an important area of research into medieval Greece – art and material culture – which has not always received the attention it deserves. It is a valuable contribution to the historiography on this area.

MIKE CARR,
UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH
Mike.Carr@ed.ac.uk

MULTIPERIOD

Krzysztof Nawotka, *The Nourisher of Apollo*. pp. 294, 1 graph, 2 maps, 1 table. Wiesbaden: Harassowitz Verlag, 2023. ISBN 978-3-447-12021-0, paperback 68 Euros.

The polis Miletos, praised by Herodot (V 28,1) as the "ornament of Ionia", is especially acknowledged for its political role in Archaic times. In this period, it is known as the founder of numerous colonies along the coasts of the Black Sea area, as well as the birthplace of Ionian philosophy ("Ionian Enlightenment"). It was a centre of extensive art and craft production and home of the renowned sanctuary of Apollo and his oracle at Didyma. The period of prosperity came to a harsh end when, in 494 BCE, Miletos and its territory were devastated by the Persians to put an end to the Ionian revolt – and this is where research on Miletos usually fades out. In over 100 years, the post-Archaic phases of Miletos have been the subject of only selective studies.[1] Systematic excavation programmes focusing on the later phases and the long-term development of the settlement have only recently begun.[2] Indeed, the imbalance of research in favour of the Archaic (and to a lesser extent Bronze Age) city and its history has led to a "need for a history of Miletos" (p. 1). Krzysztof Nawotka has now filled this gap of a comprehensive monograph on Miletos and Didyma in the Classical, Hellenistic and Roman periods with his book "The Nourisher of Apollo. Miletos from Xerxes to Diocletian". The author is professor of Ancient History at the University of Wrocław and one of the leading historians of ancient Miletos. He

[1] In the historical overviews of Gorman 2001 or Kobylina 1965 the post-Archaic periods are treated very briefly. There are a number of articles discussing the socio-political events of the post-Archaic polis, but no monograph that gives a comprehensive picture (cf. Kinns 1986, 247). In archaeology, there have been individual studies of monumental buildings or specific groups of objects, but no comprehensive studies either. An exception is the unpublished habilitation thesis by A. Slawisch (Slawisch 2017) on Ionia in the 5th century BCE. For a brief summary see Slawisch 2022. A detailed bibliography according to topics and periods can be accessed at: https://www.academia.edu/39222651/Bibliographie_Milet_thematisch.

[2] From 2013 to 2016 the Byzantine phases were researched under the direction of Ph. Niewöhner (DAI, Zentrale Berlin), and since 2017 the excavations have been carried out under the direction of Ch. Berns (University of Hamburg) in cooperation with J. Zurbach (ENS, Paris), focusing in particular on the settlement development beyond the central public spaces in a long-term perspective from the Late Bronze Age to the end of the Roman Imperial Period, see https://www.miletgrabung.uni-hamburg.de/projekte/projektliste/megamil.html (access: 05 June 2024).

has published many books and articles especially on the Hellenistic city and the "Nourisher of Apollo" can be regarded as a synthesis of his longstanding engagement with the Ionian polis.

The book is divided into six chapters. The first three are arranged chronologically according to the historical events of the Classical (Chapter I), Hellenistic (Chapter II) and Roman (Chapter III) times. Here, Nawotka is concerned not only with outlining the historical narrative, but also with identifying the aims of Milesian foreign policy and its relations with other Greek poleis and political alliances, as well as analysing the dynamics of the internal constitutional order. The following chapters are devoted to the social topics of the economy and population (Chapter IV), rivalry and identity (Chapter V) and the religious and administrative structures of the sanctuary of Apollo at Didyma (Chapter VI). The extensive bibliography and the appendix with indexes of cited inscriptions and sources as well as place names, personal names and general terms are extremely helpful. A chronological table of the main events would also have been useful, given the long period covered. The two maps are unfortunately too coarse, and M. Müllenhoff and H. Brückner should have been credited as the original authors. With the exception of a few missing references or incorrect publication dates, the book has been well edited and is also available in open access (https://www.harrassowitz-verlag.de/titel_7217.ahtml).

As a historian, Nawotka of course concentrates mainly on written sources, especially the numerous inscriptions from Miletos and Didyma. Citations are given in Greek or Latin, with an English translation for the former. The written evidence leads to the focus on the Milesian elite. Nawotka is interested in the social upper class and the prominent citizens of the city who controlled and directed political decisions, not the reality of the city's entire population (p. 2). He therefore highlights the top officials and career options in Miletos and Didyma as well as the biographies of famous citizens (e.g. Eudemos pp. 93–95, Epicrates pp. 108–112; Capito pp. 119–122). A stimulating and productive approach is the quantitative analysis of the inscriptions ("epigraphic curve"), linking them with political events and constitutional transformation (cf. pp. 36–39, Fig. 1, also pp. 16. 114. 118).[3] Although the author reveals a hierarchical understanding between written and material sources, according to which "human history is best studied on the basis of writings", which is why "this book goes far beyond archaeological evidence" (p. 2), he nevertheless includes regularly the results of archaeological work in Miletos and Didyma. Thanks to his many years of intensive research on the two sites, the author is familiar with a large number of discourses in great detail. In particular, when discussing economic performance and prosperity, he refers to topography, architectural programs and find assemblages. Occasionally these datasets are even used as a corrective to the literary tradition. Nawotka deals with the entire territory of the city, including its terrestrial and island chora, and also takes into account the dynamics of the natural environment (the sedimentation processes of the Meander delta). Overall, the book's approach is rather traditional, and the author is very sceptical about theoretical models (e.g. social network analysis, see p. 5). But in view of the main objective of providing an account of the history of political events, it is appropriate to analyse the sources in the conventional linear chronological order and Nawotka impressively combines very different sets of data into a coherent narrative.

The chronological entry into the history of Miletos in the early 5th century BCE, i.e. the end of the Ionian Revolt, is a very reasonable choice, given the profound disruption caused by the Persian destruction and in light of the central role previously attributed to the Archaic period in research. The chronological end of the study with the reign of Diocletian is congruent with the disappearance of major sources of imperial elite communication (see p. 147) and the reorganisation of the provincial administration. The argument, set out in the introduction (p. 3–4), that a new elite settled in the city with the advent of Christianity at the beginning of the 5th century CE sheds further light on the transition from antiquity to the early Byzantine period, although the 4th century is not discussed in detail in this book. In fact, the title "The Nourisher of Apollo" goes back to one of the last Milesian *tituli honorarii* from the 4th century CE. The phrase describes the role of the Milesian authorities as providers of the great sanctuary of Apollo at Didyma (cf. pp. 149. 186). Nawotka thus emphasises that he is striving for a history that links the polis of Miletos with its extra-urban sanctuary. This is particularly worthwhile as the administrative separation of the archaeological missions at Miletos and Didyma since the end of the 19th century has led to largely independent research. Consequently, right at the beginning (p. 2) Nawotka puts forward the hypothesis that the main factor "for the international position of Miletos"

[3] For example, a high number of public decrees speaks in favour of democratic legislation, while a low number speaks in favour of an oligarchic regime. In detail Nawotka 2020a & 2020b.

was not the export-oriented economy, but the great sanctuary of Apollo at Didyma "as the unique assets of Miletos in its dialogue with Hellenistic kings and Roman emperors".

Chapter I deals with the period after the Persian destruction until the age of Alexander the Great and discusses the changing positions of Miletos in the field of opposing forces between the Persian Empire, Athens and Sparta. The starting point is the extent and consequences of the Persian destruction of 494 BCE, one of the most debated aspects of the history of Miletos. Nawotka outlines the archaeological evidence for the destruction and burning of the city and the sanctuary in Didyma. The sanctuary of Apollo Didymeus was not seriously damaged. However, it lost much of its importance and even its function as an oracle for about 150 years due to the deportation of the Branchidai (pp. 16–17. 190). The situation is quite different at Miletos itself, where several layers with traces of fire have been excavated. These are generally associated with the Persian destruction (p. 10). The archaeological record is, however, much more complex: For example, the re-evaluation of the finds from an ashy layer of black earth excavated at the site of the later Heroon III, changed the interpretation of the deposit from "Perserschutt" to the remains of a prehistoric settlement.[4] These observations confirm the pieces of written sources (Herodotus, Diodorus and Pausanias) to which Nawotka refers in his argument against the complete destruction of the city. Instead, Miletos was not completely depopulated, as the famous quote from Herodotus VI 22.1 "Miletos then was left empty of Milesians" claims (pp. 10–11). Nawotka therefore rightly rejects the theory that Miletos was formally re-founded after 479 BCE (battle at Mykale Mountain), and refers to the unbroken list of *stephanephoroi* from the period between 525/4 and 314/3 BCE (p. 15).[5] A. Herda's objection that this was a retrospective forgery[6] is dismissed by Nawotka. In line with the general opinion, he concludes that the rebuilding of the polis would have begun only after the liberation of the city in 479 BCE and hardly before the middle of the 5th century. He underlines this with the hiatus in the epigraphic record. Only the new temple of Athena was "the only monumental temple constructed in the fifth c. BCE in Miletos and in all of Ionia" (p. 22; see also p. 10 with notes 6 & 7). Nawotka thus agrees with an outdated hypothesis expressed by Mallwitz and Held that the new temple of Athena was built only after the battle at Mykale Mountain, as part of the reconstruction of the city.[7] Stratigraphic and typological arguments, however, tend to favour the construction of the second temple of Athena in the late Archaic period, i.e. before the Persian devastation.[8] Nawotka's aim here is to show the economic stagnation of Miletos and Didyma in the 5th century BCE, which is reflected in the lack of construction activity, the absence of inscriptions, the medium-rate tribute payments to Athens (ATL) and the low occurrence of Milesian coins in the hoards found in the region. Against this background, the financing of a major building project seems all the more questionable,[9] and the dating of the second temple of Athena to the time before the Persian destruction even supports Nawotka's line of argument. In Chapter IV, pp. 152–153, Nawotka again considers the economic situation after the Persians' devastation. But there his assessment is less pessimistic and he ranks Miletos as an "important mid-size" polis if the tribute obligations in the Delian League reflect the actual size of local economies.

For the 4th century BCE the relationship between Miletos and the Carian Hecatomnid satrapy, which has been controversially debated, is discussed rather briefly (pp. 34–36). Whether Miletos was ruled by the Hecatomnids or whether they merely maintained good relations depends largely on the interpretation of the numismatic evidence.[10] Nawotka interprets the silver coins minted according to the (slightly reduced) Milesian standard, which combine the Milesian lion's head with the legend ΕΚΑ(τόμνως) and ΜΑ(ύσωλλος), as a Hecatomnid production. However, these so-called συμμαχικοῦ δραχμαί (a term known from inscriptions at Didyma (see note 241), should not be understood as imitations, since they were only in local circulation, but as ideological counterbalances. Yet it remains unclear what this means in practice. In any case, Nawotka interprets these coins as a formal alliance between the Hecatomnid satraps and Miletus, confirming Hecatomnid rule over Miletus.[11] Subsequently, the democratic constitution was replaced by an oligarchic regime, as evidenced by the extremely

[4] Parzinger 1989, 416. For a summary of the discussion see Slawisch 2017, 84–85. Also the ongoing excavations at Miletos have led to the re-evaluation of the assumed Persian destruction layer and demonstrated the continuity of the settlement beyond the early 5th century BCE (directors: Ch. Berns, University of Hamburg and J. Zurbach, ENS Paris; not yet published).

[5] Contra, see p. 190, where he speaks of Miletos refounded in 479 BCE.

[6] Herda 2019, 96.

[7] Mallwitz 1968, 122; Held 2000, 29. 73–75. 182.

[8] See Grüner & Hennemeyer 2001, 552–553; recently debated, comparing the arguments of the different sides: Slawisch 2017, 87–90.

[9] Likewise, Slawisch 2017, 89 note 208.

[10] He follows Marcellesi's argument: Discussion summarised by Marcellesi 2004, 45–47; recently Dündar 2021, 139–143.

[11] Cf. Marcellesi 2004, 46–47.

small number of decrees from the 2nd quarter of the 4th century BCE that have survived in inscriptions (p. 36).

Nawotka then explores the ambivalent relationship between Miletos and Alexander the Great (pp. 37–47). The resistance of the polis to the Macedonian army did not lead to the renewed destruction of Miletos simply because of its symbolic significance, and Nawotka argues persuasively against the view that the Milesians were obliged to pay tribute (p. 41). One of the major issues of the newly democratic polis (p. 42) was the reviving of the oracle in Didyma, that had been left inactive since the Persian devastation of the early 5th century. Based on Kallisthenes' report of a Milesian embassy to Alexander while he was in Egypt, Nawotka reconstructs its reactivation in 331 BCE. The Milesians may have hoped to gain Alexander's support for the rebuilding of the sanctuary of Apollo. These attempts failed, however, just as Miletos failed to institutionalise a cult for Alexander.

In Chapter II on the Hellenistic period, Nawotka portrays Miletos as an "active player" in the power game with the Hellenistic royal states and other neighbours, following its own political ambitions (p. 49). This is particularly evident in the presentation of the diplomatic activities of prominent Milesians, who skilfully represented the political interests of their polis on the global stage between the monarchies and the rising power of Rome (pp. 56–76). As the central currency of diplomacy, the acquisition of privileges and euergetic gestures were at the forefront of relations with the royal territorial states, especially until the middle of the 2nd century. Combining literary, epigraphic and archaeological data, Nawotka develops a broad panorama of urban diplomacy. In particular, the close ties between Miletos and the Seleucids, established from the early 3rd century BCE, are expressed in numerous privileges and donations – not least in the promotion of Milesian elites at the royal court. Nawotka outlines how the Milesian Demodamas firmly anchored Apollo Didymeus and his oracular sanctuary in the Seleucid ideology. The benefits from the Seleucids were therefore not a compensation for Persian aggression in earlier centuries,[12] but rather the result of an active foreign policy that established Miletos' international position through an invented kinship between Seleukos I and his divine father Apollo Didymeus, and made it a "pioneer of the dialogue between Greek poleis and Hellenistic kings" (p. 57–60). The various benefactions in Miletos and Didyma give a good idea of the range and internationality of the agents involved.[13] The first part of Chapter II thus clearly shows that it was the internationally recognised sanctuary of Apollo at Didyma that shaped the Milesians' relations with foreign powers. This is underlined in the presentation of the Didymeia in Chapter VI.4, which were upgraded to Panhellenic Games in the late 3rd century BCE (pp. 206–208).

In the second part of Chapter II, Nawotka examines in detail the structure of the democratic order in Miletos and discusses its relations with other Greek poleis. Again, by combining written and material sources, he creates a nuanced image of the relations marked by rivalry and war. He foregrounds both *isopoliteia* with friendly poleis as well as aggressive claims and strategies to expand one's own chora (see, for example, the so-called alluvial wars and the settlement of Cretan mercenaries to protect the Milesian chora). The Milesian policy of establishing a network of "friendly cities" (p. 83) with local neighbours as well as distant former colonies again emphasises Miletos' ambition to play a leading international role. In Nawotka's view, ideology was an even more important motivation for the – partly invented – 'city kinships' than the strengthening of the local economy (e.g. through tax exemptions in trade with Olbia) and their own protection (e.g. from Cretan pirates). He further argues that the close relationship with Athens, which manifested itself in a large-scale migration in the late Hellenistic and early Imperial periods, was only conceivable in the context of an *isopolitia* treaty guaranteeing the legal status of Milesians moving to Athens. The reasons for the numerous emigrants remain unclear, but Nawotka rightly points out that the hypothesis of an economic decline of Miletos in the Hellenistic period is not acceptable in view of the flourishing trade contacts, intensive building projects and chora farming (p. 97).

A major turning point was the siding with Mithridates VI in the 1st Mithridatic War, which was punished by Rome with the temporary loss of foreign policy independence and control over Didyma (Chapter III). The subsequent period of the 1st century BCE is often characterised by economic recession. However, by referring to the restoration of the Didyma games in 63 BCE, the high number of inscriptions and the unproblematic recruitment of the local elite for the *stephanephoria*, Nawotka

[12] Cf. Marcellesi 2004, 169.

[13] The gymnasium, sponsored by the Pergamenian King Eumenes II, is misidentified on map 1, no. 6, and must refer to the architectural structures to the west of the stadium. A newly created, interactive map is available on: https://geoserver.dainst.org/catalogue/#/map/5764

dismisses the economic collapse in Miletos in the post-Sullan age (p. 107).

In the imperial period Miletos played a subordinate role to Ephesos and Pergamon (cf. Chapter V.5). Anyway, as Nawotka demonstrates, Didyma remained a major asset of Milesian politics. The euergetic sponsorship of ambitious Italic businessmen (notably Cn. Vergilius Capito) as well as the generosity of emperors led to extensive building and statue programmes and the expansion of the Didyma games (pp. 119–121; 137–139). The emperors' attention was attracted by the venerability of the polis of Miletos and the international significance of its oracle sanctuary. The top magistracies in Miletos (*stephanephoros*) and Didyma (*prophetes*) were adopted several times by emperors. Noteworthy benefactions are the paving of the Sacred Way financed by Trajan (pp. 125–129) and the awarding of the honorary title of *Kommodeia* to the Didyma games with the upgrade to the *agon eiselastikos* under Commodus (pp. 140–142, see in particular Chapter VI, pp. 209–221 with list of victors). In the competition for social prestige, athletic *agones* enjoyed their heyday in the 2nd century CE. However, just as other forms of inscriptions such as decrees and *tituli honorarii* declined sharply in the 3rd century, victory inscriptions also disappeared in the second half of the 3rd century. Thus, the decrease in variability and quantity of inscriptions indicates not only the end of the games, but also the beginning of political instability in the 3rd century CE (pp. 144–146).

Chapters IV, V and VI analyse the topics of economy, cultural identity and cult organisation in Didyma in greater detail. The discussion of the local economy is mainly concerned with the pre-Christian phases, but this is due less to the author than to the available evidence and its state of publication. The monumental building projects of the imperial period, which he cites in Chapter III as an indicator of economic prosperity (e.g. pp. 115, 193), are not mentioned again in this context.[14] Nawotka's account of Miletos as an export-oriented trading center is based on a variety of sources. For the first half of the 5th century BC he analyses the evidence of tribute payments to the Delian League, coin hoards and the decreasing import of Attic figure-decorated pottery, all of which demonstrate the shrinking of Miletos from a former 'global' to a local player (p. 151. 160). This is certainly true, although it should be noted that Attic and Corinthian wares are not a very convincing source for this point. Their decline in trade was a supra-regional phenomenon – more related to Corinth and Athens than to consumer societies.[15] More reliable in this context would have been the evidence of transport amphorae at the turn of the 6th and 5th centuries, proving both a sharp decline in the consumption of local products as well as its export to the former main distribution markets in the Black Sea area.[16] For the following periods (mainly late Classical to Hellenistic) Nawotka firstly refers to the numerous sources that demonstrate the importance of wool, purple and clothing for the Milesian economy (pp. 156–158). However, based on amphora stamps he concludes that Miletos was only "a medium-size regional center of production" (p. 164). This is a rather hasty conclusion, and he himself emphasizes the methodological problems by using only stamped – and not also unstamped – amphorae (so-called stamping coefficient) as a proxy for trade volume. He also refers to the Zenon papyri, which indicate much larger exports. Indeed, the results of a recent survey on the Humeitepe delivered a mass of transport amphorae (local and foreign productions) that clearly demonstrate the revival of Miletos' trading business at least from the 4th century BCE onwards.[17] In this context, I also disagree with the author's characterisation of the East Harbour as the "most important commercial harbour of the city" (p. 160). Given the large number of transport amphorae found in the Humeitepe Survey, the excavated harbour gate and the epigraphic evidence for an association of shipowners near the port (cf. p. 133), it is more likely that the harbour at Humeitepe fulfilled this role from the 4th century BCE at the latest and shaped the character of the northern part of the city.[18]

Chapter V, foregrounding philosophy, foundation myths and urban rivalries, deals with the cultural identity and historical memory of Miletos. A central character is the philosopher Thales. According to A. Herda,[19] a heroon was dedicated to him in the North Market in the 6th century BCE. Nawotka rejects this hypothesis because there is no reliable evidence except Plutarch's comment (Solon 12.11).

[14] Nor are not the repeated references to Apollon as eponymous *stephanephoros* in the first three chapters, which is a sign of economic instability and weakness (for the first time in 332/331 BCE, cf. p. 77, note 270 for an overview of the respective years).

[15] As Slawisch 2013 has shown the decline of Attic table ware in the 2nd–3rd quarter of the 5th century was not a local phenomenon and even not restricted to Ionia, but also occurred in places such as Daskyleion and Phanagoria.

[16] See for example Monakhov 2003, 30–37; Seifert 2004; Huy & Weissová 2020, § 36; von Miller 2022.

[17] Cf. Huy & Weissová 2020, § 39–44.

[18] Transport amphorae make up around 40% of all pottery found during the survey, dating mostly between the 4th century BCE and the 2nd century CE (Huy & Weissovà 2020, § 31–32); for the harbour gate and the association of shipowners see Bumke & Tanrıöver 2017.

[19] Herda 2011, 94–99.

Rather, by listing inscriptions of the name Thales Μειλήσιος, which were widespread throughout the empire in Roman Imperial times but absent in Miletos, Nawotka shows that Miletos' most famous citizen played no role in the city's cultural identity at all (pp. 168–171). This is a surprising result for which one would have liked an explanation, since, as Nawotka argues in the following subchapters, the remembrance of one's own history was indeed of considerable significance for the self-conception of the urban community. It becomes particularly evident in the way Miletos stressed its former importance as the founder of numerous colonies in the framework of the competition for prestigious city titles in Imperial Asia Minor. As Miletos could not compete with the neighbouring cities of Ephesos and Smyrna for the titles of *neokoros* and *metropolis* of Asia, it invented the title *metropolis* of Ionia and boasted of being the "metropolis of numerous and big cities in Pontus and Egypt..." (pp. 179–184, note 143). This policy of remembering was by no means a unique strategy. As M. Hallmannsecker in his book on Roman Ionia elaborated, also other towns such as Sardis, Aphrodisias and Stratonikeia invented special titles and referred to their own region.[20] The discussion of dealing with the past would also have been worth extending on the inner-city activities by including evidence for the restaging of Archaic statues in Hellenistic and Roman contexts,[21] as well as the revival of Archaic names in the 2nd and 1st centuries BC.[22] This would have further strengthened Nawotka's arguments here.

Many of the aspects discussed in Chapters IV, V and especially VI have already been addressed in the first three chapters and so there are inevitably some repetitions. Hence, in some places the reader has to jump back and forth between chapters in order to grasp the overall idea (see, for example, the comments on the Molpoi Decree, pp. 16 and 190, or on the Roman Imperial cult pp. 112–118 & 180–181). However, the socio-cultural backgrounds and explanations of Chapters IV–VI are extremely valuable for a deeper understanding of the historical events.

Nawotka has produced an extremely rich book that goes far beyond the political history of Miletos, discussing its role in regional and supra-regional contexts from a hitherto largely neglected diachronic perspective. The range of aspects and data sets from written and material culture that Nawotka integrates into a coherent narrative is remarkable, even if one does not follow the author in every detail. He not only provides the first handbook on the post-archaic history of the polis. His special merit is to have established the political significance of the extra-urban sanctuary at Didyma for Miletus by linking its histories. Thus, "The Nourisher of Apollo" will certainly become an indispensable reference work and a book of great value to anyone interested in Miletos and Didyma – and Ionia as a whole.

Sabine Huy
University of Hamburg
sabine.huy@posteo.de

[20] Hallmannsecker 2022, 53–59. Nawotka could certainly not have considered this publication.
[21] See for example the Archaic sculpture of a lion in the frigidarium of the Faustina baths: Dally 2012, 219; more examples: Bumke 2009.
[22] Günther 2014, 305–306.

Bumke, H. 2009. Neue Köpfe für alte Damen. Zeugnisse für die Inszenierung von Tradition und Vergangenheit im griechischen Osten, in: Einicke, R., Lehmann, S., Löhr, H., Mehnert, A., Mehnert, G. and Slawisch, A. (eds) *Zurück zum Gegenstand. Festschrift für Andreas E. Furtwängler* (ZAKSSchriften 16): 25–36 Langenweißbach: Beier & Beran.

Bumke, H. and A. Tanrıöver 2017. Der Hafen am Humeitepe in Milet. Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen 2011. *Archäologischer Anzeiger* 2017 (2): 123–177.

Dally, O. 2012. Bild – Raum – Handlung. Die Faustinathermen in Milet, in: Dally, O., Moraw, S. and Ziemssen, H. (eds) *Bild – Raum – Handlung. Perspektiven der Archäologie* (Berlin Studies of the Ancient World 11): 215–234 Berlin: Topoi.

Dündar, E. 2021. The Mushroom-Rimmed Amphora as an Indicator of Hekatomnid Regional Hegemony. *Jahrbuch des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts* 136: 111–150.

Gorman, V. B. 2001. *Miletus. The Ornament of Ionia: A History of the City to 400 B. C. E.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Grüner, A. and A. Hennemeyer 2001. Review W. Held, Das Heiligtum der Athena in Milet, Milesische Forschungen 2 (Mainz 2000). *Bonner Jahrbücher* 201: 552–553.

Günther, L.-M. 2014. *Bürgerinnen und ihre Familien im hellenistischen Milet. Untersuchungen zur Rolle von Frauen und Mädchen in der Polis-Öffentlichkeit*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Hallmannsecker, M. 2022. *Roman Ionia: Constructions of cultural identity in Western Asia Minor*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Held, W. 2000. *Das Heiligtum der Athena in Milet* (Milesische Forschungen 2). Mainz: P. von Zabern.

Herda, A. 2011. Burying a Sage: The Heroon of Thales in the Agora of Miletos. With remarks on some other excavated Heroa and on Cults and Graves of Mythical Founders of the City, in Henry, O., (ed.), *Le Mort dans la* Ville*. Pratiques, contextes et impacts des inhumations intra-muros en Anatolie, du début de l'Age du Bronze à l'époque romaine*: 67–122, Istanbul: Institut français d'études anatoliennes.

Herda, A. 2019. Copy and Paste? Miletos Before and After the Persian Wars, in: Capet, E., Doginez, C., Gorea, M., Koch Piettre, R., Massa F., and Rouillard-Bonraisin, H. (eds) *Reconstruire les villes. Modes, motifs et récits* (Semitica et Classica Suppl. 1): 91–120, Turnhout: Brepols.

Huy, S. and B. Weissová 2020. An Urban Survey Applied in Miletus. Methodology and Preliminary Results of Systematic Survey on Humeitepe, in: Wilkinson, T. C. and A. Slawisch (eds) *The Fieldwalker* https://www.fieldwalker.org/articles/aegean/002_huy_weissova/

Kinns, Ph. 1986. The Coinage of Miletus, The Numismatic Chronicle. *The Journal of the Royal Society* 146: 233–260.

Kobylina, M. M. 1965. *Milet*. Moskow: Nauka.

Mallwitz, A. and W. Schiering 1968. Der alte Athena-Tempel von Milet. *Istanbuler Mitteilungen* 18: 87–160.

Monakhov, S. Yu. 2003. *Греческие амфоры в Причерноморье. Типология амфор ведущих центров-экспортеров товаров в керамической таре = Grecheskie amfory v Prichernomor'e. Tipologija amfor vedushchikh centrov-eksporterov v keramicheskoj tare*. Moskow, Saratov: Kimmerida, Izdatel'stvo Saratovskogo Universiteta.

Marcellesi, M.-Ch. 2004. *Milet des Hékatomnides à la domination romaine. Pratiques monetaires et histoire de la cité du IV^e au II^e siècle avant J.-C.* (Milesische Forschungen 3). Mainz: P. von Zabern.

Nawotka, K. 2020a. Introduction. Epigraphic Habit, Epigraphic Culture, Epigraphic Curve: Statement of the problem, in: Nawotka, K. (ed.) *Epigraphic Culture in the Eastern Mediterranean in Antiquity*: 1–30. Abingdon, New York: Routledge.

Nawotka, K. 2020b. Epigraphic Curves in Western Asia Minor: the Case Studies of Miletos, Ephesos and Pergamon, in: Nawotka, K. (ed.) *Epigraphic Culture in the Eastern Mediterranean in Antiquity*: 118–143. Abingdon, New York: Routledge.

Parzinger, H. 1989. Zur frühesten Besiedlung Milets (Festschrift W. Müller-Wiener). *Istanbuler Mitteilungen* 39: 415–431.

Seifert, M. 2004. *Herkunftsbestimmung archaischer Keramik am Beispiel von Amphoren aus Milet* (British Archaeological Reports int. ser. 1233). Oxford: John and Erica Hedges.

Slawisch, A. 2013. Absatzmarkt Ionien: Zur Rolle attischer Keramik als Indikator für die Unterbrechung oder Verschiebung von Handelsnetzwerken in der Ägäis im 5. Jh. v. Chr., in: Slawisch, A. (ed.) *Handels- und Finanzgebahren in der Ägäis im 5. Jh. v. Chr* (Byzas 18): 185–206. Istanbul: Ege Yayınları.

Slawisch, A. 2017. *Ionien im 5. Jh. v. Chr.: Kollaps, Resilienz, Regeneration* (unpublished habilitation). Ruhr-University Bochum.

Slawisch, A. 2022. M.Ö. 5. yüzyılda Ionia: Diplomasi, Sanat ve Iktisadi Yapı / Ionia during the Fifth century BC, Art, Diplomacy and Economy, in: Ersoy, Y. and E. Koparal (eds) *Ancient Civilizations of Anatolia – Ionia*: 496-506. Istanbul: Yapı Kredi Publishing.

von Miller, A. 2022. Amphorae at Taxiarchis Hill, Didyma: Economy and Cult of an Archaic Sanctuary in Light of its Assemblage of Transport Jars, in: Lawall, M. (ed.) *Assemblages of Transport Amphoras: From Chronology to Economics and Society, Proceedings of the 19th International Congress of Classical Archaeology 'Archaeology and Economy in the Ancient World' Cologne/Bonn 2018, 36*: 5-9. Heidelberg: Propylaeum.

Judith M. Barringer, *Olympia. A Cultural History*. pp. xvii + 336, Princeton University Press 2021. ISBN 9780691210476, hardcover US $39.95, £35.

++Disclaimer: Professor Barringer (Edinburgh University) is a member of the editorial board of the JGA.

When the modern iterations of the Summer Olympics come round, there is often detectable a string of publications, more and less scholarly, on the ancient (summer-only) quadrennial Games and their original, unique and immovable, site. Professor Barringer's severely scholarly and academic volume is no exception, if only by accident. It first appeared in the same year that the Tokyo Olympics (officially XXXII) actually occurred, though – thanks to the covid-19 pandemic – that was not the year for which they had been scheduled. The ancient version of the Games lasted for over 1100 years without a single break (give or take a couple of reorganizations and Emperor Nero's gross interference in CE 66/67), but celebrations of the modern version running since 1896 have been either totally omitted several times (1916, 1940, 1944) or (2020) postponed. That very fact should give rise to