιτείας, νόμον θεῖς ἕκαστον ἐπάναγκες τρέφειν ἵππον. Προμηθεὺς δέ τις ἀνὴρ δραστήριος καὶ ἱκανὸς εἰπεῖν χιλίους παρέδωκε τὴν πολιτείαν).

<sup>43</sup> Archilochos fr. 19 West.

<sup>44</sup> Hdt. IV 137–138. See DE LIBERO 1996, 414–417.

<sup>45</sup> If the Kimmerian invasion against central and western Anatolia took place around the middle of the 7<sup>th</sup> century, as the Assyrian sources indicate (see the literature quoted in note 8), the Midas who perished during this attack can neither be identical with the contemporary of Sargon II, nor of course with the anonymous king buried in the Tumulus MM at Gordion. We cannot however exclude the possibility of the reign of several kings called Midas or named so in the Greek tradition (see the detailed discussion of the evidence, with somewhat different conclusions, in RÄTHEL 2019, 222–267). In that case there would be no way of specifying the identity of the Midas the son-in-law of Agamemnon.

Agamemnon of Kyme,<sup>46</sup> probably before the cavalry-based collective government was established in the polis. When Midas died, his sons, or the relatives of his Greek wife, reputedly commissioned from Homer the tomb epigram for the Phrygian king.<sup>47</sup> The involvement of Homer in this story is hardly credible, but the existence of a Greek epigram on the tomb of Midas may be accepted. This tradition, if based on historical truth, indicates close ties between the Phrygian royal house and the Greek elite, and implies the importance of familial relations with the eastern potentates for legitimating the power of the Greek rulers.

Firmer evidence for this way of power legitimation is available in connection to the relations with Lydia. As noted above, the Lydian kings attempted to conquer the Greek poleis since the foundation of the Mermnad dynasty. However, the way how they ruled their Greek subjects is never specified by the sources and calls for consideration. Only in the case of Miletos have we some specific evidence, as we are informed by Herodotos that after the unsuccessful attempts to subject the polis the king Alyattes concluded a treaty of friendship with the Milesian tyrant Thrasybulos.<sup>48</sup> We can indeed suppose that this friendship helped to secure the power of Thrasybulos. A similar treaty might have been concluded with Priene,<sup>49</sup> but this must have remained ephemeral since Priene was, according to Herodotos, soon reduced into the status of taxpayers. Herodotos states that Kroisos made all the Greek poleis in Asia, except Miletos, pay tribute, but did not give any information about how, or by whom exactly, this was exacted.<sup>50</sup> Concerning Kroisos' predecessors we have no information whatsoever on what the Lydian domination might have meant. The statements that Gyges repeatedly invaded the land of the Magnetes and eventually 'subjected the polis' (χειροῦται τὴν πόλιν),<sup>51</sup> that he 'took the town of Kolophon' (Κολοφῶνος τὸ ἄστυ εἴλε), that Ardys 'took Priene' (Πριηνέας τε εἴλε) and Alyattes 'took Smyrna' (Σμύρνην τε ... εἴλε),<sup>52</sup> are sadly uninformative on this point. We even cannot say if this 'taking' always meant an establishment of a permanent subjection. A permanent subjection was probably forced upon Smyrna by Alyattes, the people of which were after the conquest settled into separate villages<sup>53</sup> which, we can suppose, stood under direct

<sup>46</sup> Pollux Onom. IX 83. Aristotle in his *Kymean politeia* (fr. 611 Rose = Epit. Heracl. 37) mentioned a wise and beautiful Kymean woman called Hermodike who married Midas and was the first to mint coins for the Kymean. She must be obviously identified with the Demodike the daughter of Agamemnon in Pollux, but the excerpt of Herakleides transmitting the fragment does not say anything about her father.

<sup>47</sup> According to Cert. Hom. Hes. 260–270 it was commissioned by Midas' sons, according to Ps-Hdt. Vit. Hom. 11 by his 'relatives by marriage' (δεηθέντων πενθερῶν αὐτοῦ). On this tradition see KIVILO 2011, 91; RÄTHEL 2019, 207–208, 322–326.

<sup>48</sup> See note 17.

<sup>49</sup> See note 18.

<sup>50</sup> Hdt. I 26.3–27.1.

<sup>51</sup> Nic. Dam. FGrH 90 F 62.

<sup>52</sup> Hdt. I 15–16.

<sup>53</sup> Strab. XIV 1.37. When Alexander the Great later 're-founded' the city, the 'New Smyrna' was situated several kilometres southward of the previous polis.



Lydian control. If a verse of Theognis, stating that ‘hybris destroyed the Magnetans and Kolophon and Smyrna’,<sup>54</sup> refer to the conquests by the Lydian kings, this may suggest that Magnesia and Kolophon were, like Smyrna, subjected to direct Lydian rule. However, we do not know if Theognis referred to the Magnesia at Sipylos conquered by Gyges, or to Magnesia on Maiandros which was sacked by a people called Treres attacking western Anatolia more or less contemporarily to the raids of the Kimmerians, after which its territory was allegedly annexed by either Miletos or Ephesos, not by the Lydians.<sup>55</sup> About Kolophon we know that it was still a mighty polis in the late 7<sup>th</sup> and early 6<sup>th</sup> century, thus after it was ‘taken’ by Gyges. As noted above, Alyattes allegedly beguiled and killed the Kolophonian knights diminishing their power, and even after that, in the late 6<sup>th</sup> century, Xenophanes noted the luxury of the ‘no less than a thousand’ Kolophonians ‘before the hateful tyranny’, probably referring to the Kolophonians’ life-style before the establishment of the Persian power.<sup>56</sup> As Kolophon continued to bloom after the conquest by Gyges, and Alyattes had to neutralise the Kolophonian knights by beguiling them with the promise of extra pay, we can legitimately ask to what extent was Kolophon subjected to the Lydian power at all during this period.

Some insight into the relations between the Lydian dynasty and the rulers of a Greek polis may be offered in the case of Ephesos. Ephesos was situated very close to Sardeis and was easily accessible. A fairly direct and easy road through the Karabel pass connected Ephesos with the Lydian capital. It is therefore notable that we have no information about any attack against Ephesos before the last Lydian king Kroisos. Magnesia, Smyrna and Kolophon were indeed attacked by Gyges, who even harassed Miletos much further to the south. Miletos was again attacked by his son Ardys who also attacked its northern neighbour Priene, and Sadyattes the son of Ardys launched a long though eventually unsuccessful war against Miletos. Ephesos, however, is never mentioned as a target for Lydian aggression. This impunity of Ephesos before Kroisos can imply special relations between its elite and the Lydian royal house.

There is some evidence indicating a special relationship. We know of a certain Melas who was related by marriage to Gyges, and whose ‘descendant’ (son?) called Miletos was married to a sister of Sadyattes (Gyges’ grandson) whom the Lydian king, her brother, afterwards seduced and took as one of his own wives. She became the mother of the next king Alyattes.<sup>57</sup> Nothing is stated about either the home polis of this Melas, or of Miletos. But there is evidence about another Melas who was a tyrant of Ephesos and was married to a daughter of Alyattes, thus living two or three generations after the first. This Melas the Ephesian tyrant

---

<sup>54</sup> Theogn. 1103–1104.

<sup>55</sup> Strab. 14.1.40 quoting Archilochos fr. 20 West, apparently referred to this event. The manuscript of Strabon has that Magnesia was after the destruction annexed by the Milesians (Μιλησίου), which has been often emended to Ἐφεσίου, since immediately afterwards Strabon mentions an earlier war between Ephesos and Magnesia. See also Eustath. Od. XI 14.

<sup>56</sup> Xenophanes fr. 3 West.

<sup>57</sup> Nic. Dam. FGrH 90 F 63.

bequeathed the power to his son Pindaros during whose reign the next Lydian king Kroisos, the son of Alyattes and a maternal uncle of Pindaros (Kroisos and the mother of Pindaros were both children of Alyattes, thus [half?] brother and sister), attacked Ephesos and deposed Pindaros.<sup>58</sup> When Pindaros thus abdicated and went into exile he left his property and son at Ephesos under a guardian Pasikles,<sup>59</sup> who was, however, apparently killed by still another Melas, probably Pindaros' son.<sup>60</sup> Thus, the evidence suggests that a dynasty where the name Melas was recurrent ruled Ephesos during the late 7<sup>th</sup> and the first half of 6<sup>th</sup> century. During the rule of the Melas contemporary to Alyattes there were certainly marriage ties established between this ruling family and the Mermnad dynasty of Lydia, which allows us to suggest that the earlier Melas, related by marriage to Gyges, was also an Ephesian, probably a member of the same family, which could well have already held the power in the polis. This would suggest a long rule for the Ephesian dynasty, and a longstanding relationship between the ruling house of Ephesos and the Lydian royal family.

Moreover, some evidence suggest that Kroisos had close personal relations with Ephesos, and its famous sanctuary of Artemis, before he ascended the throne. According to Nikolaos of Damascus (thus probably Xanthos of Lydia) Kroisos was, before becoming the king, in shortage of money for providing an army on his father's request, and when a rich Lydian refused to give him a loan he was helped by an Ephesian, a friend of his, and that when he became the king he dedicated the property of the unhelpful Lydian to the sanctuary of Artemis at Ephesos.<sup>61</sup> When Kroisos eventually attacked Ephesos, the Ephesians allegedly tried to save their city by connecting the town with a rope to the Artemision, thus symbolically putting themselves under direct protection of the goddess.<sup>62</sup> This implies their hope for a special respect from Kroisos towards the sanctuary and may thus indicate special relations between the sanctuary and the Lydian king. Either before or after the conquest, Kroisos dedicated a number of pillars to the sanctuary, testified by Herodotos and an Archaic inscription.<sup>63</sup>

The longstanding marriage relations between the Lydian kings and the Ephesian tyrants, if reliable, can explain why the polis was never directly attacked by the Lydians before Kroisos. No aggression towards the polis was apparently necessary because the Lydian kings

---

<sup>58</sup> Aelianos VH III 26; the attack of Kroisos is mentioned also in Hdt. I 26.1–2 (without mentioning Pindaros) and Polyainos VI 50. The accounts are however different so far as the subsequent status of Ephesos is concerned: Herodotos clearly implies that Ephesos was henceforth subjected to the Lydian power (he said that Kroisos first attacked Ephesos and thereafter all the other Greeks, reducing them to the status of tribute payers), while according to Aelianos and Polyainos Kroisos granted 'liberty' to the Ephesians when Pindaros left the city.

<sup>59</sup> Aelianos VH III 26.

<sup>60</sup> Kallimachos fr. 102 Pfeiffer with diegesis and the conjecture of STROUX 1934, 310–313, accepted by BERVE 1967, 99 and HUXLEY 1966, 109–110.

<sup>61</sup> Nic. Dam. FGrH 90 F 65.

<sup>62</sup> Hdt. I 26.1–2.

<sup>63</sup> See note 32.

were able to achieve their ends through the friendly relations with the ruling family who functioned, at least indirectly, as agents for the Lydian interests. We cannot tell why Kroisos reversed this policy, but the attack on and the subjection of Ephesos was clearly connected with some falling out with Pindaros, because the expulsion of the tyrant was allegedly the main demand of Kroisos when the polis submitted, after which the king was prepared to grant autonomy to it.<sup>64</sup>

From the point of view of the Ephesian rulers, we can suppose that the friendship with the Lydian dynasty was an important aspect for safeguarding the fairly long duration of their power. If the first Melas related to Gyges was indeed the member of the same family, as we have reason to believe, and if he was already the ruler of the polis, then this family with the heads called Melas and Pindaros must have governed Ephesos for at least four generations: the first Melas was apparently a contemporary of Gyges the great-great-grandfather of Kroisos who ended the rule of his descendant Pindaros. This first Melas might have been the grandfather of the second and the great-great-grandfather of the third who, however, might have not confirmed the power. This would give us the following line of the Ephesian rulers: Melas – xxx (= Miletos?) – Melas – Pindaros – Melas.

It may be that this was the family of the Basilids (the Kingly Ones) who claimed descent from the founders of the polis and had reputedly ruled Ephesos since the time of the foundation.<sup>65</sup> Similar families allegedly ruled in a number of poleis on the Anatolian coast and nearby islands. We know of the Penthilids of Mytilene on Lesbos, the Neleids of Miletos and the Basilids of Erythrai.<sup>66</sup> The reliability of the supposed extraordinary long rules by single families throughout the Early Iron Age can be doubted,<sup>67</sup> but we can trust that the families claiming descent from the legendary founders had established their power in the early Archaic period, thus probably at the time of the formation of the organised poleis. The name of Agamemnon, the *basileus* of Kyme and father-in-law of the Phrygian Midas, also suggests that he claimed descent from the founders, who were believed to be the descendants of the great Agamemnon of the legendary past,<sup>68</sup> which implies that a comparable dynasty ruled Kyme during the early

---

<sup>64</sup> As stated in Aelianos VH III 26.

<sup>65</sup> Basilids were reputedly the descendants of Androkles the founder of the Greek city. In the historical period the clan had the hereditary priesthood of Demeter Eleusinia with some prerogatives in the public competitions (Pherekydes FGrH 3 F 155 ap. Strab. XIV 1.3).

<sup>66</sup> See below, with notes 70–72.

<sup>67</sup> See KÕIV 2016, 25–27.

<sup>68</sup> According to Strab. XIII 1.3 Kyme was founded by two descendants of Agamemnon called Kleues and Malaos. LENZ 1993, 278–284 thinks that the two founders indicate a double kingship in Kyme, for which there is, however, no evidence.

7<sup>th</sup> century. Its rule must have been soon overthrown, as indicated by the broad horse-breeding elite ruling Kyme soon afterwards.<sup>69</sup>

It would be unwarranted to connect the dynasties ruling at the time of the polis formation necessarily with the eastern rulers. We know nothing about the Basilids of Erythrai, except the statement of Aristotle that their oligarchy was at some unspecified time replaced by a sort of democracy.<sup>70</sup> Of the Penthilids of Mytilene we know that they were violently overthrown, probably around the middle of the 7<sup>th</sup> century, but there is nothing which would suggest their special relations with the Anatolian rulers.<sup>71</sup> Nor is any indication for this available in the case of the Neleids of Miletos, whose rule also ended violently according to the tradition, as a result of the conflicts between its own members, which probably took place during the late 8<sup>th</sup> or early 7<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>72</sup> Tyrannies however continued in both Mytilene and Miletos, and at least in Mytilene the contestants for power sought Lydian support.<sup>73</sup> In the case of Agamemnon of Kyme we can indeed suppose that the intermarriage with the Phrygian royal house helped to legitimise his power, and can only guess if the end of the rule was connected to the fall of Midas depriving the dynasty of the legitimating friendship with the great Phrygian king.

The Basilids of Ephesos were, like the Penthilids and the Neleids, overthrown according to the tradition. This was allegedly done by a certain Pythagoras who established his own tyranny and proved to be a terrible ruler, violating both human and divine laws (he eventually caused a suicide of a maiden in a sanctuary) and thus surely deserved a violent punishment as divine retribution. But we do not know when exactly this took place – our source

---

<sup>69</sup> See above, with note 42. In the *Kymeian Politieia* Aristotle mentioned something about *tyrannoi* and *aisymnetai*, allegedly stating that *tyrannoi* were earlier called *aisymnetai*, or that the rulers (*archontes*) were called *aisymnetai* by the Kymeans (Arist. fr. 524 Rose ap. Argum. Soph. Oid. Tyr. and Schol. Eurip. Med. 19). This could hardly refer to the tyrant Aristagoras installed by the Persians (Hdt. IV 138, 2; V 37–38; Arist. fr. 611 Rose = Epit. Herakl. 38) as suggested by RUBINSTEIN 2004, 1044, because the use of plural indicates that Aristotle meant many rulers. If this refers to the dynasty of Agamemnon or to the subsequent *politeia* cannot be stated.

<sup>70</sup> Arist. Pol. 1305b 18–22.

<sup>71</sup> According to Aristotle (Pol. 1311b26–30) the Penthilids ruled violently, striking people with their staves, and were consequently overthrown by a certain Megakles, which was followed by a series of internal conflicts and short-term tyrannies until the early 6<sup>th</sup> century – see PAGE 1955, 149–243; RÖSLER 1980, 115–285; PIPPIN BURNETT 1983, 107–181; KURKE 1994; DE LIBERO 1996, 315–328; LIBERMAN 2003, XIV–XXIII and comments; FORDSDYKE 2005, 36–48; GAGNÉ 2009; KÖIV 2016, 28–33.

<sup>72</sup> Konon 44 and Nic. Dam. FGrH 90 F 52, 53 reports the conflicts between two members of the clan – Leodamas and Amphitres – for the position of the ruler, which resulted in the abolition of the Neleid rule and the appointment of a certain Epimenes as *aisymnetes* for stabilizing the polis – see HUXLEY 1966, 50–51; BERVE 1967, 100–101; JEFFERY 1978, 210; DE LIBERO 1996, 355–356; PARKER 1997, 125–127; GORMAN 2001, 88–101; KÖIV 2016, 37–41. Soon afterwards, however, the tyranny of Thrasylbulos was established, for which see above, with notes 17 and 48.

<sup>73</sup> Alkaios states (fr. 69) that Lydians gave him and his faction money for enabling them to return to the 'holy city', presumably Mytilene – see LIBERMAN 2002, 48.

states only that it was ‘before Kyros the Persian’.<sup>74</sup> It has been assumed that this Pythagoras overthrew the Basilids during a relatively early period, no later than the 7<sup>th</sup> century, and that the tyrants Melas and Pindaros, the contemporaries of Alyattes and Kroisos, thus ruled after him and were consequently not Basilids.<sup>75</sup> Alternatively, it has been supposed that the Basilids’ reign was temporarily broken by the tyrant Pythagoras and restored after his fall, and that Melas and Pindaros were the restored Basilids ruling after Pythagoras’ fall.<sup>76</sup> However, ‘before Kyros the Persian’ is perhaps not likely to indicate a 7<sup>th</sup> century dating. It seems more probable that it refers to the period immediately before the establishment of the Persian rule, thus to the events very soon after the expulsion of Pindaros by Kroisos. This expulsion was allegedly followed by internal troubles. As noted above, Pindaros left his property and son in charge of his friend Pasikles, who was however murdered, possibly by the very son of Pindaros called Melas like his grandfather. We are also informed that a certain Aristarchos was called from Athens to rule Ephesos for 5 years, in every likelihood to stabilise the polis after the previous troubles, and that this took place ‘at the time when Harpagos incited Kyros the son of Kambyses to rise against the Medians’,<sup>77</sup> thus exactly at the time when Kyros established his power.<sup>78</sup> The statement that Pythagoras ruled ‘before Kyros’ can indeed refer to the period immediately before this event, thus to the events in Ephesos before Aristarchos was called from Athens to settle the affairs. The cruel tyranny of Pythagoras would be, in this case, a relatively short episode in the troubles following the expulsion of Pindaros: we could suppose that he acquired power in the course of the conflicts between the members of the family of Pindaros, that their rule was thus overthrown by him, but his power was in turn soon overthrown by the Ephesians, not surprisingly given his alleged crimes, and that the Ephesians consequently called Aristarchos from Athens to calm the situation and reorganise the polis. All this must have taken place during a decade from 560 (the ascendance of Kroisos) to ca 550 (the establishment of the power of Kyros over Media).<sup>79</sup>

There are thus good grounds for assuming that the rulers called Melas and Pindaros were the Basilids, and that the family maintained power in Ephesos from an unspecified date until the middle of the 6<sup>th</sup> century when their rule was replaced by the violent but short

---

<sup>74</sup> Baton of Sinope FGrH 268 F3 (Suda s.v. *Pythagoras*).

<sup>75</sup> HUXLEY 1966, 33, 78; KNIBBE 1998, 80–81.

<sup>76</sup> BERVE 1967, 99; CARLIER 1984, 443; DE LIBERO 1996, 370. The suggestion of JEFFERY 1978, 223 that Pythagoras also was a member of the Basilids contradicts the evidence of Baton explicitly stating that Pythagoras overthrew the Basilid power.

<sup>77</sup> Suda. s.v. *Aristarchos*.

<sup>78</sup> The Nabunaidus chronicle dates the war between Kyros and Astyages the king of Media to the year 550/49 (KUHRT 2010, 50; see also the Nabonaidus’ vision of Kyros’ war against the Medes in KUHRT 2010, 56).

<sup>79</sup> Kroisos was given by Herodotos (I 86.1) and other Greek sources 14 (or 15) years of rule, which would mean that if we would accept the year 547/6 as the date of his downfall, he must have ascended to the throne ca 560. The narrative of Herodotos (I 26.1) implies that the attack on Ephesos was his first beg enterprise, after which he subjected the other Greek poleis. The revolt of Kyros against Astyages should be dated to 550/49 – see the previous note.

tyranny of Pythagoras. This would indicate that in Ephesos the dynasty claiming descent from the legendary founders of the polis was able to hold its power for a considerably longer period than the comparable ruling families elsewhere. The close relations with the Lydian house, and presumably some support from its part, is likely to have been an important factor in securing this lineage.

The relative chronology proposed here cannot be taken for granted. The evidence, fragmentary and deriving ultimately from inevitably debatable oral tradition, can hardly allow a reliable reconstruction of the events. The tyranny of Pythagoras inevitably remains a 'floating' event which could be placed at almost any point of time before the establishment of the Persian power. However, even if Pythagoras removed the Basilids at an early date, and the family of Melas and Pindaros represented a new dynasty in power, this would not remove the likelihood that a single family was able to control Ephesos from the time of Gyges to Kroisos, thus during almost the whole period of the Lydian empire. As this family had close marriage relations with the Mermnads of Sardeis, we have every reason to accept that these special relations did indeed contribute to the longevity of its reign.

We cannot say if or to what extent the Lydian kings used, or tried to use, similar methods for controlling the other poleis, or did Ephesos present a singular example. However, the method of indirect control of Ephesos to some extent foreshadows the later policy of the Persians establishing the local aristocrats to rule their poleis as the vassals of the Great King. The Persians could well have relied on the Lydian experience. Seen from the Greek side, this would be a clear example of how the neighbouring hegemonic monarchies not only provided imitable examples for the local elite leaders, but also offered real opportunities for claiming, legitimating and entrenching their power. Finally, this demonstrates how the elite on the fringes of an empire could profit from imperial power; how the mild influence of an empire effectively shaped the internal order of the communities in its sphere of influence by promoting the position of the local leaders, and how this strategy enabled empires to attain control of strategically important points on their outskirts.

## References

- AKURGAL, E. 1983. *Alt-Smyrna 1: Wohnschichten und Athenatempel*. Ankara.
- BERNDT-ERSÖZ, S. 2008. The chronology and historical context of Midas. *Historia* 57, 1–37.
- BERVE, H. 1967. *Die Tyrannis bei den Griechen I-II*. München.
- CAHILL, N. D. (ed.). 2010a. *The Lydians and Their World*. Istanbul.
- CAHILL, N. D. 2010b. The City of Sardis. In: N. D. Cahill (ed.). *The Lydians and Their World*. 75–105. Istanbul.
- CARLIER, P. 1984. *La Royauté en Grèce avant Alexandre*. Strasbourg.
- CARRADICE, I., PRICE, M. 1988. *Coinage in the Greek World*. London.

- COGAN, M., TADMOR, H. 1977. Gyges and Ashurbanipal. A study in literary transmission. *Orientalia* 46, 65–85.
- DE LIBERO, L. 1996. *Die archaische Tyrannis*. Stuttgart.
- DE VRIES, K. 2008. The age of Midas in Gordion and beyond. *ANES* 45, 30–64.
- DE VRIES, K. 2011. Textual evidence and the destruction level. C. B. Rose, G. Darbyshire (eds.). *The New Chronology of Iron Age Gordion*. 49–57. Philadelphia.
- FORDSYKE, S. 2005. *Exile, Ostracism, and Democracy: The Politics of Expulsion in Ancient Greece*. Princeton – Oxford.
- FUCHS, A. 2001. Mita. In: H. Baker (ed.). *The Prosopography of the Neo-Assyrian Empire. Vol. 2. Part. II*. 755–756. Eisenbrauns.
- CAGNÉ, R. 2009. Atreid ancestors in Alkaios. *JHS* 129, 39–43.
- GASSNER, V., MUSS, U., GRAMMER, B., GETSCHER, M. and MARUAUD, O. 2017. Urban Organization of Kolophon and Its Necropoleis: The Results of the 2011–2014 Surveys. *Hesperia* 86, 43–81.
- GORMAN, V. B. 2001. *Miletos, the Ornament of Ionia: A History of the City to 400 B.C.E.* Ann Arbor.
- GREAVES, A. M. 2010. *The Land of Ionia: The Society and Economy in the Archaic Period*. Chichester – Malden.
- HAWKINS, J. D. 1997. Mita. *RLA* 8, 271–273.
- HÜRMÜLZÜ, B. 2004. A new type of Clazomenian sarcophagus: The alteration of the burial customs in Clazomenae. In: R. Bol and D. Kreikenbom (eds.). *Spekular- und Votivdenkmäler östlicher Mittelmeergebiete (7. Jh. V. Chr. – 1. Jh. N. Chr.)*. 195–198. Mönnesee.
- HUXLEY, G. L. 1966. *The Early Ionians*. London.
- IVANTCHIK, A. I. 1993. *Les Cimmériens au Proche-Orient*. Göttingen.
- JEFFERY, L. H. 1978. *Archaic Greece. The City-States c. 700–500 B.C.* London.
- KERSCHNER, M. 2010. The Lydians and their Ionian and Aiolian neighbours. In: N. D. Cahill (ed.). *The Lydians and Their World*. 247–265. Istanbul.
- KIVILO, M. 2011. The early biographical tradition of Homer. In: T. R. Kämmerer (ed.). *Identities and Societies in the Ancient East-Mediterranean Regions: Comparative Approaches*. AOAT 390/1. 85–104. Münster.
- KNIBBE, D. 1998. *Ephesos: Geschichte einer bedeutender antikes Stadt und Portrait einer modernen Grossgrabung im 102. Jahr des Beginnes österreichischer Forschungen (1895–1997)*. Frankfurt am Main – New York.
- KÕIV, M. (2016), *Basileus, tyrannos and polis: the dynamics of monarchy in Early Greece*. *Klio* 98, 1–89.
- KÕIV, M. (2021), *Lydia, Phrygia and the Cimmerians: Mesopotamian and Greek evidence combined*. In: R. Mattila, S. Fink and S. Ito, (eds.). *Evidence Combined – Western and Eastern Sources in Dialogue. Proceedings of the Eleventh Symposium of the Melammu Project Held in Beirut April 3–6, 2017*. Melammu Symposia 11. 253–286. Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

- KONUİK, K. 2012. Asia Minor to the Ionian revolt. In: W. E. Metcalf (ed.). *The Oxford Handbook of Greek and Roman Coinage*. 43–60. Oxford – New York.
- KROLL, J. H. 2010. The Coins of Sardeis. In: N. D. Cahill (ed.). *The Lydians and Their World*. 134–156. Istanbul.
- KUHRT, A. 1987–90. Lygdamis. *RLA* 7, 186–189.
- KUHRT, A. 2010. *The Persian Empire: A Corpus of Sources from the Achaemenid Period*. London – New York.
- KURKE, L. 1994. Crisis and decorum in sixth-century Lesbos: reading Alkaios otherwise. *QUCC* 46, 67–92.
- LEHMANN-HAUPT, C. 1921. Kimmerier. In: *RE Hb.* 21, 397–434.
- LENZ, J. R. 1993. *Kings and the Ideology of Kingship in Early Greece (c. 1200–700 B.C.): Epic, Archaeology and History*. Columbia University.
- LIBERMAN, G. 2003, *Alcée. Fragments. I-II*. Paris.
- MARIAUD, O. 2011. The Geometric graves of Colophon and the burial customs of Early Iron Age Ionia. In: A. Mazarakis Ainian (Ed.). *The „Dark Age“ Revisited. Vol. I-II. Acts of an international symposium in memorial of William D. E. Coulson, University of Thessaly, Volos, 14–17 June 2007*. 785–799. Volos.
- PIPPIN BURNETT, A. 1983, *Three Archaic Poets: Archilochos, Alcaeus, Sappho*. Cambridge, MA.
- PAGE, D. 1955. *Sappho and Alcaeus: An Introduction to the Study of Ancient Lesbian Poetry*. Oxford.
- PARKER, V. 1997. *Untersuchungen zum Lelantischen Krieg und verwandten Problemen der frühgriechischen Geschichte (Historia Einzelschriften 109)*. Stuttgart.
- RÄTHEL, M. 2015. Das Datum der Eroberung von Sardeis. In T. R. Kämmerer, M. Köiv (eds.). *Cultures in Comparison: Religion and Politics in Ancient Mediterranean Regions*. AOAT 390/3. 131–142. Münster.
- RÄTHEL, M. 2019. *Midas und die Könige von Phrygien Untersuchungen zur Geschichte Phrygiens und seiner Herrscher vom 12. bis zum 6. Jahrhundert v. Chr.* München.
- RATTÉ, Chr. 2011. *Lydian Architecture: Ashlar Masonry Structures at Sardis*. Cambridge, MA – London.
- ROLLER, L. E. 1983. The legend of Midas. *ClAnt* 2, 299–313.
- ROOSEVELT, C. H. 2009. *The Archaeology of Lydia, From Gyges to Alexander*. Cambridge.
- RÖSLER, W. 1980. *Dichter und Gruppe: Eine Untersuchung zu den Bedingungen und zur historischen Funktion früher griechischer Lyrik am Beispiel Alkaios*. München.
- RUBINSTEIN, L. 2004. Aiolis and south-western Mysia. In: M. H. Hansen, T. H. Nielsen (eds.). *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis*. 1033–1052. Oxford.
- RUSSIN, R. U., HANFMANN, G. M. A. 1983. Lydian graves and cemeteries. In: G. M. A Hanfmann (ed.). *Sardis from Prehistoric to Roman Times: Results of the Archaeological Exploration of Sardis 1958–1975*. 53–66. Cambridge, MA – London.



- SAMS, G. K. 2011. Anatolia: the first Millennium B.C.E. in historical context. In: S. S. Steadman, G. McMahon (eds.). *The Oxford Handbook of Ancient Anatolia 1000 – 323 BC*. 604–622. Oxford.
- SAUTER, H. 2000. *Studien zum Kimmerierproblem*. Bonn.
- STROUX, J. 1934. Erzählungen aus Kallimachos. *Philologus* 89, 301–319.
- VOIGT, M. M. 2011. Gordion: the changing political and economic roles of a first millennium B.C.E. city. In: S. S. Steadman, G. McMahon (eds.). *The Oxford Handbook of Ancient Anatolia 1000–323 BC*. 1069–1094. Oxford.
- VOIGT, M. M. 2013. Gordion as citadel and city. In: S. Redford, N. Ergin (eds.). *Cities and Citadels in Turkey: From the Iron Age to the Seljuks*. 161–228. Leuven – Paris – Walpole, MA.
- VOIGT, M. M., DE VRIES, K. 2011. Emerging problems and doubts. In: C. B. Rose, G. Darbyshire (eds.). *The New Chronology of Iron Age Gordion*. 23–48. Philadelphia.
- VOIGT, M. M., Henrickson R. C. 2000. Formation of the Phrygian state: The Early Iron Age at Gordion. *AS* 50, 37–54.



© 2021 by the authors; licensee Editura Universității Al. I. Cuza din Iași. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons by Attribution (CC-BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).