

Migration theory and Greek Colonisation:
Milesians at Naukratis and Abydos
Teoria da Migração e Colonização Grega:
Milésios em Naukratis e Abydos

John Brendan Knight*

KNIGHT, J. B. Migration theory and Greek Colonisation: Milesians at Naukratis and Abydos. *R. Museu Arq. Etn.*, 33: 45-65, 2019.

Abstract: The application of post-colonial theoretical approaches in the last decades of the 20th century CE led the study of archaic Greek overseas settlement to a sort of terminological and methodological impasse. Scholars continue to debate whether Mediterranean and Black sea settlement can legitimately be termed as ‘colonisation’ yet attempts to modify this language of imperialism have thus far failed to achieve significant change of the overarching paradigms. This paper will suggest a new approach to these issues, using contemporary migration theory to conceptualise archaic Greek mobility and settlement, using the case studies of Milesian migration to Naukratis in Egypt and Abydos in the Troad during the 7th century BCE. Based on aspects of structuration and practice theory, this paper seeks to describe and explain the multi-faceted structures, practices, and agency involved in the migration of Milesian Greeks to these areas. The two case studies will be compared to understand how spatial, social, cultural, and political factors may have affected the characteristics of Naukratis and Abydos and the multitude of stimuli surrounding their settlement. This will provide ways to re-envision an important period of Mediterranean history, offering a flexible methodological approach to be used in other contexts.

Keywords: Migration; Greek colonisation; Miletos; Naukratis; Abydos.

Introduction

A “category in crisis”, Greek colonisation in the 21st century¹

One of the most important problems faced by scholars of Archaic Greek history nowadays is the nature of the ‘colonisation’

movement. Between the end of the 8th and the turn of the 6th century BCE,² Greeks established hundreds of so-called ‘colonies’ across the Mediterranean and Black Seas. Nevertheless, by the 1970’s CE, scholars began to recognise that these communities were in fact “settlements, not colonies” (Finley 1976: 185). Colonisation implies the presence of asymmetric power relations between incomers and indigenous peoples which are very difficult to identify in

*PhD Candidate, University of Liverpool. <j.b.knight@liverpool.ac.uk>

1 Quotation from Purcell (2005).

2 All dates are BCE unless otherwise stated.

archaeological and historical records (De Angelis 2010; Dietler 2010; van Dommelen 2012). Nevertheless, scholars have not achieved any kind of consensus on how this phenomenon should be framed if it is not colonialism (Malkin 2016a, b). The solutions offered, such as retaining colonial terminology for want of better alternatives (Whitley 2001) or introducing neologisms such as “apoikiazation” (De Angelis 2010: 20-21), either ignore the intellectual baggage of colonial terminology or simply replace one anachronous label with another.³

In the last three decades, scholars *have* been engaged with new theoretical and methodological approaches, most notably incorporating the role of local and/or subaltern populations in the development of nominally Greek settlements, particularly in the Mediterranean (e.g. Hodos 2006; Zuchtriegel, 2018). This has eased a de-colonisation of Greek settlement processes, exploring the roles of hybridity, middle-grounds, networks, and entanglement in these inchoate communities (e.g. Malkin 2011; Antonaccio 2003; Dietler 2010).

Nevertheless, these new developments, while commendable, run the risk of underplaying the important fact that there *were* incomers and they assuredly brought their own contextual “baggage” with them (Harzig & Hoerder 2009: 5; Greaves 2019). These incomers, however, neither had the desire nor the means to form the kind of dominant grouping associated with colonisation. If they were not colonists, then what (and who) were they? Mobility and settlement are presented in many temporal and spatial guises and it makes a difference whether we are talking about settlers or salesmen, pioneers or pirates (Osborne 1998). Much ink has been spilled on generalising the motivations underpinning Greek overseas settlement and we need not retrace the topic here.⁴ Actually, generalisations only serve to cloud the issue and there is

limited evidence with which to build the motivations of any individual historical immigrant, furthermore, even if such evidence did exist, extrapolation beyond its immediate context would remain a problematic endeavour (Tsetschladze 2006). Then, it seems reasonable to suggest that migrating agents probably came from a wide variety of socio-economic contexts and chose to migrate for several reasons (Osborne 1996).

Colonists or migrants, towards a new paradigm

This article aims to explore how migration theory, and particularly, migration practice theory, can provide a more nuanced framework for approaching what has been previously termed Greek ‘colonisation.’⁵ We shall explore the contexts in which migration-related decisions are taken and how, subsequently, migrants conceptualise migration-narratives to negotiate new identities and repurpose existing ones. This approach can offer us new perspectives and begin to answer questions such as: what were the wider contexts in which mobility and settlement occurred in the archaic period? How were they structured and regulated in socio-cultural contexts in both immigrant and emigrant communities? And, what were the medium- to long-term implications of these movements? In other words, we wish to explore psychosocial mechanisms with which migration and settlement were managed, negotiated, and enacted. Such investigation requires engagement with general theories of individual and social behaviour applied to contexts of mobility, providing us new manners to assess evidence and to reconceptualise the contexts in which mobile agents enacted processes of movement and settlement.

Using Karen O’Reilly’s (2012) framework for migration practice, we will explore structures, outcomes and practices that affect migration

3 The term *apoikia* is not attested before the late 6th century (Ibyc. F7 S227), see also Strab. (14.1.30) for a less secure attestation.

4 The best synthesis is Tsetschladze (2006).

5 The migration paradigm is not new, several scholars have been aware to its potential but yet little systematic exploration of implications for the archaic period has been undertaken e.g. van Dommelen (2012), Müller C. (2013), Müller S. (2013), and Osborne (2016).

in two specific case studies; Abydos on the Hellespont and Naukratis in Egypt. These settlements are particularly relevant as both were located within the spheres of supra-regional powers, prefiguring the notion of asymmetrical colonial power relations supporting incomers. We shall begin by outlining the theoretical and methodological frameworks that compose this study. Then we shall move on to a discussion of the external structures within which migration was enacted, especially political and economical conditions of 7th century BCE Anatolia and Egypt and the role of regional powers and invasive groups in forming conditions in which migration was undertaken. Then, we shall map out the development of migratory dispositions within the emigrant community, especially with ritual and day-to-day practices. We shall then explore the creation of immigrant identities and the ways in which these created a dialogue between immigrants and potential emigrants, before becoming some of the longer-term results of migratory behaviours. Finally, we will conclude with a brief discussion on the implications of this approach for understanding ancient migration before drawing some preliminary conclusions on the effect of understanding Greek mobility as a process of migration rather than colonisation.

Practice theory and migration studies

Migration studies, as a field of inquiry in its own right, remains in its relative infancy. Previous work on migration was frequently conducted as part of wider academic disciplines and consequently it suffered from narrow disciplinary approaches and aims of its similar subjects (Brettel & Hollifield 2012). Only in the last few decades that general theories of human behaviour, many developed in sociological or anthropological contexts have begun to be applied to historical migration. As such approach, practice theory, draws upon the works of sociologists Anthony Giddens and Pierre Bourdieu, particularly their understanding of the relationship between structure and agency as recursive and mutually affective (Bourdieu 1977; Giddens 1984).

This recursive and mutually affective relationship can be viewed in a migration context where an individual chooses to migrate due to localised structural factors such as unemployment. The practice of this migration-agency may subsequently create new structures, such as migration networks, which facilitate the movement of other individuals or groups with social links to the initial migrant, despite not being subject to the same initial structures.

In migration studies, practice theory has been most explicitly used by Karen O'Reilly in her 2012 book *International Migration and Social Theory*. O'Reilly offers a set of guidelines that can be used to outline the unfolding process of migration and the role of structures and agents within it (O'Reilly 2012). This framework consists of:

- 'External structures'; wide-ranging historical processes over which the individual agent has little if any control (O'Reilly 2012). For example, drought, warfare, famine or industrialization (Harzig & Hoerder 2009).
- 'Internal structures'; the dispositions of individual agents; some of them shared with wider communities, others uniquely conditioned by the agent's life experience, which can range from basic biographical events to moral, ethical, and political outlooks (O'Reilly 2012).
- 'Practices', i.e. the enactment of social life. These are the ways in which individuals and groups behave by consensus and negotiation. Practices also have a role in the creation and change of internal and external structures (O'Reilly 2012). 'Communities of practice' also constitute an important tool in practice theory by conceptualising identity formation and collective practice as a process of inclusion by negotiation, enactment and participation (Wenger 1998).
- 'Outcomes'. Found at the nexus of structure, agency, and practice in migratory contexts (O'Reilly 2012). Outcomes are the result of practices and they can be reconstituted as internal or external structures.

The strength of this approach lies in its ability to consider the totality of factors regarding to migration-related decisions. Rather than following simplistic push-pull models of migration, it enable us to outline the various mutually reinforcing contexts in which an individual chooses to migrate from the perspective of both emigrant and immigrant communities and the migrating agent themselves.

It is equally relevant to recognise that this model does not function predictively. Considering identical observable conditions, individual agents may still choose to act in widely divergent manners for several different reasons. For example, while we can identify Milesian migrants at Abydos and Naukratis as well as at many communities in the Propontus and Black Sea, population growth at Miletos itself during the archaic period leads to the inevitable conclusion that most Milesians did not emigrate in fact (Herda 2019). If we are willing to avoid falling into the trap of a reductive structuralist approach, we must identify an observable demonstration of agency (King 2012), in this case the decision of some Milesians to migrate. Notably, motivations that support such demonstrations of agency are difficult to identify in historical case studies considering the limited evidence for individual migration (hi)stories. Therefore, the decision to migrate expressed by collective dispositions, behaviours, and adaptations of emigrant and immigrant communities of practice is configured as a demonstration of agency. This practice-based approach can enable the exploration of migrant experience aspects in the ancient world which are often ignored or underestimated in contemporary scholarship. Furthermore, it offers us a new paradigm that could be applied to numerous nominally Greek communities which appeared across the Mediterranean and Black Seas in the Archaic period.

The external structures of Milesian migration

Migration does not occur in a vacuum. In traditional studies of migration, the

analyses have frequently focused on the push-pull factors compelling or encouraging migration (Harzig & Hoerder 2009; King 2012). In practice theory these are the ‘external structures’ of migration. At 7th century Miletos, we have evidence for ‘external structures’ ranging between social discord, tyranny, and invasion and increasing economic and intellectual prosperity, and widening horizons of trade and movement (Gorman 2001; Greaves 2002).

As already noted, all these aspects may represent ‘push’ factors for different emigrant agents, therefore the following section will sketch some of the external structures concerned specifically with immigration to Naukratis and Abydos. At these locations two conjuncturally specific structural conditions can be identify, in which migration was fostered; the increasing role of Milesian mercenaries in Anatolia and Egypt, and the concurrent opportunities afforded to Milesian traders, particularly after the accession of Saïte dynasty in Egypt.

Milesian mercenaries in Anatolia and Egypt

Abydos, situated on Nara Burnu, modern Turkish province of Çanakkale, was strategically placed to command the shortest crossing point of the Hellespont (Mitchell, 2004). The circumstances surrounding the arrival of the initial migrants are recounted by Strabo (12.1.22) who claims, “Abydos was founded by Milesians with the permission of Gyges the Lydian King.”⁶ Most scholars suggest these migrants arrived sometime after 680, the estimation is based on the date of Gyges’ accession (Loukopolou 1989; Roosevelt 2009), though contemporary Assyrian Prism inscriptions record a series of events that enable us to situate the settlement of Abydos in early 660’s. Between 667 and 665, according to prism E₁, a messenger arrived at the court of the Assyrian king Assurbanipal from the

6 All translations are the author’s own unless otherwise stated.

Lydian kingdom⁷ during Lydian expansion in the western Anatolia (Spalinger 1978). Then, a second inscription tells us that Lydians, under threat of nomadic Kimmerians, appealed to Assurbanipal for military support (Prism E² BM 134454 & 134445) (Cogan & Tadmor 1977).

While ancient literature seems to conceive Kimmerians as a unified group, scholars now believe that they were composed of numerous unrelated nomadic groups who periodically conducted raids against communities of Anatolia between the 9th and 7th centuries (Ivantchik 1993; Bridgman 1998). The Thracian Treres crossed over from Thrace to Anatolia at the Hellespont, settling in the Troad (Plin. *NH*. 4.35; Strab. 13.1.8; see also de Boer 2006). Jan de Boer has rightly perceived that this may constitute the wider context for settlement at Abydos, namely that Milesian and Karian mercenaries were garrisoned there as part of Gyges' attempts to stem the destructive results of Thracian migrations in the region (de Boer 2006).⁸ After all, during this period the garrison of mercenaries groups for border defense, frequently East Greeks and Karians, was a common practice among great powers such as Egypt, Assyria, Babylon, and Lydia (Niemeier 2001; Kaplan 2003; Luraghi 2006; Iancu 2016). While the initial Milesian migrants at Abydos probably consisted of these mercenaries, their presence in Abydos probably encouraged other migrants to follow them and settle in an area that potentially offered social and economic benefits.

The conditions that first facilitated the movement of Milesians to Egypt may also be connected to mercenary activity. Despite Gyges' establishment of diplomatic relations with Assyrians, he also sent mercenaries to support a

revolt against them in Egypt led by Psamtik I.⁹ This may be the first mass migration of East Greeks and Karians to Egypt, in addition to cause a rift with Assurbanipal. The political circumstances of Egypt in the late 7th century were marked by invasion, fragmentation, and internal disorder, and Psamtik I may have been the first to use Aegean and Anatolian mercenaries in Egypt on a wide scale (Hdt. 2.152–154) (Perdu 2010). These mercenaries played an important role in overthrowing the Assyrian yoke and reuniting Egypt under the Saïte dynasty, subsequently providing a border force to ward off future incursions (Diod. Sic. 1.66.7) (Kaplan 2003; Burstein 2009). Individuals previously stationed at Abydos may have been amongst this group, who were the first to equate its with the Egyptian city *Abdju* henceforth known to Greek speakers as Abydos. Unfortunately, graffiti left by Greek mercenaries does not include any indication of individual polis or *ethnē* so this must remain speculative (Braun 1982). Nevertheless, long-term settlement of mercenaries at several places in Egypt under Psamtik I created an initial migrant community to which others would soon join, drawn by potentially economic benefits of trade with Egypt that opened up at the same time.

Trade and traders in Egypt

In the century prior to Psamtik's reign, little evidence corroborates interactions between Milesians and Egypt, yet within a few decades of these mercenaries' arrival, the first, and for many centuries single, nominally Greek settlement in Egypt was established at Naukratis on the Canopic branch of the Nile.¹⁰ The initial activities of Greeks in this location seem to have predominantly focused on establishing trading links between Aegean and Egypt (Colburn 2018).

⁷ Prism E1 K.1821/A7920 Cogan & Tadmor. According to Tadmor & Colgan (1977), despite not explicitly naming Gyges, the term “*rak/būšiu*” is unique to Lydian messengers in the Prism inscriptions.

⁸ See also Strab. 14.1.40. Roosevelt (2009) suggests Abydos' establishment was due to Gyges' interest in the nearby gold mines at Astyra, on these see Pernicka *et al.* (2003).

⁹ Prism A, Cogan. See also Luckenbill (1927) and Cogan (2014). Spalinger (1976) denies the connection between Gyges' mercenaries and Psamtik's revolt.

¹⁰ The most recent overviews of Naukratite history are Möller (2000) and Demetriou (2012).

While Psamtik I generally encouraged these economic interactions, the Egyptian state also seems to have had an relevant role in structuring and focusing the parameters of its attendant migration, limiting it exclusively to Naukratis, although Aegean traders and mercenaries were certainly active elsewhere, probably under strict centralized control (Austin 1970: 28; Kaplan 2003: 15-16; Pfeiffer 2010: 15; Villing 2017: 575). Naukratis was situated around 20 km West of the Saïte capital at Sais and it may have been connected to Saïte capital by canal, further implying a desire for tight control of economic and migrant activities there (Villing, 2017: 578). Milesians were probably drawn to Naukratis by the prospect of a profitable grain trade with Aegean markets, considering the islands susceptibility to shortages (Roebuck 1951; Greaves 2002: 101, 2010: 74). Austin (1970: 36) also suggests that linen and papyrus may have been exchanged but he rejects the notion that wine and olive oil were exported due to the availability of preferred local alternatives (though Greeks of Naukratis would have made use of them).

It is difficult to ascertain to what extent, Milesian migrants in Abydos and Naukratis were aware of these external structures. A mercenary may have had some awareness of the conflicts in Northwest Anatolia or Egypt, but wider geo-political awareness probably remained vague. For traders, the specific circumstances around Psamtik's accession to the Egyptian throne may also have been a mystery, but the opportunities to trade with the vast economy of Late Period Egypt were clear. In other words, while external structures might appear only as a kind of background noise to migrants themselves; their relevance in structuring patterns of migration are clear. Yet, external structures by themselves cannot adequately explain why Milesians particularly fulfilled these roles and eventually migrated in increasing numbers. The answer to this question lies in the social and cultural dispositions of the Milesian community of practice itself, both at home and abroad.

Internal structures and migration in the emigrant community

Migration, whether conceived as a solution to constraints in emigrant community or as an opportunity to improve socio-economic life of the migrant, remains a radical course of action. It is important to understand how contexts in which this decision becomes viable can be created and fostered within internal dispositions of the migrant and the wider community of potential migrants. These dispositions are structured and restructured throughout the everyday life of agents and also through communities of practice. Within the emigrant community, we can trace part of this process by investigating how negotiated and shared systems of representation were used to formulate, ingrain and reimagine mobility as an important element in the community's sense of itself.

Milesian migration neither began nor ended with Abydos and Naukratis. Emigration from the *polis* spanned a period of over two centuries, and it resulted in the settlement of nearly 60 different centres, some from the metropolis itself, others by subsequent migration from established immigrant communities (Bilabel 1920; Ehrhardt 1988; Gorman 2001; Greaves 2002, 2007; Herda 2016). Simultaneously, at Miletos, a shared myth of descent focused on the idea of an earlier Ionian migration to Miletos originated in the Greek mainland had taken shape by the 8th century at least. This long history of real and imagined migration acted to inscribe migratory dispositions in the minds of Milesians and in the fabric of the community; supporting the potential for future migration and normalising the idea of movement in the minds of potential migrants. These embedded dispositions enabled agents to negotiate potential migratory contexts and conceptualise mobility as a psychologically acceptable or even desirable course of action (Kalir 2005). By the late 7th century and with the movement of the first Milesians to Naukratis; Egyptian and Egyptianising objects had become a relevant source of cultural capital at Miletos. This also encouraged the possibility of movement and migration to Egypt, both

temporarily, as can be seen in the travels of Hekataios (Burstein 2009), or permanently. Therefore, decisions to migrate were not made in a socio-cultural vacuum; throughout the life of the potential migrant, migration possibilities were continuously renegotiated within social settings. This fact fostered the development of dispositions that, at the very least, promoted the idea of migration as a plausible risk-management or life-benefiting action.

Miletos and the Ionian migration

Imagined memories of earlier migrations played an important role in the conceptualisation of Milesian migration in the archaic period and its inculcation into cultural forms of personal and communal identity. Whereas migration was undoubtedly a significant element in the realities of Bronze and Early Iron age Miletos (Mac Sweeney 2013); popular, negotiated, and shared memories of descent – which play an important role in the formation of community – are often more a reflection of contemporary circumstances than an real memory of past events (Osborne 1996; Hall 1997). Notions of Ionian migration must be interpreted as a reflection of the historical period of archaic Milesian migration, more than a direct memory of the movements of the population in the 11th and 10th century. We can trace ideas of this primigenial migration as far back as the *Iliad*, in which Miletos is said to have been ruled by Nastes the Karian, implying the absence of Greek migrants in the imagined past of the Trojan war (Il. 2.870; Mac Sweeney 2013). Whereas this context is clearly fictive, it still implies that for contemporary 8th and 7th century audiences, the notion that Ionians were migrants was not novelty.¹¹ By the fifth century we have explicit recognition of an Ionian migration to Miletos (e.g. FGrH 3 F155), and myths that incorporate the notion of migration were placed at the heart of everyday practices in Miletos (Hdt. 1.146).

11 See Mac Sweeney (2013) for issues with the chronology of Milesian foundation myths.

These conceptions of migration resided not only within mental configurations, practices, and traditions but they seem to have been enacted within the topography of the city itself. In the 6th century, the centre of Miletos was undergoing significant changes. Land reclamation was occurring to extend the surface area of the peninsula, resulting in artificial infilling of areas that had been previously been beach-side or underwater (Brückner *et al.* 2006). The Milesian Delphinion was located in such area to the Southeast of the important Lion harbour. This building contained the public hearth of the city embodying the goddess Hestia and it was the symbolic centre of Miletos (Herda 2005, 2011). The earliest remains from the complex can be dated to the 6th century, but it has been speculated that there may have been an earlier ash-altar on the beach itself (Herda 2005).¹² Delphinion may have been deliberately constructed in a liminal space between Milesian emigrant and immigrant self-identities. It was also the departure point for the annual procession from Miletos to Brachidai-Didyma detailed in the famous Molpoi inscription.¹³ Some scholars suggest that this important procession can be considered as a kind of symbolic re-enactment of the original migrants' arrival, analogous to the establishment of the Delphic oracle described in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* (Faraone 2018).

In sum, the combination of conceptualisation of a memorialised Ionian migration, associated with the reality of wide-ranging contemporary migration, strongly indicates the significance of ideas of migration

12 Faraone (2018: 17) confuses Herda's speculative ash-altar with the actual remains when he claims, "in [sic.] earliest archaic phase of the city the Milesians did indeed erect a small altar in the centre of the Delphinion and [...] the foundations for this altar were placed directly on a sandy beach". In fact, land reclamation probably removed any traces of an earlier structure. Cf

13 *Milet* 1.3 n° 133. Herda (2006) and Gorman (2001) suggest a New Year festival. Cf. Parker (2008); Chaniotis (2010). Herda (2011) has recently readdressed the issue. Slawisch (2009) offers a date in the mid sixth century for the establishment of these rituals and parts of the inscription almost certainly predate the Persian destruction of Miletos in 494 (Gorman 2001).

and movement within notions of self and community at Miletos. The implementation of idea of Milesians as migrants would certainly have acted to make potential migration-related decisions more palatable for individual agents; who could see this action as part of a continuum of migration from the past to the present and from their ancestors to themselves. In this sense, internal structure of communal identity acted as a regulatory framework for conceptions of migration. Again, it must be reiterated that this did not mean all, or even most, Milesians became migrants, in fact the number was probably small. However, it means that in the presence of strong external structures of contextually contingent i.e. invasion, civil disorder, famine, potential wealth creation etc. (above), migration as a potential solution or opportunity was already firmly implanted within conceptions of individual and communal identity.

Aegyptiaca for Aphrodite at Miletos

The relationship between agents and material culture provides another significant internal structure, one which has wide implications in the structuring and restructuring of dispositions. People perceive and mentally interact with the world around them in a daily basis, and conceptual understanding of this material world is concomitantly objective and subjective (Morawska 2009). The frequency of votive depositions of Aegyptiaca in the peri-urban Milesian sanctuary of Aphrodite *Oikous* on Zeytintepe is a case in point.¹⁴ Both chronology and derivation of these items illustrates developing interactions between Milesians and Egypt throughout the first half of the first millennium. The earliest items, predating the temple construction, begin in the ninth century and may have arrived through intermediaries including Lydia, Assyria, and

Phoenicia (Villing 2017). In the 7th and 6th centuries, larger volumes of Egyptian manufactured votive objects begin to appear in the sanctuary, while Naukratis simultaneously developed into an important centre for the manufacture of Aegyptiaca (Hölbl 1999). Though Naukratite and Egyptian manufactured objects are in the minority, they still indicate interaction between Miletos and Naukratis and, more significant to us, the mobility of individuals between both. Though most deposits from the sanctuary are Egyptianizing, made in Aegean workshops probably located on Rhodes (Hölbl 1999).

While only those of higher social status would have the means to travel to Egypt and the opportunity to acquire original first-hand material, the dedication of Aegyptiaca imitation provided a path for all Milesians to enhance their own social capital and reinforce “the social value accorded to ‘Egyptianalia’ back home” (Villing 2017: 580). The Milesian ‘idea of Egypt’ had great importance, especially in the 7th and 6th centuries, leading to the development of, as Alan Greaves has termed it, “an Egyptophile cultural Aesthetic” (Greaves 2010: 190). Socio-religious practices involved in the dedication of Aegyptiaca contributed to the potential for mobility and migration to Egypt. They provide a material instantiation of disposition that undergirded potential migration by everyday tasks practice such as votive deposition. Interaction between Milesian migrants, mercenaries, traders, and their home sanctuaries, with Egyptian objects, ideas and style functioned within a feedback loop. As Herodotus notes (2.159), the Egyptian Pharaoh Necho II dedicated his clothing worn at the battle of Magdolos to Apollo at Branchidai-Didyma in an act Alexandra Villing calls “‘religious diplomacy’[...] aimed at promoting commercial and, especially, military alliances and [ensuring] the supply of crucial mercenaries” (Villing 2017: 576).¹⁵

14 See Hölbl (1999) for the finds of Aegyptiaca and Senff (2003a; 2003b); Pantaleon & Senff (2008) for the excavations and other finds. See also Held (2000) for Egyptian material in the temple of Athena.

15 See also Braun (1982), Bowden (1996), Herda (2008) for the dedication as a reciprocal offering for the role played by his Milesian mercenaries. See also Buxton (2002) for Lydian royal dedications. Fantalkin (2014) rejects the convention of equating this battle with Meggido ca 609 (e.g.

This fact acknowledged the importance of votive practices for Necho's Milesian interlocutors, performing a clear statement to potential migrants and mercenaries and strengthened the existing bonds between King, his mercenaries, and the Milesian community at Naukratis.

These internal structures significantly affected the people of Miletos. Firstly, with the Ionian migration mythology, the genesis of the Milesian community itself was thought to have been built based on migration. Milesian self-identity was predicated on the fundamental conception that they were a migrant people. Whatever the reality of the settlement of Miletos in the Early Iron Age, this basic principle of self-conception served to regulate the disruptive effects of migration on social life of the individual agent. In the case of Naukratis and Egypt, as potential migrant destinations, the viability of this course of actions was mitigated by continued day-to-day interactions with a Milesian idea of Egyptian culture and aesthetics. Votive deposition constituted an important point of interaction with the gods of the *poleis* and the use of Egyptian objects and motifs as dedications were used to undergird the mystique of Egypt in daily social and cultural actions and interactions. This 'special relationship' with Egypt, enhanced and underlined by Pharaonic interest in Miletos itself, without a doubt augmented the underlying migratory dispositions in Milesian cultural forms and, by linking a specific migration destination with an important form of cultural capital, served to draw some Milesians southwards to the land of the Nile.

The practice of Milesian migrant identity

The internal structuring devices we have discussed, were used to create underlying dispositions which regulated, enhanced, and encouraged migration in emigrant community.

But if we are willing to understand cyclical and structuring nature of migratory dispositions, we must also consider the role of practice within immigrant communities and its ability to sustain internal migration structures. The act of movement is one of several stages in the process of migration rather than the final point in and of itself. Migrants and their communities adopt several strategies at the point of immigration to simultaneously delineate their special status and ingratiate themselves within the wider communities and neighbouring groups of the area to which they migrate. Particularly in the ancient world, a significant strategy was the adoption and adaptation of primeval foundation stories, narratives that placed migrants within a continuum of movement, usually in an imagined past, which legitimated their presence in an immigrant area (Dougherty 1993). At Naukratis, novel religious practices were incorporated into the worship of tutelary deities, particularly Apollo and Aphrodite, to further reinforce bonds with emigrant community, whereas underlining a uniquely immigrant identity. In modern treatments of migration, this dualistic creation of identity has been widely studied as a manifestation of transnationalism, wherein mobile and migrant people conceive of themselves as holding multiple identities simultaneously and they are able to cross over between cultures, societies and cultural forms by deploying these identities (Harzig & Hoerder 2009).

Milesian foundation myths at Naukratis

There is considerable debate as to whether Naukratis was originally a Milesian foundation, though almost certainly Milesians were present from its beginning.¹⁶ The nearest contemporary source, Herodotus, states that it was established by charter from the pharaoh Amasis and controlled by the nine *poleis* with an interest

Greaves, 2010; Bresson 2005). He argues that the battle Herodotus refers to occurred in Northern Sinai in 601/0 in the context of Necho's wars against the Babylonians.

16 Drijvers (1999), Bresson (2005), Herda (2008) *contra*. Möller (2000), Bowden (1996). MWG II pottery from the end of the 7th century confirms some links with Miletos at this time (Cook & Dupont 1998; Möller 2000).

in the Hellenion (Hdt. 2.178). However, archaeological evidence demonstrates the earliest Greek material was brought to the site during the reign of Psamtek I (664-610) (Möller 2000),¹⁷ whereas later sources indicate it was a Milesian foundation (e.g. Strab. 17.1.18; Euseb. Chron. 88b Helm). A tradition reported in a Scholion to Theocritus' *Idylls* states: "Around the name Neileus there is a note of interest, the Milesian founder of Naukratis was called by the same name as the Egyptian river Nile which some say he named after himself." (Schol. Idyll. 7.98).

Neileus was also the traditional founder of Miletos (Mac Sweeney, 2003). The historicity of Neileus and his travels is extremely dubious and there is little need to retrace the arguments against the Nile as an eponym.¹⁸ Yet, by identifying Neileus with the Nile, Milesian migrants were performing a clear statement to their place in the Naukratic community and Egypt as a whole. Furthermore, as Alain Bresson has observed, the designation of the founder's role to Neileus fulfilled multiple purposes, as the founder of Miletos, he had a unique place in Milesian claims at Naukratis, while simultaneously his wanderings and Pylia ancestry provided him a Panhellenic character adequate for migrants from other *poleis* (Bresson, 2005). This provides us with an excellent example of the overlap between practices and internal structures. Migrant agents are propagating a specific narrative that connects them intimately to their place of immigration; by migrating to Naukratis and Egypt they are not so much uprooting themselves as merely following in the footsteps of their founding hero. This results in the concretisation of an identity that remains intimately connected with emigrant community and thus it can be more easily adopted and absorbed by future potential emigrants.

Milesian claims of primacy at Naukratis can also be observed in a passage of Strabo, which describes the geography of the region, stating:

17 These were found in the temple of Aphrodite, itself possibly a Milesian sanctuary (see below). Amasis intervention may have been an administrative reorganization.

18 See Bresson (2005) with references, for a thorough treatment.

Then comes the "Watchtower of Perseus" and the "Milesian Teichos". Coming by sea, in the time of Psammetichus (contemporary with Cyarxes the Mede), thirty Milesian ships gained possession of the Bolbitine mouth [of the Nile] then, on disembarking, fortified the place mentioned. Returning to the Saitic nome, they defeated Inaros in a naval battle and founded the town of Naukratis near Schedia (Strab. 17.1.18).

Jan Willem Drijvers offers a reconstruction in which the Milesians wish to settle at Naukratis, already occupied by Greeks, but the Milesians have to fight for their right to settle after being rejected by Psamtik I (Drijvers 1999). Strabo wrote nearly 700 years after the fact, meaning the specific details of this confused episode are almost impossible to reconcile even if his source was the earlier Artemidorus of Ephesos (Herda 2008). At any rate, the significance of this passage does not lie in its detail as much as that these claims should be made at all. It is difficult to know how far back these claims can be traced (Redon 2012), but we can surmise that this foundation tale was probably advanced at both Miletos and Naukratis (Pfeiffer 2010). Amongst the competing claims at Naukratis, Milesian migrants may have aimed to imprint their version of its establishment, though whether this was the story told by Strabo or Theocritus' scholiast is impossible to say.¹⁹ The method in which these stories were remembered and confirmed is important and landmarks such as the river Nile and a place called "Milesian Teichos"²⁰ related to these events to provide ground proof of these stories veracity.

Certainly, there was a sense of competitiveness between different migrants at Naukratis (Villing 2017). We can observe an

19 Two texts titled *On Naukratis* are known to have circulated in antiquity, attributed to the local authors Philistos (Suda s.v. *Φίλιστος*) and Charon (Suda s.v. *Χάρων Ναυκρατίτης*), though very little is known of their contents of these works.

20 Pfeiffer (2010: 16-17), Drijvers (1999: 17) and Braun (1982: 38) suggest it was a mercenary settlement protecting the delta from piratical raids.

allusion to this aspects by Herodotus, who states that, apart from the initial ennearchy, other *poleis'* claims on the Hellenion are spurious (Hdt. 2.178). In this spirit of competition, we can envision Milesio-Naukratite foundation narratives as a case of immigrants indicating places intrinsically connected with them to demonstrate the importance of their community at Naukratis and their primacy above other Greek immigrants. While there is definitively identifiable Milesian pottery at Naukratis (Schlotzhauer & Villing 2006), only a single limestone grave stela, from among hundreds of inscriptions, attests to an individual identified as Milesian (Cairo JE 31183; Milne 1905, CG9241; see also Butz 2013). Use of the ethnic identifier "Milesian" seems to occur far more often in the divine, rather than the earthly sphere.

Apollo Milesios and Aphrodite at Naukratis

Excavation of the temenos of Apollo at Naukratis, conducted in the 1880's, uncovered some of the earliest ceramics at the site, leading researchers to place Apolline worship in the earliest epoch of the Greek settlement.²¹ Though, while temenos itself presented considerable dimensions, the first temple was relatively modest (Petrie 1886). The temenos and temple were assigned to Apollo by hundreds of inscriptions bearing the gods name uncovered in the vicinity (Petrie 1886: XXXII-XXXII; Villing 2006; Ehrhardt, Höckmann, Schlotzhauer 2006). A relevant observation, regarding the finds is the predominance of epiclesis "*Milesios*" for Apollo (Petrie 1886: 60-62), though in the first decades of settlement the dedications to Apollo did not include an epithet (Ehrhardt, Höckmann, Schlotzhauer 2006). At Miletos the two main epithets for Apollo were "*Delphinios*" and "*Didymeus*," the latter being present on a

21 Petrie (1888) dated the earliest temple to ca. 620, but cf. Boardman (1959) for the first half of the sixth century based on architectural remains. Astrid Möller (2000) suggests a date between 570-555 for the temple itself but rightly observes that pottery indicates Apollonine worship from the settlement's beginning.

single fragment from Naukratis (Petrie 1886: 61). Robert Parker (2003) has observed that the use of epithets in Greek religion performed two functions, firstly to illuminate a particular characteristic of the deity and secondly to identify and distinguish a specific earthly location of the cult. The fact that Milesian immigrants to Naukratis worshipped Apollo under this unique title demonstrates the importance they placed on both their origin and destination.²² Thus, attaching the name of the metropolis to their cult "served as [a] familiar landmark [...] in alien territory" (Villing 2017: 580), yet the absence of epithet at Miletos suggests that they were also distinguishing themselves from the metropolis (Ehrhardt, Höckmann, Schlotzhauer 2006: 169). The protection of youth and warriors seems to have been a significant facet of this cult and it has been suggested that the *kouroi* found in the vicinity were dedicated by Milesian mercenaries (Ehrhardt, Höckmann, Schlotzhauer 2006: 172-173). Feasts also constituted an important aspect of Apollonine cult at Naukratis in a form that is limited evidence at Miletos exists (Villing, 2006). This demonstrates the multiplicity of meanings that can be attached to the act of migration by agents who can conceptualise an identity that is simultaneously emigrant and immigrant, unique in both their community of origin and arrival.

In addition to Apollo, Aphrodite also seems to have played an important role in Milesian migration. The temple of Aphrodite, where some of the earliest Greek material at Naukratis was uncovered (Gardner 1888; Möller, 2000), may also have been a Milesian cult (Greaves 2004, 2010: 50). Sanctuaries to Aphrodite appear in a number of Milesian migrant settlements in the 6th century particularly in the Black Sea (Greaves 2004). The earliest, identified by fragments of an inscribed tile and dating to the first half of the 6th century, were at Istros on the western coast (Zimmerman 2000). An inscription to Aphrodite from the second quarter of the 6th

22 "*Milesios*" also appears on a bone tablet allegedly discovered at Berezan in the northern Black Sea (SEG 58.756).

century has also been identified at Kepoi on the Taman peninsula (Tsetskhladze & Kuznetsov 2000), whereas the island of (Kryzhitskii & Nazarov 2005), Nikonion in Crimea (Sekerskaya 2001), and Olbia on the river Bug (Dubois 1996; Rousayaeva 2010) may have constructed temples to the Goddess by the end of the 6th century at the latest. The Milesian community at Naukratis, by their worship of Apollo and Aphrodite, were aimed to create a new identity, not merely repurposing an existing one (Cf. Brettell 2015).

Another aspect of Milesian identity at Naukratis, albeit one shared by the whole community, is presented in the form of calendar (Ehrhardt 1988; Herda 2008).²³ We cannot necessarily assume that this indicates a Milesian origin for the community, only that Milesians were undoubtedly amongst the earliest immigrants (Bresson 2005; Osborne 2016). Milesian identity was practiced by numerous immigrants to Naukratis, mainly by foundation myths and cult in which they constituted an identity based on the *idea* of their emigrant community. Furthermore, this practice works as an affective internal structure, concurrently enhancing and re-imagining potential and actual migration. Milesian migrants repurposed aspects of cultural identity which then assumed new facets and distinctions relative to their conceived status as Milesio-Naukratites.

Few data is available about the practices of migrants at Abydos. Apollo nine worship is only testified by later evidence in the form of theophoric name Apolophanes provided by Herodotus and by imagery on fourth century coinage, despite this are originated some three centuries after the earliest coinage attributed to Abydos (Hdt. 6.62; Ehrhardt 1988). Abydeans also seem to have followed Milesian naming conventions and they used an Ionic alphabet similar to Miletos alphabet

(Jeffrey 1961; Ehrhardt 1988: 299ff).²⁴

It has also been suggested that the “South Ionia 3” pottery identified by archaeometric analysis, which was found in numerous Milesian settlements including Naukratis, was manufactured in or near Abydos (Ehrhardt, Höckmann, Schlotzhauer 2006: 166; Dupont 2008). If this is indeed the case, it testifies strong and continuous commercial ties between Milesian migrant communities from southern Russia to Egypt.

The importance placed upon Milesian identity, particularly at Naukratis and its use in internal and external aggrandisement demonstrates the way migrants create identities which surpass political boundaries. These migrants and their descendants formulated and disseminated narratives emphasising both their origin and role as *the* primordial migrants among many others, conceiving themselves as simultaneously Milesian and Naukratite, and even Greek and Egyptian.²⁵ This conception can also be observed in their daily religious practices, as a emphasis seems to have been placed upon the worship of Milesian Apollo, though different in form from practices of the emigrant community, whereas the worship of Aphrodite, such the dissemination of “South Ionia 3” pottery from Abydos, was used to create physical and mental connections beyond the emigrant community, associating the large network of other Milesian immigrant centres. The importance of conceiving these settlements as connected and a kind of cultural *koine* with the emigrant community at its heart seems to have become particularly important in later antiquity.

The afterlife of Milesian migration

We have spoken about Milesian migration throughout with the basic assumption that such

23 The Hadrianic foundation of Antinoupolis received its *nomima* from Naukratis and it used the Milesian calendar, thus, it is assumed that the same can be said of Naukratis.

24 In addition to Ehrhardt’s list, the name Daphnis is attested as a tyrant of Abydos (Hdt. 4.138) and in the Milesian *asymantai* list (Milet I (3) 122 I, 29).

25 See Vittmann (2003) for the suggestion that later generations might have begun to recognise themselves as Egyptians.

phenomenon can be perceived in archaeological and historical record. There is no doubt that Milesians did migrate and they were influenced, and themselves influenced with practice, the structures we have discussed in previous sections. But it is equally important to recognise that the inherently circular, though far from entropic, nature of migration practice theory, determines the outcomes of migration practice become in themselves new internal and external structures. In the long term, this process functioned to “create” Milesian migration long after the establishment of new migrant communities had ceased. Miletos, particularly in the Roman period, started to propagate an image of itself as a founding state *par excellence*, creating a kind of socio-cultural capital that other communities were eager to engage with.

In the literature of the first century CE, estimates on the number of cities founded by Milesians varied between 75 (Sen. *Helv.* 7.2) and 90 (Plin. *HN.* 5.112). Whereas modern scholars dispute these numbers,²⁶ we should not discount the significance of these claims. They testify to the role migration still played in Milesian conceptions of self-identity more than half a millennium after the city’s alleged golden age. Indeed, as late as the end of the third century CE we still find Miletos stylised as: “The first of the Ionians, founder and mother-city of a great many cities on the Pontus, in Egypt and many places across the inhabited world” (CIG 2878).²⁷

In the changed geo-political worlds of Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor, civic aggrandizement still played an important role in identity construction (Ma 2003). We may go further to argue that. For Miletos, migration became even more important as a source of civic pride than it had been in the Archaic period. Moreover, for other communities,

tapping into socio-political capital offered by the status of a Milesian *apoikia* received new vigour (Greaves 2007). Apollonia-on-the-Rhydacus presents an important case in point. In the second century, Apollonians sent an embassy to Miletos to enquire as whether their city could be identified as an *apoikia* of the Milesians. This event was commemorated in an inscription, found in the Delphionion, which reads:

By decree of the council, the demos and the archons we sent ambassadors to the Milesians to learn whether we were a Milesian foundation. The ambassadors were heard by the Milesians with all sincerity and they adjudged, having consulted the histories and other writings, that our city was indeed founded from there (Milet I.3; 155).²⁸

In reality, Apollonia-on-the-Rhyndacus was probably founded by the Attalid monarchy (Greaves 2010)²⁹ Yet, the events recorded in the inscription must have been credible at the time (Greaves 2002). This demonstrates two important points; firstly, the idea of the extent of Milesian migration was well known and accepted by the Hellenistic period thus performing claims to this status entirely plausible, and secondly that the establishment of this status was desirable both for alleged *apoikia* and for Miletos. Miletos’ status as the *metropolis* *par excellence*, provided a significant source of capital far beyond the time period in which Milesians were migrating in significant numbers.

28 See Greaves (2002).

29 Greaves (2007) raises an important question of the extent to which literary and epigraphic evidence for Milesian *apoikia* can be accepted at face value. The convergence of evidence categories such as calendars and cults used by modern scholars e.g. Bilabel (1920) and Ehrhardt (1988), to identify Milesian foundations predominantly are originated from post-Archaic contexts, but cf. Osbourne (2016: 25) who notes “The calendar of the person who led the settlers [...] would naturally impose itself, and future migrants might well prefer to join a city whose [...] institutions were familiar.”

26 Ehrhardt (1988) identifies 40 primary and 30 secondary settlements, while Bilabel (1920) identifies 45. More recently Tsetskhladze (2006) has tallied 35 Milesian settlements. The author of this paper, as part of his PhD research, has identified around 56 primary and secondary settlements pre-dating the Persian destruction of Miletos in 494.

27 See also *Milet* VI,3 1111.

Discussion

Throughout antiquity, Milesian self-conception was intrinsically tied to its emigration and immigration role; that is, it cultivated an identity as *the premier settling-state* of the ancient world, especially in the archaic period. The application of practice theory has allowed us to break down some of the facets involved in the creation of these migration identities, dispositions, and contexts; reconceptualising the myriad of competing and complimentary factors which undergirded mental and physical configurations of migration.

In the cases of Abydos and Naukratis, the combination of an Eastern Greek culture of mercenary service and concomitant need for mercenaries as a defensive and offensive force in the Troad and Egypt, facilitated paths of mobility between these areas and Greek communities of Western Anatolia. This fact brought initial settlers to Abydos, including some Milesians, and who sought to promote a Milesian identity. In Egypt the social and cultural paths forged by these mercenaries created and sustained the establishment of a Greek community at Naukratis which itself tapped into and underscored trade networks further facilitating the mobility of agents. Clearly, wider political and economic structures in a geo-political landscape dominated by supra-regional polities had an important role to play in establishing, negotiating, and perpetuating conditions with wide-ranging effects at micro-regional level, especially the creation of amenable conditions to movement and migration.

Milesians, in particular, were well placed to take advantage of the establishment and opening of these networks of mobility with their inculcated conception of themselves as a migrant people, formed by contemporary migration, migratory foundation narratives and potentially inscribed in the urban fabric of their community itself. These aspects were enhanced by the role of a daily cosmopolitanism mainly focusing on Egyptian aesthetics and placing an 'idea of Egypt' within the lives of Milesians. Overall, for archaic Milesians, migration was not merely one opportunity or risk-management strategy among many, but a preeminent course

of action inculcated as a natural condition of being Milesian, in other words it was inscribed in their self-conception through "experience, habit and socialization" (O'Reilly 2012: 26).

Within immigrant communities, practices – such as identification of deities with emigrant community and dissemination of foundation stories focusing on contributions to community formation – embedded forms of immigrant identity while simultaneously encompassing migrant's liminal position between two communities of practice. Furthermore, the outcomes of migration in medium- and long-term created new foci for communal and political interactions, adapting to changed external circumstances, and actualising long-term emigrant and immigrant community practices and identities.

Milesian, and more generally Greek, migration was predicated on and negotiated by a myriad of complimentary and competing factors. Careful mapping of these structures, practices, and outcomes has demonstrated the ways in which migration was managed and negotiated within minds, bodies, and actions of potential migrants. Emigration, for 7th and 6th century Milesians was no step into the 'heart of darkness,' but a behaviour rooted deep within their own communal identity and daily activities. Once that decision was taken, migrant could arrive within a community whose practices and identity formation welcomed them as both emigrant and immigrant, managing and negotiating the tension between the two and the uncertainty of the migrant's situation.

Conclusions

In sum, we can understand how exploring archaic Greek settlement and mobility through the lens of migration practice theory can overcome many of prejudices involved in colonialist approaches. The effect of Greek settlement and mobility on the course of subsequent regional histories cannot be underestimated, yet it is equally important that we do not reduce this phenomenon to a manifestation of an endogenous "Greek miracle." The Greeks migrated as much as any other groups have

throughout the course of human history. More important, we have demonstrated how a migration practice-based approach can redefine the roles of culture, identity, practices, and negotiated dispositions in structuring decision-making contexts for potential migrants. Considering the limitations of our evidence, by applying practice theory we can illuminate the complex frameworks of structure and agency that regulate, formulate, and inspire decision-making processes. In other words, with the analysis of social and group behaviours we can understand the mental configurations which enabled agents to practice mobility and migration.

This process undoubtedly had a great role in the conceptualisation and concretisation of distinctive practices which characterised groups practicing forms of Greek identity. Furthermore, the spread of these communities had a deep effect on the subsequent history of the Mediterranean and Black Sea regions. Whereas migration remains at the heart of discourses about movement and identity in the modern

era, the same can be said for antiquity. It is of paramount importance that we do not neglect this aspect of ancient experience by consigning it to a more reassuring metaphorical plain such as colonialism, but treat it as a dynamic social and psychological force which played an important role in the lives of ancient peoples.

Acknowledgments

Earlier versions of this paper were read at Lisbon and Edinburgh. I am grateful to the organisers and participants on those occasions for their useful comments and discussion. I would also like to express my gratitude to Alan Greaves for his invaluable input and Alexander Herda for sharing his insights into work at Delphinion. Finally, I would like to thank the anonymous reviewer at *Revista do Museu de Arqueologia e Etnologia* for their helpful suggestions which undoubtedly improved the final work. All remaining errors are, of course, mine.

KNIGHT, J. B. Teoria da Migração e Colonização Grega: Milésios em Naukratis e Abydos. *R. Museu Arq. Etn.*, 33: 45-65, 2019.

Resumo: Com a aplicação das abordagens teóricas pós-coloniais nas últimas décadas do século XX, o estudo do assentamento ultramarino grego arcaico chegou a um impasse terminológico e metodológico. Os estudiosos continuam a debater se os assentamentos do Mediterrâneo e do Mar Negro podem ser legitimamente denominados “colonização”, mas tentativas de modificar essa linguagem do imperialismo falharam até agora em alcançar uma alteração significativa dos paradigmas dominantes. Este artigo sugerirá uma nova abordagem para esses problemas usando a teoria da migração contemporânea para conceituar a mobilidade e assentamentos gregos arcaicos, por meio dos estudos de caso da migração de milésios para Náucratis no Egito e Abydos na Troada, durante o século VII. Com base nos aspectos da teoria da “structuration” e da teoria prática, este artigo procurará descrever e explicar as estruturas multifacetadas, práticas e agência envolvidas na migração dos gregos milésios para estas áreas. Os dois estudos de caso escolhidos serão comparados para compreender como os fatores espaciais, sociais, culturais e políticos podem ter impactado as características de Náucratis e Abydos e a multiplicidade de estímulos que cercam seu assentamento. Isso fornecerá maneiras de reavaliar um período importante da história do Mediterrâneo, oferecendo uma abordagem metodológica flexível para ser usada em outros contextos.

Palavras-chave: Migração; colonização grega; Mileto; Náucratis; Abydos.

Bibliographic References

- Antonaccio, C. 2003. Hybridity and the cultures within Greek culture. In: Dougherty, C.; Kurke, L. (Eds.) *The Cultures within Ancient Greek culture: contact, conflict, collaboration*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 57-74.
- Austin, M.M. 1970. *Greeks and Egypt in the Archaic Age*. Cambridge Philological Society, Cambridge.
- Bilabel, F. 1920. *Die Ionische Kolonisation: Untersuchungen über die Gründungen der Ionier, deren staatliche und kulturelle Organisation und Beziehungen zu den Mutterstädten*. Dieterich, Leipzig.
- Bourdieu, P. 1977. *Outline of a theory of practice*. Cambridge University Press, New York.
- Bowden, H. 1996. The Greek settlement and sanctuaries at Naukratis: Herodotus and archaeology. In: Hanson, M.; Raaflaub, K. (Eds.). *More studies in the ancient Greek polis*. Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart, 17-37.
- Braun, T.F.R.G. 1982. The Greeks in Egypt. In: Boardman, J.; Hammond, N.G.L. (Eds.). *The Cambridge Ancient History. Volume 3, Part 3: the expansion of the Greek world, Eighth to Sixth Centuries B.C.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 32-56.
- Bresson, A. 2005. Naukratis: de l'emporion à la cite. *Topoi* 12-13: 133-155.
- Brettell, C.B. 2015. Theorizing migration in anthropology: the cultural, social, and phenomenological dimensions of movement. In: Brettell, C.B.; Hollifield, J.F. (Eds.). *Migration theory: talking across disciplines*. Routledge, New York, 148-197.
- Brettell, C.B.; Hollifield, J.F. 2015. Introduction. In: Brettell, C.B.; Hollifield, J.F. (Eds.). *Migration theory: talking across disciplines*. Routledge, New York, 1-36.
- Bridgman, T. 1998. Who were the Cimmerians? *Hermathena* 164: 31-64.
- Brückner, H. et al. 2006. From archipelago to floodplain – geographical and ecological changes in Miletus and its environs during the last six millennia (Western Anatolia, Turkey). *Zeitschrift für Geomorphologie N.F. Supplement* 142: 63-83.
- Burstein, S.M. 2009. Hecataeus of Miletos: the Greek encounter with Egypt. *Ancient West and East* 8: 133-146.
- Butz, P.A. 2013. The memorial of Metrodorus: Greek Stoichedon from North Africa. *Abgadiyat* 8: 110-121.
- Buxton, A.H. 2002. *Lydian Royal Dedications in Greek Sanctuaries*. PhD Thesis. University of California, Berkeley.
- Chaniotis, A. 2010. The Molpoi inscription: ritual prescription or riddle? *Kernos* 23: 375-379.
- Cogan, M. 2014. The author of Assurbanipal Prism A (Rassam): an inquiry into his plan and purpose, with a note on his persona. *Oriens* 49: 69-83.
- Cogan, M.; Tadmor, H. 1977. Gyges and Assurbanipal: a study in literary transmission. *Orientalia* 46: 65-85.
- Colburn, H. 2018. Contact points: Memphis, Naukratis, and the Greek East. In: Spier, J.; Potts, T.; Cole, S.E. (Eds.). *Beyond the Nile: Egypt and the Classical World*. Getty Publications, Los Angeles, 84-90.
- Cook, R.M.; Dupont, P. 1998. *East Greek Pottery*. Routledge, London.
- De Angelis, F.D. 2010. Ancient Greek colonization in the 21st century: some suggested directions. *Bollettino di Archeologia Online* 1: 18-30.

- de Boer, J. 2006. The Cimmerian invasions in Anatolia and the earliest Greek colonies in the Black Sea area. *Eirene* 42: 43-55.
- Demetriou, D. 2012. *Negotiating identity in the Ancient Mediterranean: the archaic and classical Greek multiethnic emporia*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Dietler, M. 2010. *Archaeologies of colonialism: consumption, entanglement, and violence in Ancient Mediterranean France*. University of California Press, Berkeley.
- Dougherty, C. 1993. *The poetics of colonization: from city to text in Archaic Greece*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Drijvers, J. 1999. Strabo 17.1.18 (801C): Inaros, the Milesians and Naukratis. *Mnemosyne* 52: 16-22.
- Dubois, L. 1996. *Inscriptions grecques dialectales: D'Olbis du pont*. Librairie Droz, Geneva.
- Dupont, P. 2008. « Ionie du Sud 3 » Un centre producteur des confins de la Grèce de l'Est et du Pont-Euxin? *Ancient Civilisations from Scythia to Siberia* 14: 1-24.
- Ehrhardt, N. 1988. *Milet und seine Kolonien*. Verlag Peter Lang GmbH, Frankfurt am Main.
- Ehrhardt, N., Höckmann, U. & Schlotzhauer, U. 2006. Weihungen an Apollon Didymeus und Apollon Milesios in Naukratis. In: Villing, A.; Schlotzhauer, U. (Eds.). *Naukratis: Greek diversity in Egypt: studies on East Greek pottery and exchange in the eastern Mediterranean*. The British Museum Press, London, 163-182.
- Fantalkin, A. 2014. Naukratis as a contact zone: revealing the Lydian connection. In: Rollinger, R.; Schnegg, K. (Eds.). *Kulturkontakte in Antiken Welten*. Peeters, Leuven, 27-51.
- Faraone, C.A. 2018. Seaside altars of Apollo Delphinios, embedded hymns, and the tripartite structure of the homeric hymn to Apollo. *Greece and Rome* 65: 15-33.
- Finley, M.I. 1976. Colonies: an attempt at a typology. *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 26: 167-188.
- Gardner, E.A. 1888. *Naukratis, Part II: 1885-6*. Trubner, London.
- Giddens, A. 1984. *The Constitution of society: outline of the theory of structuration*. University of California Press, Berkeley.
- Gorman, V. 2001. *Miletos, the ornament of ionia: a history of the city to 400 B.C.E.* The University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor.
- Greaves, A.M. 2002. *Miletos: a history*. Routledge, London.
- Greaves, A.M. 2004. The cult of Aphrodite in Miletos and its colonies. *Anatolian Studies* 54: 27-33.
- Greaves, A.M. 2007. Milesians in the Black Sea: trade, settlement and religion. In: Gabrielsen, V.; Lund, J. (Eds.). *The Black Sea in antiquity: regional and interregional economic exchanges*. Aarhus University Press, Aarhus, 9-21.
- Greaves, A.M. 2010. *The land of ionia: society and economy in the archaic period*. Wiley-Blackwell, Oxford.
- Greaves, A.M. 2019. 'Greek' colonization: the view from Ionia. In: Lucas, J.; Murray, C.A.; Owen, S. (Eds.). *Greek colonization in local contexts: case studies in colonial interactions*. University of Cambridge Press, Cambridge, 229-241.
- Hall, J.M. 1997. *Ethnic identity in Greek antiquity*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Hall, J.M. 2008. Foundation Stories. In: Tsetshladze, G.R. (Ed.). *Greek colonisation: an account of Greek colonies and other settlements overseas*. Leiden, Brill, 383-426.
- Hall, J.M. 2014. *A History of the Archaic Greek World: ca. 1200-479 BCE*. Wiley-Blackwell, Oxford.

- Hansen, M.H.; Nielson, T.H. 2004. *An inventory of archaic and classical poleis*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Harzig, C.; Hoerder, D. 2009. *What is migration history?* Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Held, W. 2000. *Das Heiligtum der Athena in Milet*. Verlag Philipp von Zabern, Mainz.
- Herda, A. 2005. Apollon Delphinios, das Prytaneion und die Agora von Milet: Neue Forschungen. *Archäologischer Anzeiger* 1: 243-294.
- Herda, A. 2006. *Der Apollon-Delphinios-Kult in Milet und die Neujahrsprozession nach Didyma. Ein neuer Kommentar der sog. Molpoi-Satzung*. Verlag Phillip von Zabern, Mainz.
- Herda, A. 2008. Apollon Delphinios – Apollon Didymeus: Zwei Gesichter einesmilesischen Gottes und ihr Bezug zur Kolonisation Milets in archaischer Zeit. In: Bol, R.; Höckmann, U.; Schollmeyer, P. (Eds.). *Kult(ur)kontakte Apollon in Milet/Didyma, Histria, Myus, Naukratis und auf Zypern*. Verlag Marie Leidorf, Rahden, 13-75.
- Herda, A. 2011. How to run a state cult: the organisation of the cult of Apollo Delphinios in Miletos. In: M. Haysom & J. Wallensten (Eds.) *Current Approaches to Religion in Ancient Greece*. Swedish Institute at Athens, Stockholm, 57-93.
- Herda, A. 2016. Megara and Miletos: colonising with Apollo: a structural comparison of religious and political institutions in two Archaic Greek Polis States. In: Robu, A.; Bîrzescu, I. (Eds.). *Mégarika: Nouvelles recherches sur Mégare et les cites de la Propontide et du Pont-Euxin: archeologie, épigraphie, Histoire*. Éditions de Boccard, Paris, 15-127.
- Herda, A. 2019. Copy and paste? Miletos before and after the Persian Wars. In: Capet, E. et al. (Eds.). *Reconstruire les villes: modes, motifs et récits*. Turnhout, Brepols, 91-120.
- Hodos, T. 2006. *Local responses to colonization in the Iron Age Mediterranean*. Routledge, London.
- Hölbl, G. 1999. Funde aus Milet VIII: Die Aegyptiaca vom Aphroditetempel auf dem Zeytintepe. *Archäologischer Anzeiger* 114: 345-371.
- Hurst, H.; Owen, S. 2005. *Ancient colonizations: analogy, similarity & difference*. Duckworth, London.
- Iancu, L.M. 2016. Greek and other aegean mercenaries in the Archaic Age: aristocrats, common people, or both? *Studia Hercynia* 20: 9-39.
- Ivantchik, A. 1993. *Les Cimmériens au Proche-Orient*. Editions Universitaires, Fribourg.
- Jeffrey, L. 1961. *The local scripts of Archaic Greece*. Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- Kalir, B. 2005. The development of a migratory disposition: explaining a “new emigration”. *International Migration* 43: 167-196.
- Kaplan, P. 2003. Cross-cultural Contacts among Mercenary Communities in Saïte and Persian Egypt. *Mediterranean Historical Review* 18: 1-31.
- King, R. 2012. *Theories and typologies of migration: an overview and a primer*. Malmö Institute for Studies of Migration, Diversity and Welfare, Malmö.
- Kryzhitskii, S.D.; Nazarov, V.V. 2005. The Temple of Aphrodite on the Island of Berezan. *Mouseion* 5: 261-285.
- Loukopoulou, L.D. 1989. *Contribution a l'histoire de la Thrace Propontique*. Diffusion de Boccard, Athens.
- Luckenbill, D.D. 1927. *Ancient records of Assyria and Babylonia*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Luraghi, N. 2006. Traders, pirates, warriors: the proto-history of Greek mercenary soldiers in the Eastern Mediterranean. *Phoenix* 60: 21-47.
- Ma, J. 2003. Peer polity interaction in the Hellenistic Age. *Past & Present* 180: 9-39.

- Mac Sweeney, N. 2013. *Foundation myths and politics in ancient Ionia*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Malkin, I. 2011. *A Small Greek world: Networks in the Ancient Mediterranean*. Oxford University Press, New York.
- Malkin, I. 2016a. Greek Colonisation: The Right to Return. In: Donnellan, L.; Nizzo, V.; Burgers, G.J. (Eds.). *Conceptualising early colonization*. Belgisch historisch Instituut de Rome, Bruxelles, 27-50.
- Malkin, I. 2016b. Migration and Colonization. Turbulence, continuity and the Practice of Mediterranean Space (11th to 5th centuries). In: Dabag, M. et al. (Eds.) *New Horizons: Mediterranean Research in the 21st century*. Ferdinand Schöningh, Paderborn, 285-307.
- Milne, J. 1905. *Greek inscriptions : catalogue général des antiquités égyptiennes du Musée du Caire*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Mitchell, S. 2004. Troas. In: Hansen, M.H.; Neilson, T.H. (Eds.). *An inventory of archaic and classical poleis*. Oxford University, Oxford, 1000-1017.
- Möller, A. 2000. *Naukratis: trade in Archaic Greece*. Oxford University, Oxford.
- Morawska, E. 2009. *A sociology of immigration (re)making multifaceted America*. Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke.
- Müller, C. 2013. Mobility and belonging in antiquity: Greeks and Barbarians on the move in the Northern Black Sea Region. In: Bosma, U.; Kessler, E.; Lucassen, L. (Eds.). *Migration and membership regimes in global and historical perspective: an introduction*. Brill, Leiden, 23-50.
- Müller, S. 2013. Away from home: Ancient Greek colonization seen as a migratory process. *Mediterranean Review* 6: 33-57.
- Niemeier, W.D. 2001. Archaic Greeks in the orient: textual and archaeological evidence. *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 322: 11-32.
- O'Reilly, K. 2012. *International migration and social theory*. Palgrave Macmillan, New York.
- Osborne, R. 1996. *Greece in the making 1200-479 BC*. Routledge, London.
- Osborne, R. 1998. Early Greek colonization? The nature of Greek settlement in the West. In: Fisher, N.; van Wees, H. (Eds.). *Archaic Greece: new approaches and new evidence*. Classical Press of Wales, Swansea, 251-270.
- Osborne, R. 2016. Greek 'colonisation': what was, and what is, at stake? In: Donnellan, L.; Nizzo, V.; Burgers, G.J. (Eds.). *Conceptualising early colonization*. Belgisch historisch Instituut de Rome, Bruxelles, 21-26.
- Pantaleon, I.A.; Senff, R. 2008. Die Grabung im Aphroditeheiligtum auf dem Zeytintepe bei Milet in den Jahren 2003–2005. *Archäologischer Anzeiger* 2: 33-46.
- Parker, R. 2003. The problem of the Greek cult epithet. *Opuscula Atheniesia* 28: 173-183.
- Parker, R. 2008. Review: the Molpoi. *The Classical Review* 58: 178-180.
- Perdu, O. 2010. Saïtes and Persians (664–332). In: Lloyd, A. (Ed.). *A companion to Ancient Egypt*. Blackwell, Oxford, 140-158.
- Pernicka, E. et al. 2003. Early bronze age metallurgy in the Northeast Aegean. In: Wagner, G. A.; Pernicka, E.; Uerpmann, H. (Eds.). *Troia and the troad. scientific approaches*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 143-172.
- Petrie, W.M.F. 1886. *Naukratis: Part I.: 1884-5*. Trubner, London.
- Pfeiffer, S. 2010. Naukratis, Heracleion-Thonis and Alexandria: Remarks on the Presence and Trade Activities of Greeks in the North-West Delta from the Seventh Century BC to the End of the Fourth Century BC. In: Robinson, D.; Wilson, A. (Eds.). *Alexandria and the North-Western Delta: joint conference proceedings of Alexandria: city*

- and harbour (Oxford 2004) and, *The trade and topography of Egypt's North-Western Delta, 8th century BC to 8th century AD* (Berlin 2006). Oxford Centre for Maritime Archaeology, Oxford, 15-24.
- Purcell, N. 2005. Colonization and Mediterranean history. In: Hurst, H.; Owen, S. (Eds.). *Ancient colonizations: analogy, similarity and difference*. Duckworth, London, 115-139.
- Redon, B. 2012. L'identité grecque de Naukratis. Enquête sur la fabrication de la mémoire d'une cité grecque d'Égypte aux époques hellénistique et romaine. *REG* 125: 55-93.
- Roebuck, C. 1951. The organisation of Naukratis. *Classical Philology* 46: 212-220.
- Roosevelt, C. 2009. *The archaeology of Lydia: from Gyges to Alexander*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Rousayeva, A. 2010. Sanctuaries in the context of the cultural and historical development of Olbia Pontica. In: Petropoulos, E.K.; Maslennikov, A.A. (Eds.). *Ancient Sacral Monuments in the Black Sea*. Kyriakidis Brothers, Thessaloniki, 63-92.
- Schlotzhauer, U.; Villing, A. 2006. East Greek pottery from Naukratis: the current state of research. In: Villing, A.; Schlotzhauer, U. (Eds.). *Naukratis: Greek diversity in Egypt: studies on East Greek pottery and exchange in the eastern Mediterranean*. The British Museum Press, London, 53-68.
- Sekerskaya, N.M. 2001. Nikonion. In: Tsetskhladze, G.R. (Ed.). *North Pontic archaeology: recent studies and discoveries*. Brill, Leiden, 67-90.
- Senff, R. 2003a. Das Aphroditeheiligtum von Milet. *Asia Minor Studien* 49: 11-25.
- Senff, R. 2003b. Form and function of sanctuaries in Archaic Miletos. *Revue Des Etudes Anciennes* 108: 159-172.
- Slawisch, A. 2009. Epigraphy versus archaeology: conflicting evidence for cult continuity in Ionia during the fifth century BC. In: Gates, C.; Morin, J.; Zimmerman, T. (Eds.). *Sacred landscapes in anatolia and neighboring regions*. Archaeopress, Oxford, 29-34.
- Spalinger, A.J. 1976. Psammetichus, King of Egypt: 1. *Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt* 13: 133-147.
- Spalinger, A.J. 1978. The date of the death of Gyges and its historical implication. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 98: 400-409.
- Tsetskhladze, G.R. 2006. Introduction: revisiting Ancient Greek colonisation. In: Tsetskhladze, G.R. (Ed.). *Greek colonisation: an account of Greek colonies and other settlements overseas*. Leiden, Brill, I-LXXXIII.
- Tsetskhladze, G.R.; Kuzentsov, V.D. 2000. On the cult of Aphrodite in Kepoi. In: Tsetskhladze, G.R.; Prag, A.J.N.W.; Snodgrass, A. M. (Eds.). *Periplous: papers on classical art and archaeology presented to Sir John Boardman*. Thames & Hudson, London, 353-360.
- van Dommelen, P. 2012. Colonialism and migration in the Ancient Mediterranean. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 41:393-409.
- Villing, A. 2006. 'Drab Bowls' for Apollo: the Mortaria of Naukratis and exchange in the archaic Eastern Mediterranean. In: Villing, A.; Schlotzhauer, U. (Eds.). *Naukratis: Greek diversity in Egypt: studies on East Greek pottery and exchange in the eastern Mediterranean*. The British Museum Press, London, 31-46.
- Villing, A. 2017. Greece and Egypt: reconsidering early contact and exchange. In: Mazarakis Ainian, A.; Alexandridou, A.; Charalambidou, X. (Eds.). *Regional stories towards a new perception of the early Greek world*. University of Thessaly Press, Volos, 563-596.
- Vittmann, G. 2003. *Ägypten und die Fremden im ersten vorchristlichen Jahrtausend*. Verlag Phillip von Zabern, Mainz.

Wenger, E. 1998. *Communities of practice: learning, meaning, and identity*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Whitley, J. 2001. *The archaeology of Ancient Greece*. University of Cambridge Press, Cambridge.

Zimmerman, K. 2000. Αφροδιτιάνθηκιν... Zu einem Dachziegel mit Votivinschrift. In: Avram,

A.; Babeş, M. (Eds.). *Civilisation grecque et cultures antiques périphériques: Hommage à Petre Alexandrescu à son 70e anniversaire*. Editura Enciclopedica, Bucharest, 239-251.

Zuchtriegel, G. 2018. *Colonization and subalternity in Classical Greece: experience of the nonelite population*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.