Studia Antiqua et Archaeologica 26(2): 199–211
DOI: 10.47743/saa-2020-26-2-5

On the Ionian League in the Fourth Century BC

Maxim M. KHOLOD[1]

Abstract. *The author argues that the revival of the Ionian League, most likely dissolved by the Persians right after 494, happened ca. 373 BC. The sLeague seems to have been refounded then as a purely religious association. Its life was very long this time: the League most probably did not cease to exist not only during the rest of the 4th century BC but it was the same one which functioned almost interruptedly throughout further several centuries and disappeared only at a moment after the mid-3rd century AD.*

Rezumat. *Autorul susține că renașterea Ligii Ionice, cel mai probabil dizolvată de perși imediat după 494, s-a produs aprocimativ în 373 î.H. Liga pare să fi fost reîntemeiată atunci ca o asociație pur religioasă. Existența sa a fost foarte îndelungată: Liga nu numai că nu a încetat cel mai probabil să existe pe parcursul secolului al IV-lea î.Hr., ci a funcționat aproape neîntrerupt în secolele care au urmat și a dispărut imediat după mijlocul secolului al III-lea d.Hr.*

Keywords: Ionian League, Panionion, Panionia, Persian Empire, Alexander the Great.

The evidence for the Ionian League (also named the Panionian League) in the Classical period, after the suppression of the Ionian revolt by the Persians in 494[2], is scarce. It is absolutely absent for the rest of the 5th century, a fact speaking, in all likelihood, that the League did not exist at this time[3]. Furthermore, it is significant that Herodotus describing the Panionion, a sacred place of the Ionians at Mycale in the territory of Priene, writes about a festival of the Ionian League in honour of Heliconian Poseidon held at this place, the Panionia, as if it is no longer celebrated in his time (I, 148)[4]. A situation is different for the 4th century. In this case we have some pieces of evidence of which the account of Diodorus (XV, 49, 1–3) about the prerequisites of the terrible earthquake in the Peloponnese in the winter of 373/2[5],

[1] St. Petersburg State University, Institute of History, Dept. of History of Ancient Greece and Rome; mmkholod@yandex.ru

[2] All dates are BC/BCE unless otherwise noted.

[3] Such an opinion was expressed already by WILAMOWITZ-MÖLLENDORFF 1906, 12.

[4] ... συλλεγόμενοι ἀπὸ τῶν πολίων Ἴωνες ἄγεσκον ὁρτὴν τῇ ἔθέντο οὔνομα Πανιώνια.

[5] The date of Diodorus is supported by other sources: Arist. Meteor., I, 6, 343b; VII, 344b; Strab., VIII, 7, 2, 384; Paus., VII, 25, 4; cf. Polyb., II, 41, 7.

when two cities, Helice and Bura, in Achaea were destroyed[6], is especially important. Relying in this passage on the writing of Ephorus[7], Diodorus gives the following story as one of the existing explanations of this disaster:

> "In Ionia nine cities were in the habit of holding sacrifices of great antiquity on a large scale to Poseidon in a lonely region near the place called Mycale. Later, however, as a result of the outbreak of wars in this neighborhood, since they were unable to hold the Panionia there, they shifted the festival gathering to a safe place near Ephesus. Having sent an embassy to Delphi, they received an oracle telling them to take copies of the ancient ancestral altars at Helice, which was situated in what was then known as Ionia, but is now known as Achaea. So the Ionians in obedience to the oracle sent men to Achaea to make the copies, and they spoke before the council of the Achaeans and persuaded them to give them what they asked. The inhabitants of Helice, however, who had an ancient saying that they would suffer danger when Ionians should sacrifice at the altar of Poseidon, taking account of the oracle, opposed the Ionians in the matter of the copies, saying that the sanctuary was not the common property of the Achaeans, but their own particular possession. The inhabitants of Bura also took part with them in this. But since the Achaeans by common decree had concurred, the Ionians sacrificed at the altar of Poseidon as the oracle directed, but the people of Helice scattered the sacred possessions of the Ionians and seized the persons of their representatives[8], thus committing sacrilege"
>
> (transl. C.L. Sherman, Loeb).

Strabo also indicates such a reason of Helice's submergence by the sea, naming Heracleides Ponticus his source in this case (VIII, 7, 2, 385):

"And Heracleides says that the submersion took place by night in his time, and, although the city was twelve stadia distant from the sea, this whole district together with the city was hidden from sight; and two thousand men who had been sent by the Achaeans were unable to recover the dead bodies; and they divided the territory of Helice among the neighbours; and the submersion was the result of the anger of Poseidon, for the Ionians who had been driven out of Helice sent men to ask the inhabitants of Helice particularly for the statue of Poseidon, or, if not that, for the model of the temple (τοῦ γε ἱεροῦ τὴν ἀφίδρυσιν); and when the inhabitants refused to give either, the Ionians sent word to the general council of the

[6] According to Diodorus, both cities were submerged by the sea. But this is not correct. Only Helice was submerged, Bura was demolished by the earthquake and consequently rebuilt. On this, see in detail: STYLIANOU 1998, 377.

[7] There is reason to suggest that Ephorus, in his turn, used in the account of the earthquake of 373/2 Callisthenes' *Hellenica*, combining it with Heracleides Ponticus' περὶ εὐσεβείας. At the same time, insofar as one is able to judge, in the passage on the embassy of the Ionians to Achaea he relied more on the latter author's writing (see below). See STYLIANOU 1998, 377–378.

[8] Perhaps the Heliceans even killed them: Paus., VII, 24, 6; Ael. *De nat. anim.*, 11, 19.

Achaeans; but although the assembly voted favorably, yet even so the inhabitants of Helice refused to obey; and the submersion resulted the following winter; but the Achaeans later gave the model of the temple (ἀφίδρυσιν) to the Ionians." (transl. H.L. Jones, Loeb).

Strabo's account is more brief and, in general, agrees with that of Diodorus, although it contains some differences: the Ionians ask Helice to give them either the statue of Poseidon or his temple's *aphidrysis*[9]; they meet a refusal; then the Ionian embassy obtains permission of the Achaean League; the Heliceans again express their dissent; disaster befalls the city in the winter following the refusal.

It is usually accepted (see below) that these accounts, and above all the passage of Diodorus, testify about the existence of the Ionian League at the time of the described events. Indeed, in this case the cities of Ionia (nine of the traditional twelve) act jointly and in concert, a fact that, it seems, clearly shows their unity, at least when solving the religious issues. Besides, the very goal of the cities' action (to repair their common cult of Heliconian Poseidon, being, as is well known, central for the previous Ionian League) appears to speak in favour of this view too: such an action is better suited for that of the Ionian communities forming an association than for that of the separated ones. The dating of these events is, however, quite another matter: there is no unanimity on it in scholarship.

In the opinion of Judeich, the move of the Panionia to a site in the territory of Ephesus may have been caused either by the military operations that Mausolus waged against the Greek cities of Asia Minor in the first half of the 350s or by the wars the reason of which one can see in the old dispute between Samos and Priene[10]. In turn, Caspari has noted that there is no need to relate the Ionian embassy to Achaea to a time immediately before 373. According to him, Diodorus' mention of certain wars which forced the Ionians to transfer the Panionia to Ephesus points to an earlier date, probably to 392 when the Persian satrap Struthas defeated the Spartan Thibron near Priene (Xen. *Hell.*, IV, 8, 17–19; Diod., XIV, 99). At the same time, Caspari supposes that the revival of the Ionian League happened *ca.* 400. He admits that its restoration may have been due to Agesilaus but the scholar also does not rule out that it was the result of the Ionians' independent action taken several years earlier. At any rate, the duration of the refounded League was not long; the Persians should have dissolved it right after the King's Peace (387/6)[11].

[9] On this, see HERDA 2009, 56–58.

[10] JUDEICH 1892, 214, n. 1.

[11] CASPARI 1915, 182–183. *Cf.* LAPTEVA 2009, 113–114. In this connection also see FOGAZZA 1973, 166–167, who suggests that the Ionian League continued to exist in the 5th century, but with exclusively religious functions, and its activities were stopped only by the Persians in the 4th century, during the new period of their domination over the Greeks of Asia Minor. I do not agree with such a view, because there is no evidence of the existence of the Ionian League in the 5th and early 4th centuries (prior to 373). Even if the Panionia were transferred to Epesus in the 5th century, as Fogazza supposes, it does not follow from this that the festival was celebrated by the cities still forming the Ionian League. For the equating of the Panionia and the Ephesia, see below.

Other scholars considered the cited account of Diodorus in connection with the debate on the Ephesia, a festival of the Ionians, mentioned by Thucydides (III, 104, 3). Hornblower has supported and refined the idea[12] that Thucydides meant by the Ephesia none other but the Panionia relocated, according to Diodorus, owing to wars from Mycale to a safe place near Ephesus. The scholar believes that Diodorus speaking about this relocation had in mind an event of earlier date than 373, probably that of 440/39 when Samos and Miletus quarreled for Priene (Thuc., I, 115, 2)[13]. Stylianou did not agree with the opinion of Hornblower. He argues that the idea of equating the Ephesia and the Panionia is not convincing. As to the Ionian embassy to Achaea, it, in the scholar's view, has to be dated either to 373 or to a moment shortly before this year. It is most likely that the dispatch of the embassy was connected (contrary to Diodurus' indication who in this case probably incompetently abbreviated the account of Ephorus) not with the transfer of the festival to Ephesus but with its move back to Mycale. According to Stylianou, the first relocation of the Panionia (to Ephesus) may have happened *ca.* 400 when, as Caspari has suggested, the Ionian League was refounded due to the Spartans, and the second one (back to Mycale) may have done at the late 370s when the new revival of the League presumably took place[14].

There are thus divergent views of scholars on the dating of the events described by Diodorus. Taken this into account, it is appropriate now to consider the issue once more.

First of all, I agree with Stylianou that Diodorus confused in the passage (as a result of his incompetent abbreviation of the text of Ephorus) two events which in reality happened at different times: the original move of the Panionia to a safe place in the territory of Ephesus because of certain wars and the subsequent move of the festival from Ephesus back to Mycale, i.e. to its original site. Also, it is worth believing that the whole further narrative in Diodorus' passage (the receipt of Apollo's oracle in Delphi by the Ionians and their unfortunate embassy to Achaea) was connected just with the latter event. At the same time, in my view, it is obvious that the activities of this embassy cannot be related to an earlier (and especially to a later) date than that of the earthquake in Peloponnese (373/2), as those scholars who try to identify the wars mentioned by Diodorus with one or another military conflict in the region, do (such a position of them results from the fact that the years *ca.* 373 were peaceful in western Asia Minor). Indeed, while Diodorus' account itself gives rather clear impression of closeness in time of the Ionian embassy to the destruction of Helice (with Bura)[15], this is

[12] It has been expressed, for instance, by MAGIE 1950, II 867, n. 49; BEAN 1966, 216–217; KLEINER, HOMMEL, MÜLLER-WIENER 1967, 13–14; KNIBBE 1970, 278.

[13] HORNBLOWER 1982, 241–245. Cf. HORNBLOWER 1991, 527–529, who admits here, among other things, the possible correctness of Stylianou's suggestion (see below) that Diodorus incompetently abbreviated the text of Ephorus and hence confused the transfer of the Panionia to a place near Ephesus with the festival's subsequent remove to the original site.

[14] STYLIANOU 1983, 245–249; 1998, 379 (briefly).

[15] So too Paus., VII, 24, 6; Ael. *De nat. anim.*, 11, 19.

explicitly shown by Strabo (here probably continuing, in contrast to Diodorus, to use the narrative of Heracleides) who writes: "the disaster happened in the following winter" (τῷ δ' ἑξῆς χειμῶνι συμβῆναι τὸ πάθος), which means that the events relating to this embassy have to be dated to 373. Correspondingly, one can conclude that the revival of the Ionian League should also have happened at a time shortly before these events and that its first, and entirely natural, action (or one of the first) became the decision on the move of the Panionia back to its original place at Mycale, to the earlier neglected Panionion. Besides, it is possible that an indirect support to the idea of the Ionian League's restoration at this time (after the King's Peace) contains in the very account of Diodorus who mentions not twelve but only nine cities of Ionia: such a figure is quite explainable for the situation of this period when, according to the stipulations of the King's Peace, Samos and Chios, in contrast to the other Ionian communities, were left outside the Persian Empire and therefore could be enrolled in no association of the Ionians of Asia Minor itself, while Priene as a city, in all likelihood, was not yet rebuilt on the new (or on the old) site[16].

Hence the considered account of Diodorus supported by the corresponding passage of Strabo, in my view, allows us to believe that the refoundation of the Ionian League took place *ca*. 373. It is unknown whether or not the League managed immediately, despite the failure of the Ionian embassy in Helice, to transfer the Panionia from a place near Ephesus to Mycale. However, given the statement of Strabo (VIII, 7, 2, 385) that the Achaeans later, after Helice's submergence by the sea, gave to the Ionians what they had asked for (according to the ancient geographer, the *aphidrysis*[17]), it seems the move of the festival back to have happened at a moment shortly after 373/2 (at least I see no reason why the Ionians had to postpone such an action, so important for them, for years). At any rate, judging from the archaeological evidence which appears to fix clearly the construction activities at the site of the Panionion

[16] For the similar explanation, see LENSCHAU 1940, 220–221. It has been supported by STYLIANOU 1983, 247, n. 13; 1998, 379. *Cf.* FOGAZZA 1973, 167. The date of the refoundation of new Priene is much debated in scholarship. A survey of opinions on the issue: COHEN 1995, 187–188. Without going into details of such a discussion, I shall limit myself to one remark: in my opinion, the idea that Priene began its new history in around the mid-4th century and therefore already existed at the new site before Alexander's Asian expedition (if the city changed its site at all) is most convincing. Incidentally, this alone (i.e. the earliest of the proposed dates of the city's refoundation) appears to cast doubt on the idea of Debord that namely Priene played a key role in dispatching the Ionian embassy to Helice in 373 (DEBORD 1999, 177).

[17] See above.

in around the mid-4th century[18], the festival with the participation of the delegates from the Ionian cities was held here already by this time[19].

But how could the refoundation of the Ionian League happen in the late 370s, at the time when Achaemenid power in western Asia Minor was rather strong? It appears that such an initiative of the Ionians did not encounter obstacles from the Persians due to a purely religious nature of the revived association: such a nature of this Ionian League is proved not only by the lack of references to it in the context of the political events of the 4th century but also by the fact that all our evidence on the League, at least for this period, relates to the matters connected exceptionally with religion. Taken this into account, it seems obvious that the Persians did not regard the restoration of such an association as a threat against them. Moreover, perhaps they even could take a certain political advantage of the Ionian League's reanimation: it was easier for them to exercise control over the cities united in an association (which, in addition, represented no danger to Persian power) than over the separated communities of Ionia. As to the Ionians, for them the situation when supreme authority did not prohibit (and maybe even somehow encouraged) the refoundation of their old League gave a great chance to put such an idea in action and at the same time revive their common sacred centre in the Panionion.

It is worth believing that the life of this, refounded in *ca.* 373, Ionian League was very long: this League most probably did not cease to exist not only during the rest of the 4th century but it was the same one which, as is well known, functioned almost interruptedly throughout further several centuries and disappeared only at a moment after the mid-3rd century AD[20]. Indeed, there is no ground to suggest that some time after its revival in the late 370s it was dissolved and then, as it is often stated in scholarship, refounded again either during the reign of Alexander the Great or later, under Antigonus the One-Eyed[21]. (In my

[18] KLEINER, HOMMEL, MÜLLER-WIENER 1967, 15. In addition, see HANSEN, FISCHER-HANSEN 1994, 68–69; MÜLLER 1997, 660. Lohmann's recent attempts to question the widely-recognized location of the Panionion on Otomatik Tepe (in his view, the Archaic Panionion was situated on Çatallar Tepe) do not seem convincing to me. See, in particular, LOHMANN 2005, 57–91; 2007, 81–82, 106–107, 129–167; 2012, 32–50; 2013, 109–122. For a critique of his hypothesis, see especially HERDA 2006, 43–102; also see HERDA 2009, 37–43; 2013, 427.

[19] Nevertheless, this is not to say that the revival of the Ionian League should have happened at the same time (not earlier). Those who date its refoundation to around the mid-4th century (see, in particular, KLEINER, HOMMEL, MÜLLER-WIENER 1967, 14–15; MAREK 2010, 207) undeservedly depreciate a reliability of the accounts of Diodorus and Strabo to suit the archaeological evidence. It is clear that the representatives of the member cities of the Ionian League could well meet together not only in one of them (especially initially) but also in the Panionion even before the beginning of construction works there, including the construction of the so called *bouleuterion*. For this "*bouleuterion*", see KLEINER, HOMMEL, MÜLLER-WIENER 1967, 28–37; HANSEN, FISCHER-HANSEN 1994, 67–69; HERDA 2006, 50–52; cf. LOHMANN 2005, 73–74; 2012, 37–38.

[20] On the Ionian League in the epoch of Roman domination, mainly in the Imperial period, see, in particular, VUJČIĆ 2009, 139–151; and especially HERRMANN 2002, 223–240.

[21] A survey of scholarship on the relationship between the Ionian League and Alexander, including the issue of its supposed refoundation by the Macedonian king: SEIBERT 1972, 90–92, 268. Among studies that were published after

view, the main reason why some scholars attribute the Ionian League's reanimation either to Alexander or to Antigonus, considering its earlier existence impossible, is that they hold the League to be not a purely religious association – as, I believe, it in reality was – but above all an association with certain political functions and therefore do not find a place for it in the structures of the Persian Empire[22].) At any rate, it appears that a number of inscriptions of the second half of the 4th century exclude any attribution of the refoundation of the Ionian League to Antigonus, fixing its earlier existence: the first is a fragment of the decision of the *boulē* of the Ionian League to allow the Lebedians to set up a stele at the Panionion (I.Priene^2 398); the second is the very beginning of a decree of the Ionians and Aeolians (I.Erythrai 16, ll. 6–11); the third is a fragment of regulations concerning the Panionia (I.Priene^2 399)[23]. It is impossible to date these inscriptions exactly. However, given that Ionic forms which occur in each of them become very rear in epigraphic documents from the cities of Ionia by the late 320s[24], one can conclude that the mentioned inscriptions were engraved, in all likelihood, before this time, i.e. under Alexander at the latest. (Of course it is not ruled out that one or another of them could appear later, even when the Ionian cities were under Antigonus' control, but the possibility of engraving all the three inscriptions in this period seems – because of the indicated dialectical specificity of their texts – ver small.) On the other hand, it is quite unnecessary to restrict the date of these epigraphic documents only to the years of Alexander's reign; it is more likely that at least one of the inscriptions was engraved before his Asian expedition.

Although Alexander, insofar as we are able to judge, had nothing to do with the refoundation of the Ionian League, his rule affected it.

First, it is most probable that under him, after the final destruction of the political system of the King's Peace[25], the number of the Ionian League's member-cities reached eleven. While

---

Seibert's survey or were left out of his account, see, in particular, the following: WILAMOWITZ-MÖLLENDORFF 1906, 13; MAGIE 1950, I 65–67; II 868–869, n. 51; BEAN 1966, 217; HABICHT 1970, 17; VERKINDEREN 1987, 263–268; DREYER 2009, 223; VUJČIĆ 2009, 142 (these historians attribute the refoundation of the Ionian League to Alexander); CASPARI 1915, 183–185; BILLOWS 1990, 217–218 (these scholars attribute it to Antigonus). *Cf.* FOGAZZA 1973, 167; DEBORD 1999, 177–178, 475.

[22] *Cf.* DEBORD 1999, 177.

[23] Here I deliberately set aside one more inscription that mentions the Panionion (I.Priene^2 19, l. 36), as its dating is controversial: while Hiller von Gaertringen (in his commentary on I.Priene 4) has dated the corresponding part of the document to *ca.* 332/1, in Crowther's opinion, the decree should be dated to 294/3 (CROWTHER 1996, 216–219). Cf. I.Priene^2 19 ("*ca.* 330–300").

[24] For instance, in Priene: while in I.Priene^2 15 (334/3) Ionic forms are present, in I.Priene^2 5 (shortly before 326/5) they are absent. Similarly in Ephesus: see respectively I.Ephesos 1419 (probably 336–334/3) and I.Ephesos 1435 (322/1). In inscriptions from Erythrae Ionic forms become also scarce by the late 320s and almost completely disappear by *ca.* 300 (GARBRAH 1978, 145–152).

[25] On the *de jure* destruction of this political system by Philip II of Macedon in 338/7, see BUCKLER 1994, 99, 117–118. At the same time, there is no doubt that it ceased to exist *de facto* only after Alexander's conquests in Asia.

Priene's enrollment in it during Alexander's reign is not clear, as it is possible that the city already was one of the members of the association by this time[26], it is obvious that now there remained no obstacles to Chios' rejoining the Ionian League[27].

Second, it is known – due to the extant inscriptions dated from *ca.* the second third of the 3rd century – about the existence of Alexander's cult in the Ionian League[28]. It is attested by the fact of regular celebration of the Alexandreia, a pan-Ionian festival in honour of the Macedonian king. The Alexandreia – becoming together with the Panionia the most important festival of the Ionian League – most likely were celebrated on Alexander's birthday and included, among other things, in all likelihood, a procession and offering of sacrifices (I.Erythrai 504, ll. 5–6[29] = KOTSIDU 2000, KNr. 198, E 1 [268–262]) as well as undoubtedly contests (I.Erythrai 30, ll. 22–23 [270–260]; 87, l. 6 [3rd–2nd centuries][30]; SEG 46. 422, ll. 8–10 [2nd–1st centuries][31]; I.Erythrai 89a, ll. 6–7 [after 31]). At the time of Strabo the festival was always held in a grove consecrated to Alexander, between Erythrae and Teos (Strab., XIV, 31, 644 = KOTSIDU 2000, KNr. 198, L 1). But initially (and for rather a long period) it was celebrated in various cities of the Ionian League – either alternately[32] or already from the

[26] See above, n. 15. It is appropriate here to make one more remark on Priene's refoundation: perhaps it was provoked namely by the reanimation of the neighbouring Panionion, and not the reverse, as some scholars suppose (see recently e.g. LOHMANN 2005, 75–76; 2012, 37–38).

[27] The enrollment of Samos in the Ionian League (the twelfth traditional member) happened at a later point, after the Samians had managed to recover their island following the Lamian War. Later still, Smyrna (refounded by efforts of Antigonus and Lysimachus) joined the Ionian League, and hence the number of its member cities reached thirteen (an earliest epigraphic evidence for this figure: I.Smyrna 577, ll. 1–2 [*ca.* 289/8]). On the refoundation of new Smyrna, see, in particular, COHEN 1995, 180–183, 422–423 (with literature).

[28] On the issue, see KHOLOD 2016, 513–516 (the relevant section of this publication is reflected further).

[29] A decree of the Ionian League, from Clazomenae, in honour of Antiochus I and his son. [πομπὴν(?) καὶ θυσ]ίαν is the restoration of L. and J. Robert of l. 6 that appears to me rather grounded; at least the restoration [ἡμέραν τὴν γενεθλ]ίαν given in OGIS 222 is impossible, for in such a case γενέθλιον would be needed. See ROBERT 1959, 228. But it seems highly probable that this festival was celebrated indeed on Alexander's birthday. See MAGIE 1950, I 66; HABICHT 1970, 17; DREYER 2009, 223; besides, see below.

[30] L. Robert, in my view, is right (although he provides no argumentation in such a connection), believing that the Alexandreia mentioned here is a festival of the Ionian League and not a local festival held at Erythrae (ROBERT 1929, 148; cf. I.Erythrai 87, commentary). Indeed, as Erythrae was a member of the Ionian League and hence could take part in the common Alexandreia each time, I see no reason for the establishment by the Erythraeans also their own analogous festival in honour of Alexander. Therefore Habicht's doubts on that (as well as Dreyer's who follows him) seem strange. See HABICHT 1970, 19; DREYER 2009, 224; cf. MAGIE 1950, II 868, n. 51.

[31] An inscription from Messene recording, among other things, the victory of an athlete in the Alexandreia celebrated by the Ionian League in Smyrna. On this inscription, see HABICHT 2000, 126; GAUTHIER 2000, 634–635; HERRMANN 2002, 231–232.

[32] If the restoration of ll. 24–26 of the same inscription from Clazomenae (see above) occurring in OGIS 222 ([ἐπειδὰν δὲ ἐπανέλθ]ωσιν αἱ πρεσβεῖαι, τὴμ πόλιν, [ἐν ἧι ἄν συντελέσωμεν τὴν θυ]σίαν τῶν Ἀλεξανδρείων, [παρακαλεῖν πάντας δήμ]ους κτλ.) is correct. The idea that the Alexandreia were held at first in the cities of the Ionian League alternately is admitted by MAGIE 1950, I 66; HABICHT 1970, 17; 2000, 126; DREYER 2009, 223; but see GAUTHIER 2000, 634–635; cf. HERRMANN 2002, 232. At the same time, see the commentary on I.Erythrai 504, where it is noted that

very beginning in one or another city on more or less long-term basis: at least at a moment in the 2nd–1st centuries, before the age of Strabo, Smyrna is evidenced as a place of, it seems, regular celebrations of the Alexandreia by the Ionians (SEG 46. 422, ll. 8–10)[33].

The issue as to when Alexander's cult, with the festival in his honour, was established in the Ionian League – whether still in the Macedonian king's lifetime or posthumously and in such a case either under Antigonus or Lysimachus – remains debatable. Habicht has believed that the Alexandreia of the Ionian League had to be instituted, like the festival established in honour of Antiochus I[34], on Alexander's birthday, consequently during his reign. And these Alexandreia, once introduced, naturally continued to be held on the same day after the Macedonian king's death as well[35]. Another argument presented by some scholars in favour of the Alexandreia's establishment in Alexander's lifetime is the name of the festival: according to the scholars, if this festival were introduced not under Alexander but under Antigonus, it would have been called the Antigoneia[36]. In my opinion, both these arguments, however, cannot be regarded as sufficiently forceful. As to the first of them, I agree that the festivals in honour of deified Hellenistic monarchs were mostly held indeed on their birthdays and therefore it is quite possible to believe that the Alexandreia of the Ionians were celebrated on such a day too. But this is not to say that the Alexandreia had to be necessarily instituted during the Macedonian king's lifetime: it is known that sometimes the celebrations in honour of a deified ruler could take place on his birthday even if his cult was set up posthumously[37]. As to the second argument, one can object to it in the following way: it is not improbable that Antigonus himself requested the Ionians to honour not him but Alexander in their festival; on the other hand, it is not ruled out that initially the pan-Ionian festival was indeed called the Antigoneia but then, after the Ionian League had fallen under the control of Lysimachus, this ruler ordered it to be renamed the Alexandreia, like he renamed Antigonia Troas as

such an idea contradicts with Strabo's indication of the place of the Alexandreia's celebration. However, this contradiction, it seems, can be easily removed by the suggestion that here we are dealing with some changes happening with time.

[33] The word συντελούμενα (praes.) in l. 9 of this inscription appears to indicate that the Alexandreia were held in Smyrna regularly (GAUTHIER 2000, 635). It is unclear how long it celebrated in this city. Nevertheless, if the idea that the Alexandreia were held at first in the cities of the Ionian League alternately is correct, one can suggest that later, from a date, the festival began to celebrate only in a certain city (immediately at Smyrna?) and then, by the time of Strabo, already in a grove consecrated to Alexander.

[34] See above, n. 28.

[35] HABICHT 1970, 17; cf. DREYER 2009, 223.

[36] See e. g. MAGIE 1950, II 868–869, n. 51.

[37] See HABICHT 1998, 35–41 (in connection with a decree of Miletus concerning the celebration of birthday of Eumenes II: I.Didyma 488).

Alexandria[38]. Yet, despite the indicated defects in both arguments (though it does not follow from this that they must be regarded as entirely invalid), I believe that it is better to date the establishment of Alexander's cult in the Ionian League, with the festival in his honour, to the period of his reign. Even if we set aside the considered arguments (although they taken together acquire a certain force), the introduction of Alexander's cults in a number of individual cities of Asia Minor, including Ionian[39], happening, insofar as we able to judge, in his lifetime, most likely in 324–323[40], speaks, in my view, just for this date: there seems to be no reason to separate the institution of the cults of the Macedonian king in these cities from the analogous event connected with the Ionian League; on the contrary, it is logical to believe that they were interconnected. Moreover, if so, it is not excluded that the fact that the civic cults of Alexander are evidenced (or supposed) only in several Ionian cities implies that they were set up a little earlier than the pan-Ionian cult: the institution of the latter may have been not only provoked by the establishment of the cults of Alexander in a number of cities of Ionia but stopped the further spreading of the Macedonian king's civic cult from one Ionian community to another, because at that stage the continuation of such a process became already superfluous.

Finally, let us return to the events of the beginning of the 4th century and focus on the idea – advanced by Caspari and supported by Stylianou – that the Ionian League was first revived in *ca.* 400. I would remind that, in the opinion of Caspari, this Ionian League was dissolved right after the King's Peace and was reanimated only in the age of the Successors, under Antigonus[41], while, according to Stylianou, the League was refounded in the late 370s and since then did not cease to exist. Caspari finds the argument in favour of *ca.* 400 as the date of the Ionian League's revival in the concluding verses of *The Persians* by Timotheus of Miletus. The scholar sees in them the possible reference to this association being in existence. I believe that such an argument is not persuasive. Even if it is correct that λαός in l. 239 of the nome is the same as λαὸς δυωδεκατείχης in ll. 235–236[42], it does not follow from this that

[38] Cf. BILLOWS 1990, 217–218. For the special role which the figure of Alexander played in Lysimachus' politics (and propaganda), now see PLISCHKE 2011, 61–69 (with literature). On the founding of Antigonia Troas by Antigonus and its renaming as Alexandria by Lysimachus, see COHEN 1995, 145, 421.

[39] Erythrae: I.Erythrai 201, l. a78 = KOTSIDU 2000, KNr. 235, E 1; I.Erythrai 207, l. 90 = KOTSIDU 2000, KNr. 198, E 2; I.Erythrai 64, l. 7 = KOTSIDU 2000, KNr. 235, E 2. Ephesus: Strab., XIV, 1, 22, 641; I.Ephesos 719, ll. 8–9 = KOTSIDU 2000, KNr. 245, E. Priene: I.Priene^2 = KOTSIDU 2000, KNr. 256, E.

[40] According to Habicht, in 334 (HABICHT 1970, 22–25, 245–246). For a critique of his opinion with arguments in favour of the last years of Alexander's reign (most probably 324–323) as the date of the introduction of the Macedonian king's cults in these cities, see BADIAN 1981, 60–63; WALBANK 1984, 90; STEWART 1993, 98–102, 419–420; and now especially KHOLOD 2016, 503–513.

[41] Similarly: VUJČIĆ 2009, 141–142, where, however, the subsequent restoration of the League has been connected with rather Alexander than Antigonus.

[42] As to the line numeration, I follow Hordern's edition of *The Persians* (HORDERN 2002). Caspari has followed Wilamowitz's one (WILAMOWITZ-MÖLLENDORFF 1903), and in it the relative lines are 251 and 247–248 respectively.

Timotheus requested of Apollo to benefit namely the Ionian League and not merely the Asian Ionians as a whole[43]. In addition, it seems that an accurate reflection of historical details in Timotheus' poetic (very vague) language should not be expected at all. Also, in my view, it is hardly possible to regard another piece of evidence as an argument in favour of the Ionian League's restoration in *ca.* 400, namely an inscription recording the settlement of a territorial dispute between Miletus and Myus by a court of arbitration composed from the Ionians by request of the Persian Struses (Struthas), presumably the satrap of Lydia, in 391–388 (Tod 113 = RO 16). Indeed, the fact that all the Ionian communities (both the representatives from the two disputant cities and the ones chosen from each of the other cities as jurors) took part in this trial, does not necessarily speak about such activities of them in the framework of the League[44]. Furthermore, I do not see any clear reference to the Ionian League itself in the text of the document. It is more likely that this case has to be considered a manifestation of ethno-territorial, not institutionalized, unity of the Ionians. Moreover, it is not ruled out that we are dealing here with the restoration (perhaps somewhat modified) of the practice of settling disputes between the Ionian cities which, as we know from Herodotus (VI, 42), was established for them by Artaphernes as far back as 493[45].

Thus, in my opinion, there is nothing that can testify about the refoundation of the Ionian League earlier than the late 370s. As to the time of the move of the Panionia from Mycale to a site near Ephesus, attested by Diodorus (I would remind that, according to Stylianou, it happened in connection with the supposed revival of the Ionian League in *ca.* 400), I believe that it is better to relate this event, regardless of whether or (more likely) not such a festival was the same as the Ephesia (see above), to a certain moment in the 5th century, at least before a point when Herodotus wrote about the Panionia.

Acknowledgements. The study has been conducted with the financial support of the Russian Science Foundation, project No. 20-18-00374, carried out on the basis of NNSU named after N.I. Lobachevsky.

References

BADIAN, E. 1981. The Deification of Alexander the Great. In: H.J. Dell (ed.), *Ancient Macedonian Studies in Honor of C.F. Edson*, 27–71. Thessaloniki.

BEAN, G.E. 1966. *Aegean Turkey. An Archaeological Guide*. London.

BILLOWS, R.A. 1990. *Antigonus the One-Eyed and the Creation of the Hellenistic State*. Berkeley.

[43] Cf. WILAMOWITZ-MÖLLENDORFF 1906, 12–13; and now HORDERN 2002, 245–246.

[44] As, for example, Tod states in his commentary on the inscription (Tod 113). For the analogous opinion, see HANSEN, FISCHER-HANSEN 1994, 69; DEBORD 1999, 177; SCOTT 2005, 537–538, n. 17; RUNG 2008, 428, n. 14; cf. BRIANT 2002, 495. However, see CASPARI 1915, 183.

[45] Cf. BRIANT 1982, 499; 2002, 495; SCOTT 2005, 537–538, n. 17.

BRIANT, P. 1982. *Rois, tributs et paysans*. Paris.

BRIANT, P. 2002. *From Cyrus to Alexander: A History of the Persian Empire*. Winona Lake.

BUCKLER, J. 1994. Philip II, the Greeks, and the King 346–336 B.C. *Illinois Classical Studies* 19, 99–122.

CASPARI, M.O.B. 1915. The Ionian Confederacy. *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 35, 173–188.

COHEN, G.M. 1995. *The Hellenistic Settlements in Europe, the Islands, and Asia Minor*. Berkeley.

CROWTHER, C.V. 1996. I.Priene 8 and the History of Priene in the Early Hellenistic Period. *Chiron* 26, 195–238.

DEBORD, P. 1999. *L'Asie Mineure au IV^e^ siècle (412–323 a.C.). Pouvoirs et jeux politiques*. Bordeaux.

DREYER, B. 2009. Heroes, Cults, and Divinity. In: W. Heckel, L.A. Tritle (eds.), *Alexander the Great. A New History*, 218–234. Oxford.

FOGAZZA, G. 1973. Per una storia della Lega Ionica. *La Parola del Passato* 28, 157–169.

GARBRAH, K.A. 1978. *A Grammar of the Ionic Inscriptions from Erythrae. Phonology and Morphology*. Meisenheim am Glan.

GAUTHIER, Ph. 2000. Iscription agonistique de Messène. *Revue des Études Grecques* 113, 631–635.

HABICHT, C. 1970. *Gottmenschentum und Griechische Städte*[2]. Munich.

HABICHT, C. 1998. "Zur ewig währenden Erinnerung". Ein auf das Nachleben zielender Topos. *Chiron* 28, 35–41.

HABICHT, C. 2000. Neues aus Messene. *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 130, 121–126.

HANSEN, M.H., FISCHER-HANSEN, T. 1994. Monumental Political Architecture in Archaic and Classical Greek Poleis. Evidence and Historical Significance. In: D. Whitehead (ed.), *From Political Architecture to Stephanus Byzantius*, 23–90. Stuttgart.

HERDA, A. 2006. Panionion-Melia, Mykalessos-Mykale, Perseus und Medusa. Überlegungen zu Besiedlungsgeschichte der Mykale in der frühen Eisenzeit. *Istanbuler Mitteilungen* 56, 43–102.

HERDA, A. 2009. Karkiša-Karien und die sogenannte Ionische Migration. In: F. Rumscheid (ed.), *Die Karer und die Andern. Internationales Kolloquium an der Freien Universität Berlin 13. bis 15. Oktober 2005*, 27–108. Bonn.

HERDA, A. 2013. Greek (and Our) Views on the Karians. In: A. Mouton, I. Rutherford, I. Yakubovich (eds.), *Luwian Identities. Culture, Language and Religion Between Anatolia and the Aegean*, 421–506. Leiden.

HERRMANN, P. 2002. Das κοινὸν τῶν Ἰώνων unter römischer Herrschaft. In: N. Ehrhardt, L.-M. Günther (eds.), *Widerstand-Anpassung-Integration. Die griechische Staatenwelt und Rom. Festschrift für J. Deininger zum 65. Geburtstag*, 223–240. Stuttgart.

HORDERN, J. H. 2002. *The Fragments of Timotheus of Miletus*. Oxford.

HORNBLOWER, S. 1982. Thucydides, the Panionian Festival, and the Ephesia (III 104). *Historia* 31, 241–245.

HORNBLOWER, S. 1991. *A Commentary on Thucydides*, vol. I, Oxford.

JUDEICH, W. 1892. *Kleinasiatische Studien. Untersuchungen zur griechisch-persischen Geschichte des IV. Jahrhunderts v.Chr.* Marburg.

KHOLOD, M.M. 2016. The Cults of Alexander the Great in the Greek Cities of Asia Minor. *Klio* 98, 495–525.

KLEINER, G., HOMMEL, P., MÜLLER-WIENER, W. 1967. *Panionion und Melie*. Berlin.

KNIBBE, D. 1970. Ephesos. In: *Pauly's Realencyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft. Neue Bearbeitung.* Suppl. 12, 248–297.

KOTSIDOU, H. 2000. *TIMH KAI ΔΟΞΑ. Ehrungen für hellenistische Herrscher im griechischen Mutterland und in Kleinasien unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der archäologischen Denkmäler*. Berlin.

LAPTEVA, M.Y. 2009. *U istokov drevnegretcheskoy tsivilizatsii: Ionia XI–VI vv. do n.e.* St. Petersburg. (in Russian)

LENSCHAU, T. 1940. Alexander der Grosse und Chios. *Klio* 33, 201–224.

LOHMANN, H. 2005. Melia, das Panionion und der Kult des Poseidon Helikonios. In: E. Schwertheim, E. Winter (eds.), *Neue Forschungen zu Ionien*, 57–91. Bonn.

LOHMANN, H. (et al.) 2007. Forschungen und Ausgrabungen in der Mykale 2001–2006. *Istanbuler Mitteilungen* 57, 59–178.

LOHMANN, H. 2012. Ionians and Carians in the Mycale: The Discovery of Carian Melia and the Archaic Panionion. In: G. Cifani, S. Stoddart (eds.), *Landscape, Ethnicity and Identity in the Archaic Mediterranean Area*, 32–50. Oxford.

LOHMANN, H. 2013. Melia und das archaische Panionion am Çatallar Tepe in der Mykale. In: Ü. Yalçin (ed.), *Anatolian Metal VI*, 109–122. Bochum.

MAGIE, D. 1950. *Roman Rule in Asia Minor to the End of the Third Century after Christ*, vol. I–II. Princeton.

MAREK, C. 2010. *Geschichte Kleinasiens in der Antike*. Munich.

MÜLLER, D. 1997. *Topographischer Bildkommentar zu den Historien Herodots*, vol. II, Tubingen.

PLISCHKE, S. 2011. Herrschaftslegitimation und Städtekult im Reich des Lysimachos. In: S. Plischke, L.-M. Günther (eds.), *Studien zum vorhellenistischen und hellenistischen Herrscherkult*, 55–76. Berlin.

ROBERT, L. 1929. Inscription agonistique d'Erythrai. *Revue philologique* 55, 148–149.

ROBERT, L. et J. 1959. Thasos. *Revue des Études Grecques* 72, 226–229 (BÉ 323).

RUNG, E.V. 2008. *Gretsiya i Akhemenidskaya derzhava. Istoriya diplomaticheskikh otnoscheniy v VI–IV vv. do n.e.* St. Petersburg. (in Russian)

SCOTT, L. 2005. *Historical Commentary on Herodotus. Book 6*. Leiden.

SEIBERT, J. 1972. *Alexander der Große*. Darmstadt.

STEWART, A. 1993. *Faces of Power. Alexander's Image and Hellenistic Politics*. Berkeley.

STYLIANOU, P.J. 1983. Thucydides, the Panionian Festival, and the Ephesia (III 104), Again. *Historia* 32, 245–249.

STYLIANOU, P.J. 1998. *A Historical Commentary on Diodorus Siculus. Book 15*. Oxford.

VERKINDEREN, F. 1987. The Honorary Decree for Malousios of Gargara and the κοινόν of Athena Ilias. *Tyche* 2, 247–269.

VUJČIĆ, N. 2009. Savez Jonjana u doba Rimskog carstwa. *Zbornik Matice srpske za klasične studije* 11, 139–151. (in Serbian)

WALBANK, F.W. 1984. Monarchies and Monarchic Ideas. In: *The Cambridge Ancient History*[2], vol. VII.1, 64–100. Cambridge.

VON WILAMOWITZ-MÖLLENDORFF, U. 1903. *Timotheos. Die Perser*. Leipzig.

VON WILAMOWITZ-MÖLLENDORFF, U. 1906. *Panionion*. Berlin.