
A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

stitution of the ancient State, to observe the points of similarity and the points of contrast between this and our American republic. It is folly indeed to idolize antiquity; it is equal folly to disregard it. A nearer view of the inner workings of the Athenian commonwealth prepares us the better to appreciate and admire the purer spirit and the truer freedom of our own favored institutions.

ARTICLE IX.

SMITH'S DICTIONARY OF GEOGRAPHY.—SMYRNA.

BY PROF. GEORGE M. LANE, HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

MR. SMITH is an indefatigable writer of books. His last book for 1857 is a pamphlet of some 1380 pages, on Greek and Roman Geography.

The book contains more than the title implies. Besides the geography it aims at a chorographic and topographic description of countries and cities; with historical accounts of their origin, rise and decline, and sketches of the more important buildings of the cities.

The work abounds in the excellencies and defects which may be noticed in the whole series of Mr. Smith. He has done more than any other English scholar toward popularizing the results of continental scholars, and presenting the *material* side of antiquity in a convenient and accessible form. In general the due proportion in the length and prominence of the Articles has been preserved. They are written in neat English, printed in neat type, and illustrated by neat cuts and maps. On the other hand, even a casual

[1] Dictionary of Greek and Roman Geography. Edited by William Smith, LL. D. In two volumes. Boston: Little, Brown and Company. Vol. I. 1854. pp. 1108. Vol. II. 1857. pp. 1383.

glance at the works of this series will detect many incongruities; the compilatory character is too evident. Citations are given which do not always warrant the assertions in the text, and citations are sometimes given which do not warrant anything at all. It is too often apparent that the contributors have not gone to the bottom of their subject; that they have transferred Articles, or fused them together, without going back to a careful study of authorities on which they should be founded. Neither can the effect of these works on the literary community be in all respects good. While they undoubtedly contribute to the culture of many persons who, but for these convenient English manuals, would hardly know where to apply for information on classical matters, it cannot be denied that they may lead young scholars astray. It is easier for them to turn to the Dictionaries, and find the whole story there, than to put in play their own powers of memory, comparison, and combination; and an unchecked use of illustrative books is apt to divert the attention too much to the realia, too much to things, greatly to the prejudice of the main object of classical study, intimacy with the authors themselves, a thorough acquaintance with the ancient idioms, and a genuine and searching appreciation of the unapproachable graces of classical style.

However, to speak of this estimable book in vague generalities is not our purpose. It is proposed in the following to consider with some care the history of one of the towns included in the second volume; one of the smaller towns, but to the biblical and classical scholar not the least interesting. The Article on SMYRNA has been furnished by Mr. Leonhard Schmitz, of Edinburgh, favorably known from his educational works. This Article gives the main and familiar features in the history of Smyrna, with tolerable correctness. But it is very far from complete. The few chronological data given are those commonly adopted, not his own. It is thought that a somewhat more satisfactory determination of the principal epochs in the history of the city may be made than has hitherto been done. And to do

this with any degree of thoroughness, it is easier to re-construct the whole history, as far as the ancient sources allow, than to keep up a running commentary on the somewhat meagre sketch of Mr. Schmitz.

The historical notices of the town are not many, and are often provokingly vague. The reason of this is apparent. From its early settlement down to a couple of hundred years after the beginning of authentic history, the city of Smyrna was one of the most flourishing cities of Asia Minor. Many years after, under the successors of Alexander the Great, it regained, though under a totally changed state of affairs, much of its ancient prominence, and under Augustus and Tiberius and subsequent emperors it is again spoken of as "the gem of Ionia," [1] and "the eye of Asia." [2] But between these two periods there is a great gulf fixed; Smyrna was razed to the ground, — as we shall try to show below, at or after 580, B. C., — and lay in ruins till it was restored in Alexander's time, or shortly after. During this long interval nothing remained but the temples, and a few scattered hamlets, occupied by the descendants of the ancient inhabitants. Hence, in the great historical game played between the people of the East and the people of the West, and afterwards in the feud between Sparta and Athens, Smyrna could take no part.[3] The town lay consequently out of the range of the great historians, who probably looked on it as a place that had vanished forever from the face of the earth. Herodotus alludes to it only two or three times, and then incidentally. Thucydides never mentions the name. The most direct and authentic sources left us for the history of the old town are the scanty notices of epic and lyric poets. The deductions drawn from these notices by later Greek writers can only be used with great caution. Of the new town the notices of historians, perie-

[1] Boeckh, C. I. 3191 of the period of Sept. Severus, and often in inscriptions.

[2] Aristid. Μοσ. ἐπὶ Σμ. I. p. 428.

[3] It is nothing but a blunder when Kortüm, Hellenische Staatsverfassungen, p. 51, enumerates Smyrna among the allies of Athens in the Peloponnesian War.

gets and geographers enable us to give a somewhat more connected account. The rhetor Aelius Aristides of Smyrna, gives some incidental information. His ideas of the history are shallow and absurd, but for his own times he is a credible witness. The coins and inscriptions are all, unfortunately, of the new Smyrna.

Histories, indeed, of the town were not wanting. Those historians who treated of the Aeolic and Ionian confederations could hardly have failed to notice a town which was, in a measure, the connecting link between the two confederations; and Alexandrine industry must have occupied itself with the history of a place toward which so many unshaken evidences point as the birthplace of the Homeric songs. Of special histories of the town we have two titles, of whose existence Mr. Schmitz does not seem to be aware. The first is *Ἱστορικὰ περὶ Ζμύρνης*, Historical Investigations on Smyrna. The second is *Πίναξ Ῥωμαίων καὶ Ζμυρναίων διαδοχὴ κατὰ χρόνους*, which seems to have been a chronological or annalistic catalogue of distinguished Romans and Smyrnaeans, probably public functionaries.[1] The loss of these works, which are known to us only through an inscription,[2] cannot be sufficiently deplored, as the author, Hermogenes, the son of Charidemus, who lived seventy-seven years, and wrote seventy-seven books, treated many interesting things connected with our subject, such as the Wisdom and the Country of Homer, and the Foundation of Colonies in Europe and Asia. A third work, mentioned by Suetonius,[3] a Commentarius Smyrnae, by L. Crassitius, a freedman of Tarentum, is understood by some commentators to be a history of Smyrna. But Weichert[4] and others have shown conclusively that this was a commentary on the erudite poem of Cinna.

Among modern writers on Smyrna Mr. Schmitz quotes

---

[1] Such as the *στρατηγοί*, the *ἄρχοντες* and the *πρυτάνεις*; or the *στεφανηφόροι*, who, as we learn from the names of females (C. I. 3150. 3173), were not civic but religious functionaries, but yet gave a name to the year; Philostr. vitt. soph. 2, 26, 2: *ἡ στεφανηφόρος ἀρχὴ — ἀφ' ὧν τοῖς ἐνιαυτοῖς τίθενται Σμυρναῖοι τὰ ὀνόματα.*

[2] C. I. 3311. [3] De gramm. 18. [4] Poett. Latt. Rel. p. 184.

Prokesch von Osten, whose observations on topography are useful, though his historical sketch is brief, and disfigured by some great inaccuracies; he quotes for example, under the name of Curtius, the supplements of Freinsheim. Arundell's work, Discoveries in Asia Minor, seems to have been overlooked. This book might have been used with advantage, as the second volume contains a history. A better book is the little work in Romaic, by Oeconomus, published at Malta, in 1831, which Arundell copies. The historical materials are here collected with care, though the criticism is not what it should be. How much confidence can be placed in a work which declares on the first page that Herodotus wrote the life of Homer?

The admirable commercial situation of Smyrna seems to have been appreciated in the earliest times. Philostratus[1] says she was mistress of the gates of land and sea; on the seaside the gulf, says Aristides,[2] the rhetor, in a rhetorizing strain, bears the name of one gulf, but winds into many gulfs, with thousands of harbors and stations for ships. Landward a road ran to the centre of the Lydian realm, and its capital, Sardis. Traditions and monuments alike indicate that this road was travelled from the remotest antiquity, perhaps even long before the foundation of Sardis. Herodotus[3] saw there two stone figures of the Egyptian conqueror, Sesostris or Ramses, which still remain as witnesses of the great historian's fidelity. This seems to indicate pretty clearly that considerably before the occupation of the coast by the Aeolic and Ionian colonies, Smyrna was a point of connection between the interior and the sea. Tradition furthermore reports[4] that the Lydians, who left their country during the famine under king Atys, embarked at Smyrna, probably coming down to the sea-shore from the interior of Lydia by the same road.

This great Lydian highway, travelled by Herodotus, is undoubtedly the one of which the poet Hipponax, more than

---

[1] Vitt. Soph. 1, 21, 5.
[2] Σμυρ. Πολ. I. p. 381.
[3] 2, 106.
[4] Her. 1, 94.

a century before Herodotus, gives a sort of Itinerarium in a passage[1] that is somewhat corrupt, but clear enough to show it was marked by august sepulchral monuments like the great Roman roads. "Go," he says of the "journey to Smyrna," "through the Lydians, past the tomb of Attales, and the monument of Gyges, and the gravestone of Megastrys, (?) and the sepulchre of Atys and king Myrsilus, turning thy belly to the setting sun." A recent philologist[2] has endeavored to prove that, since Hipponax was an Ephesian, and a suburb of Ephesus bore the name of Smyrna, the Ephesian Smyrna must be the one he refers to. But this assumption may be refuted by reasons that must commend themselves to every sensible man. In the first place, perspicuity would require the poet to add some qualification to the name, if he meant the Ephesian suburb; otherwise his readers would naturally understand the city of Smyrna, and not the suburb of Ephesus. In another place[3] where the suburb is mentioned, he defines it geographically. Secondly, he speaks of "the road to Smyrna, *through* the Lydians," and in a westerly direction. The starting point to be sure is not given. But the most natural starting point is the great city of Sardis, and the first mentioned tomb, that of Attales, shows that this city is probably meant. Attales, as we learn from Nicolaus Damascenus,[4] was the son of Sadyattes, king of Lydia, and his monument would naturally be at the capital of the realm. From Sardis to Smyrna the traveller would go directly westward, while from Sardis to Ephesus he would go considerably to the south. Thirdly, there is no important point or town to the east of Ephesus, and a course westward to Ephesus would not be *through* the Lydians (*διὰ Λυδῶν*), but *past* (*παρά*) the outskirts of Lydia, or indeed mostly through Caria. Fourthly, Hipponax evidently enumerates the monuments in their order from

[1] Fr. 47 Schneidewin; 15 Bergk.

[2] In Schneidewin's Philologus, 1851, p. 70.

[3] Fr. 26.

[4] Fr. 47, quoted by Bergk.; hence the emendation of Schneidewin, 'Αλυάττεω for 'Αττάλεω, which refers it to the famous monument of Alyattes at Sardis mentioned by Herodotus, and still in existence, is unnecessary.

east to west, ending with the monument of Atys, which seems to be near the Smyrna he refers to. We have seen from Herodotus that Smyrna is concerned in the traditions of Atys's reign; and the hill, which even as late as the times of Aristides,[1] bore the name of "Atys's Hill," was probably the seat of the ancient monument of this king, or of a monument that passed for his.

From these and other scanty memorials of a remote age, we learn one thing, that there was a Smyrna before Smyrna. That is, that before the establishment of the Greek colony, there was a settlement of some maritime importance near the Meles. The stretch of shore which was afterwards dotted with Greek towns was held, according to Pherecydes,[2] by two tribes at the time of the Greek settlement, the Carians and Leleges, the Carians occupying Miletus, Myus, and the tracts about Mycale and Ephesus, the Leleges the rest of the shore as far as Phocaea (including the islands of Chios and Samos), and consequently the seat of the subsequent Smyrna.[3] The great similarity of these two tribes is sufficiently shown by the frequent confusion of their names; and their affinity with the Mysians and the great Lydian stock is indicated by the mythical brotherhood of Lydus, Mysus, and Car.[4] The oldest local and particular legends of Smyrna cluster round the mythical names of Tantalus and his son Pelops. Pelops[5] reigned near Mt. Sipylus before his departure for Pelops's Island; Tantalus is named as the founder of the town. Doubtless in these myths lies a germ of historic truth. The Lelegian or Lydian town, which, according to report, was swallowed by a lake,[6] may as well be called Tantalus's Town, as by

---

[1] Ἱερ. Λόγ. I. p. 499. It is but fair to say that the reading Ἄτυος for the senseless Ὄτυος of the codd. is due to Schneidewin; it is so well confirmed by the evidence of Aristides, though the emendation was made independently of Aristides, that it may be considered established.

[2] Ap. Strab. 14, p. 632. [3] Strab. 14, p. 644. [4] Her. 1, 171.

[5] Aristid. Προσφ. Σμύρν. I. p. 440; id. Μον. ἐπὶ Σμύρν. p. 425; Paus. 2, 22, 4: 5, 13, 4.

[6] Aristid. Μον. ἐπὶ Σμ. I. p. 427. Stephan. Byz. gives as the name of Tantalus's town, which was afterwards supplanted by the Amazonian settlement, Νεώ-

any other name. But it is clear that this Tantalean settlement was not on the Smyrnaean gulf, but further inward, near Mt. Sipylus. Hence the connection between the older Lelegian town, near the Sipylus, and the thriving Hellenic colony, by the sea, was not very direct. Tantalus's town may be regarded as the head-quarters or nucleus of the Leleges, who were dispossessed of their lands by the Greeks. The Greek writers connect the two settlements, or regard the Greek colony as the continuation of the Lydian, in order to claim for their city a more august antiquity.[1] Aristides[2] names Pelops and Tantalus in one place as the founders; in another, Theseus, simply because in one place he has the Lydian town in mind, in another the Greek.

The name of Theseus brings us a step nearer to authentic history, and to the Greek accounts of Smyrna. We must premise that, as Smyrna was held at different times by two races, the Aeolic and Ionic, two theories were held with respect to its foundation: first, the AEOLIC theory, supported by Ephorus and Herodotus; secondly, the IONIAN theory, supported by Strabo. The Aeolic theory traces the origin of the city to Cyme, the Ionian to Ephesus, and through Ephesus to Athens. In both of these versions the name of Theseus occurs, and much of the confusion in the early history of Smyrna is due to his name. According to the Ionic theory, Theseus is the famous hero of Attica; according to the Aeolic, and as we believe the true theory, Theseus comes from Cyme, and is a descendant of the royal house of Pherae, in Thessaly. The personal existence of this Theseus may, perhaps, be doubted, since the whole narrative in which he plays a part is of a mythical character. But we can hardly doubt, on weighing the evidence, that Smyrna was a secondary colony, founded not directly

---

λοχον. Mr. S. makes no mention of this. Evidently Steph. is in error; is it in reality the name of the suburb of the later city along the gulf, which, as we glean from Philostratus and Aristides, was a sort of city by itself?

[1] So the embassy in Tac. A. 4, 56 At Zmyrnaei, *repetita vetustate*, seu Tantalus, etc.

[2] Προσφ. Σμ. I. p. 440, and Παλιν. ἐπὶ Σμ. I. p. 436.

from Greece, but from some Aeolian colony in Asia Minor; and that this colony was, in all probability, Cyme; and the same evidence leads us to reject confidently the Ionian-Ephesian theory of Strabo, and of modern critics, who have followed Strabo, as K. O. Müller and Oeconomus, since all the seeming indications of an Ionian origin may easily be accounted for without recourse to this assumption.

We find, to be sure, many other versions of the story besides that of Ephorus, some of them mythical, some seemingly historical. According to one of the most current local legends, the founder of the town, like the founder of Ephesus, Myrina, and Cyme itself, was an *Amazon*,[1] who called the town after her own name. The name of the Amazons naturally brings up the name of Theseus, with all the stories of his battles and loves; and hence the Cymaean Theseus was confounded, as we have seen, with the Attic Theseus, and the Attic Theseus is married to the Amazon Smyrna. Strabo's error may be due in part to these confused accounts of Theseus; and the *Attic*[2] theory of the direct origin of the city from Athens, is only a particularized version of the Ionic theory, with which the name of Theseus had much to do. The assumption once made, that this Theseus was the Attic Theseus, the Athenians had a strong motive for insisting that Smyrna was an Attic colony. For, of all the seven towns that claimed Homer as their citizen, the Smyrnaeans were adjudged to have the best claim, and to assert the claim of Athens as the metropolis of Smyrna was to assert some share in the heritage of the Homeric songs. With what interest the Athenians seized on every pretext to identify themselves with the great strife between Troy and the forces of Greece is well known from Pisistratus's interpolation in the Catalogue of Ships; and the theory of a direct colonization from Attica is due to the same period, and is, indeed, closely connected with the name of Pisistratus. On the pedestal of a statue erected to this tyrant, stood the

[1] Plin. N. H. 5, 31; Strab. 12, p. 550, and of Ephesus 14, p. 633.

[2] Cf. Aristid. Σμ. Πολ. I. p. 372; Προσφ. Σμ. I. p. 440.

following inscription, claiming the "golden citizen," Homer, as an Athenian; (auct. vit. Hom., p. 27, Westerm.)

Ἡμέτερος γὰρ ἐκεῖνος ὁ χρύσεος ἦν πολιήτης,
Εἴπερ Ἀθηναῖοι Σμύρναν ἀπῳκίσαμεν.

This theory of a direct colonization from Attica may therefore be dismissed, as founded originally on a confusion of names, and propagated by interested literary speculators like Pisistratus and his school in Athens, or by declamatory municipal patriots like Aristides [1] in Smyrna.

The *Amazon* founder of the city, who is the connecting link between Theseus of Cyme, and Theseus of Attica, is curiously interwoven with all stories of the early history of the town. Some meaning there must be in these myths, if we take care not to interpret them too literally, and look upon the Amazon as a real, concrete person. The Amazons are, of course, not a historical nation, but belong to the Asiatic mythology. They are either divinities [2] or attendants on some divinity (*ἱερόδουλοι*), like the Artemis Tauropolus, who was, according to Diodorus, a deity of the Amazons. Historically analyzed, all traditions of the Amazons as conquerors of men and founders of cities melt away; mythologically analyzed, they are an important connecting link between the Greek mythology and the older local traditions and modes of worship which the Greeks, with their pious veneration for things existing, were reluctant to displace. Hence, a victory of the Greeks over the Amazons, or the marriage of a Greek with an Amazon, stript of its mythical garb, means nothing more than this, that a new cultus was set up where the Asiatic cultus had prevailed, or the Asiatic cultus was engrafted on the Greek. The Amazon Smyrna, the eponymus heroine, afterwards adopted as the personification of the town, was the ancient local Lelegian or Lydian divinity. The myths which celebrated her attributes and deeds were gradually wrought into the form of epic lays;

[1] In *Προσφ. Σμ.* I. p. 443, Athens is called *μητρόπολις*.

[2] See Müller's Dorians, I. p. 404, English translation, and the authorities in note c.

in the reign of Gyges, Magnes[1] a Smyrnaean went round the cities of Lydia singing the deeds of the Amazons, and the victories won by the Lydians. From the epos to history it is but a step, and thus the shadowy representative of natural forces or divine attributes becomes a flesh and blood reality.

We may notice in this connection a two-fold, or even a three-fold form of the name. The word *σμύρνα* or *σμύρνη*, probably connected with the name of the town, is a dialectic form of *μύρρα*. The personal name is found in both forms also. Panyasis, quoted by Apollodorus,[2] tells the well known story of Smyrna, the mother of Adonis, which Lycophron tells of Myrrha. C. Helvius Cinna, in his elaborate poem, calls her Smyrna, Ovid calls her Myrrha. This explains what Syncellus[3] says of the Aeolic town, Myrina, that "it is called by some Smyrna." *Μυρίνα* (only a lengthened form of *Μύρρα* or *Σμύρνα*) is said by Strabo to be the name of the Amazon who founded the town of Myrina.[4] This town, then, was a seat of the same ancient Amazon-cultus with Smyrna, though the name of the divinity is a little disguised.[5]

The story of the Amazon appears in still another form in the *Ionic* account of Strabo.[6] The city of Smyrna, according to Strabo, was named from the suburb of Ephesus, which again derived its name from an Amazon Smyrna who ruled in Ephesus. In proof of this he quotes Callinus's hymn to Zeus, "Pity the Smyrnaeans," that is, the Ephesians; and this Ephesian Smyrna he goes on to prove

[1] Nicol. Damasc. fr. 62; Suid. s. v. *Μάγνης*.

[2] Bibl. 3, 14, 3. [3] P. 181. A.

[4] On the Trojan plain, according to Strabo, 12, p. 66, Tauchn., was a hill, called by the gods Baticia, but by men, the sepulchre of Myrina: another seat of this cultus.

[5] Mr. Schmitz makes no reference to the orthography *Ζμύρνα*, found in countless inscriptions, coins and manuscripts. The letter Σ complains in Lucian, judic. vocalium 9 (quoted by Eckhel, I. 2, p. 545), that Z has robbed it of Smyrna. Cf. also Sext. Empir. adv. math. pp. 638 and 639 Bekker. What Weichert, Poett. Latt. Rell. p. 169, advances in favor of *Z*myrna, is fully borne out by recent texts.

[6] XIV. p. 632. Steph. Byz. follows him, s. v. *Σμύρνα*.

from Hipponax, was situated between *Τρηχείη* and *Λέπρη Ἀκτή*. The inhabitants of this suburb went on an expedition against the Leleges, conquered them, drove them out, and built the town. But their stay was not long; the intruders were soon displaced by the Aeolians, and retired to Colophon, and sallying out in conjunction with the Ionian Colophonians, they regained their own. This again he attests from a poet, Mimnermus in his *Νανnώ*:

> Ἡμεῖς δ' αἰπὺ Πύλον Νηλῆϊον ἄστυ λιπόντες
> Ἰμερτὴν Ἀσίην νηυσὶν ἀφικόμεθα.
> Ἐς δ' ἐρατὴν Κολοφῶνα βίην ὑπέροπλον ἔχοντες
> Ἐζόμεθ' ἀργαλέης ὕβριος ἡγεμόνες·
> Κεἶθεν δ' ἀστύεντος ἀπορνύμενοι ποταμοῖο
> Θεῶν βουλῇ Σμύρνην εἵλομεν Αἰολίδα.

According to the *Ionic* version, therefore, which Strabo follows, the founders came not from Aeolis, but from the Ionian Ephesus. But here Strabo is at direct issue with a greater authority than himself; Herodotus[1] enumerates Smyrna among the twelve towns of the Aeolic confederacy. He adds, to be sure, that the town was taken from the Aeolians by the Colophonians, and in so far the two accounts agree. But in the one vital point there is an essential difference between Strabo and Herodotus. Herodotus regards the Aeolians as the founders and legitimate owners of the town; Strabo regards them as the temporary occupants, who were ejected from a place they had seized by the force of arms. One thing is certain, that the Colophonians dispossessed the Aeolians. Strabo errs in intimating, though his language is vague, that the Colophonians did it in aid of original Ephesian founders. This could not have been the case; we do not know, to be sure, how long a period intervened between the foundation of the town and the Colophonian capture, as all dates at this period are necessarily uncertain. We shall endeavor to show hereafter that it was probably a hundred years or more. At any rate it was a tolerably long time. Now, if Smyrna had been

[1] 1, 149.

founded by Ionians and occupied by Ionians, some hint of the older Greek writers would have given a gleam of the truth. But on the contrary the belief of the Aeolian origin is deeply rooted; it seems never to have been questioned; the stereotyped epithet of the town is *Αἰολίς*. Indeed the lines of Mimnermus, with which Strabo defends his position, may be turned against Strabo; Mimnermus does not say, as he undoubtedly would have said, if he sided with Strabo, "we recaptured the Ionian Smyrna from the Aeolians;" he says in a naïve straightforward fillibustering strain, "leaving Pylos, we (i. e., the Colophonians) came to Asia in our ships; we sate down at Colophon; and sallying thence, in accordance with our manifest destiny (*Θεῶν βουλῇ*), we took the *Aeolian* Smyrna." Furthermore, Mimnermus's *Σμύρνην Αἰολίδα* is not original with him; it goes back to a much more venerable authority, an epigram of the Homerids:[1] *Αἰολίδα Σμύρνην, ἀλιγείτονα, ποντοτίνακτον*: and we find the same thing repeated by Callimachus,[2] *καὶ Σμύρνης ἐστὶν ἀπ' Αἰολίδος*. Of prose-writers, besides Herodotus, Pausanias and Plutarch speak of the Aeolic origin as a settled thing; Pausanias[3] says: "Smyrna was one of the twelve Aeolic cities, and Ionians from Colophon took it and kept it;" and Plutarch,[4] who touches the matter incidentally, quotes one Metrodorus (probably the Chian Metrodorus), as saying that "the Smyrnaeans were of old Aeolians."

Besides these direct evidences, two strong arguments from probability may be adduced in support of Herodotus and against Strabo. In the first place, the Ephesians never were a colonizing people. No colony of Ephesus is any-

---

[1] Ep. 4, 7. [2] Ap. Athen. 7, p. 318, C. [3] 7, 5.

[4] Quaestt. Symp. 6, 8, 1: *τὸ δὲ τεκμήριον ἐλαμβάνομεν ἐκ τῶν Μητροδώρου Ἰωνικῶν· ἱστορεῖ γὰρ ὅτι, κ. τ. λ.* There is some doubt here as to what Metrodorus is meant, as the *Ἰωνικά* of M. are not elsewhere mentioned. Hecker proposes (in Schneidewin's Philologus. 1851, p. 421) to read *Ἀρτεμιδώρου*, referring to Athen. 3, p. 111, D. We would suggest as a simpler change, to read *Τρωικῶν* for *Ἰωνικῶν*, and understand it as a citation from the Chian Metrodorus mentioned in Athen. 4, p. 184, A: *Μητρόδωρος δ' ὁ Χῖος ἐν Τρωικοῖς φησιν, κ. τ. λ.* An examination of the context in Plutarch will convince that this passage is likely to belong in the *Τρωικά*.

where mentioned. Secondly, the importance attached in ancient times to particular numbers is well known, and especially to the number twelve. Counting Smyrna among the original Ionic cities, we find the Ionian league would embrace thirteen cities, the Aeolian eleven. Counting it among the Aeolic cities, we have twelve cities in each confederation, as in the old Etruscan confederation.

The conclusion, therefore, to which we are forced is, that Smyrna *was not* settled from Ephesus. The testimony of Strabo has been followed in modern times by Karl Otfried Müller. The respect to which this great man's opinions on any subject are entitled, makes it necessary to consider his arguments, and show the fallacy of his conclusions.

It is but fair to say that Müller touches this question incidentally only, in the course of a literary-historical investigation in his popular work, the History of Greek Literature. If his investigation had been a historical one, he would, doubtless, have come to a different conclusion. He shows that the Iliad and Odyssey contain both Aeolic and Ionic elements, the latter predominating. Homer is a native of Smyrna; and hence he accounts for the Aeolic-Ionic mixture, by assuming[1] that "the two races met about the same time in Smyrna, although perhaps it may be allowed that *the Ionians had somewhat the precedence in point of time, as the name of the town was derived from them.* It is credible, although it is not distinctly stated, that for a long time the two populations occupied Smyrna jointly." He adopts the story of the Ephesian colony, and so positively as to say "Homer was an Ionian, belonging to one of the families which went from Ephesus to Smyrna." Nay, he even traces the Ionic inhabitants of the Ephesian suburb back to the Athenians, to the Athenae Atticae.

With the Ephesian Smyrna the case is not so simple as Müller makes it. The probability is that Strabo's account is to be inverted; it is, in all probability, not the metropolis of the city of Smyrna, but itself a colony of the city of Smyrna. Other accounts of the origin of this suburb are,

[1] Page 43, English translation.

to be sure, preserved, but they are all dark and unsatisfactory. Such, for instance, is the account of Malacus; Malacus[1] says that some Samian slaves, driven from their home, settled near Ephesus, and called their settlement Samorna, the original form of Smyrna, the name being derived from the name of Samos. We must observe, however, that Malacus is here speaking, not of the founders of the suburb, but of the founders of Ephesus itself. The absurdity of supposing Ephesus itself to be a Samian colony is apparent. It is mere etymological play. But even granting that Malacus misquotes or misunderstands his authorities, and that the author he follows merely means to say that the Samian slaves settled not Ephesus, but the Smyrna of Ephesus, it is still difficult to account for the form of the name. In the absence of direct evidence then, we are left to one of two suppositions with regard to the Smyrna of Ephesus; first, that it was the seat of an ancient Lydian Amazon-cult, where the same deity occurs who is found in other places formerly occupied by the Lydians in the Aeolian Smyrna, in Myrina, where she appears in the two forms of Myrina and Smyrna, and in Cyme, where she appears in the form Myrina. Or secondly, we may assume that the cult is not indigenous at Ephesus, that it is not there a relic of the ante-Hellenic or Lydian period, but was transferred thither by the Greeks. The form of the name, which seems to bear a trace of Aeolism (Athen. 15, p. 688, C. *μύρρα ἡ σμύρνα παρ' Αἰολεῦσι*[2]), is in favor of the latter theory. We may suppose that in some civil dissension a party of the Smyrnaeans were driven forth from the city, took refuge in Ephesus, and settling close by the town, like Horace's Salaminian Teucer, gave to a portion of the Ionic town the cherished name of their Aeolic home.

The cult of Nemesis at Smyrna is cited by Müller in proof of the Ionic-Ephesus-Athens origin. Nemesis, says Müller, was worshipped at Smyrna; she was also worshipped at Rhamnus; hence, he infers that she was probably

[1] Apud Athen. 6, p. 267, B. Cf. Guhl. Ephesiaca, p. 31, n. 37.
[2] Cf. Lobeck, Patholog. p. 241.

transferred from Athens by way of Ephesus, to Smyrna. This is a specious argument at first sight, but critically analyzed, falls away to nothing.

The proofs of the antiquity of this worship at Smyrna are not very strong; yet, perhaps, they are enough to convince us that she had a temple in the older prae-Alexandrian town. Pausanias informs us (9, 35, 2) that in the temple of the Nemeses at Smyrna were placed the Graces, the work of Bupalos. This passage alone is not decisive; it does not necessarily follow that the temple of Nemesis was in existence at the time of Bupalos, as the statues may have been transferred there at a later period. But as Nemesis in some of her types bears a near resemblance to Aphrodite, it is not improbable that Bupalos's Charites were designed as her attendants. And taken in connection with another passage of Pausanias (7, 5, 1), not much room is left for doubt. In the second passage Alexander is said to have slept near the temple of the Nemeses, consequently the temple existed before the new or Alexandrian city. These two passages of Pausanias are the only passages where the older Smyrnaean Nemesis is mentioned, but there seems no ground for questioning them.

But whether this Nemesis came from Rhamnus is a very different question. If other facts proved the Ionian origin of Smyrna, then, indeed, we might suppose that in accordance with old Greek ways the Rhamnusian Nemesis was brought by the early colonists by way of Ephesus. Or, if there were any traces of a direct emigration from Attica or Rhamnus, we might infer that the Smyrnaean Nemeses came at some later period direct from Attica. But of this we have no evidence except the worthless talk of Aristides, and we are left to an entirely different theory.

The origin of the Rhamnusian Nemesis herself must be more definitely established before we can draw conclusions about the Nemeses of Smyrna. Is this deity indigenous in Attica, or was she carried there from abroad? The evidences of a foreign origin are many. The traditions of the Greeks refer her back to Asia; the first temple of Nemesis,

according to Callisthenes,[1] was built by Adrastus, near the river Aesepus, in Northern Mysia, and from him came the name of Adrastea. The etymology of Callisthenes is bad, his evidence for the origin of the cult is good. The Nemesis of Rhamnus bore the name of Upis;[2] whether this is Hyperborean or Pelasgic we will not undertake to decide, but in either case it lies outside of the genuine Greek mythology.[3] The worship of Nemesis is said to have *been introduced into Attica* by king Erechtheus;[4] and the Egyptians cut on the cup held in the hand of Phidias's statue, dark as their connection may be with the goddess, point to an origin beyond sea.

If we may infer then, that the Rhamnusian Nemesis was herself brought by some early migration from Asia to the Attic soil, which is the most natural hypothesis? That the Smyrnaean Nemesis went a round-about path from Asia to Rhamnus, from Rhamnus to Ephesus, and from Ephesus to that doubtful migration, to Smyrna? Or that she was to the manor born, indigenous to the soil and borrowed by the Greeks from the Leleges? Unquestionably the latter. Like the Amazon considered above, like the Artemis Tauropolus, and possibly like the Boubrostis who is found only at Smyrna, the Nemesis is a relic of the older Asiatic mythology. In fact the type of the Smyrnaean Nemesis differs from the Rhamnusian, and differs in such a way as to show that the Smyrnaean type is the older one; the Nemesis of Rhamnus, says Pausanias, had no wings; the Nemesis of Smyrna had.[5] The Smyrnaean deity therefore resembles the winged figures found on Asiatic monuments;[6] the Rhamnusian shows the anthropomorphic Greek element, which is certainly later.

One argument more may be added as a cumulus, which might be enough without the preceding. The cult of Ne-

---

[1] Apud Strab. 13, p. 588.
[2] Philostr. Her. 10.
[3] Müller, Dorr. I. p. 387, English translation; Guhl, Eph. p. 80.
[4] Suid. s. v. Ῥαμνουσία Νέμεσις.
[5] On coins, to be sure, the Smyrnaean is also found without wings.
[6] Lenormant, in the Revue Archéol. 1850, n. 10, p. 639.

mesis does not appear either at Ephesus or Colophon. The connecting link, therefore, between Smyrna and Rhamnus is entirely wanting.

To recapitulate briefly the foregoing considerations: the accounts of the foundation of Smyrna connected with the name of Tantalus belong to an ante-Hellenic city, to traditions of the Leleges or Lydians; those connected with the Amazon Smyrna belong not to history, but to mythology. Of the two Greek versions, the Ionian version of Strabo and the Aeolic version of Herodotus, the evidence is overwhelmingly in favor of the latter. It remains for us to inquire whether we can determine the particular Aeolic city whence the emigrants started.

Two Aeolic towns claim this honor. To adjudicate their claims is an easy task. The island of Lesbos is mentioned as the metropolis; the authority for this is the questionable authority of Vellejus Paterculus,[1] and his assertion is not confirmed by any internal probability, nor by a single passage of any other writer. On the other hand we have testimony which goes back beyond the oldest logographers, into the shadowy times of epic song. We mean the epigram already referred to, and preserved by the author of the life of Homer, ascribed to Herodotus. The aoidos who wrote this epigram cannot, according to Welcker, Müller, and other eminent philologists, have lived long after the composition of the Iliad and Odyssey; he says in explicit words that Cyme is the metropolis of Smyrna; "the people of Phricon built the Aeolian Smyrna."

Ephorus, himself a Cymaean, and well acquainted with the history of his native town, arrives at the same conclusion. These direct testimonies in favor of Cyme are certainly not refuted by such historical notices of Cyme as have reached us. We cannot, indeed, lay much stress on the name of the mythical founder of Cyme, Myrina, identical with Smyrna, because, as we have seen, the worship of this deity was wide-spread before the Hellenic period, and the recurrence of the name simply proves an affinity between the

[1] 1, 4.

Lydians or Leleges who were driven from their homes in the two places by the aggressive Greeks. But the colonizing tendency of the Cymaeans was famous. While Ephesus, during her long and splendid career, never sent forth a single colony, Cyme and Larissa sent forth some thirty. Smyrna was without question one of these. And hence both the Colophonians and Cymaeans claimed Homer as their citizen. The Colophonians, because they took Smyrna; the Cymaeans, because they founded it.

The founder of the town, according to the Aeolic account, was, as we have seen, Theseus, who was sprung from the royal stock of Pherae, in Thessaly. The same family of Admetus are said by Parthenius to have founded Magnesia, on the Maeander; it is a coincidence to which Müller himself calls attention, that Magnesians are named among the founders of Cyme. Thus two entirely independent traditions agree, and guide us back by way of Cyme, to Pherae and Mount Phricion, to the Thessalian and Locrian tribes. Perhaps it will not be going too far to find in a Smyrnaean festival a trace of this Thessalian descent. The chief gymnastic festival of the Thessalian race was the *Ταυροκαθάψια*, a kind of bull-fight, in which the horseman leapt from the back of his horse on the back of a bull, seized him by the horns, and despatched him. On a Smyrnaean monument — of late date to be sure — a representation of this combat is found, and it may be that it was propagated from the earliest times.[1]

The date of the foundation is fixed at the eighteenth year after the foundation of Cyme, or one hundred and sixty-eight years after the fall of Troy, that is, eleven hundred and two years before Christ. From this period a dark gap follows in the history of Smyrna. Of the Aeolic period hardly a vestige is left. And very naturally, since the subsequent Colophonian occupants brought with them their own Ionic traditions, and allowed the memory of Aeolic

[1] C. I. 3212. In the epigram of Antipater (Pseudopl. v. Hom. 1, 4) "Thessaly, the mother of the Lapithae," is mentioned among the birthplaces of Homer; this is also a trace of the Cymaean-Thessalian account of the town of Smyrna.

deeds to die out. During this interval Cyme[1] was engaged in hostilities with the Ionians, and the situation of Smyrna, as the outpost of the Aeolic colonies, makes it not improbable that she often bore the brunt of war. In fact Strabo says she was περιμάχητος ἀεί. From a hint preserved by the Plutarchian[2] author of the life of Homer, we may also infer that the city was occasionally exposed to Lydian aggression; the story ran that about the time Neleus, the son of Codrus, led out the Ionian colonies, Smyrna was on one occasion actually in the possession of the Lydians, under king Maeon; but being hard pressed by the Aeolians, they gave it up. The story is made a little suspicious by the explanation of the name of Homer (from ὁμηρεῖν to follow, because Homer *followed* the Lydians out) which is founded on it. It is to be observed, however, that the author of the life quotes the weighty authority of Aristotle; and there is no improbability in the circumstance itself, or flaw in the chronology to lead us to reject it.

One other historic incident we are inclined to refer to this period, — an attack made by the Chians while the inhabitants were engaged in the rites of Dionysos outside the city walls, in the hope that the town would fall an easy prey in its defenceless state.[3] Contrary to the expectations of the Chians, however, the Smyrnaeans charged vigorously, routed and killed them, and took their ships. This repulse was long dwelt on with civic pride, and commemorated in religious rites; every year in the month of Anthesterion, when the festival of Dionysos took place, a galley was borne in procession to the Agora, in which sate the priest of Dionysos, and a coin[4] of Smyrna, with the impress of a ship's prow, is thought to refer to the same incident. The time of this attack is indeed nowhere mentioned. But in the absence of other chronological determinations, the presumption is in favor of the Aeolic period; in this case it would be an attack of Ionians on Aeolians; while, if we put it later it

[1] Nicol. Dam. fr. 53. [2] 1, 3.
[3] Arist. Σμ. Πολ. I. p. 373; id. Προσφ. I. p. 440; Philostr. Vitt. Soph. 1, 25, 1.
[4] Eckhel. I. 2, p. 553.

would be Ionians against Ionians, a thing not unheard of, to be sure, but yet not so probable. Furthermore, the cult of this Dionysos evidently goes back to the Aeolic period; the inscriptions of the town show that he bore the name of *Βρησεύς* or *Βρεισεύς* (=*Βρισεύς*). The origin of this name was doubtful to the ancients themselves. Some[1] derive it from the name of Brisa, a promontory of Lesbos; others from the verb *βρίζειν*. But all accounts agree in declaring it an Aeolic cult, the chief seat of which was at Lesbos. It belongs, therefore, in the early period of history; and we shall soon learn from a similar anecdote that the Aeolian festival of Dionysos was celebrated without the city walls.

The Cymaeans were famous for the dulness of their perceptions. According to their neighbors they did not know enough to go into the house when it rained.[2] At Smyrna new surroundings and stirring events must have awakened their descendants to a new life. Strangers thronged the streets of the town, and it was the great emporium for all the country round. Thus the harmonizing effect of commerce, the kindly nature of the soil and climate, and the sweet influences of their gentler Ionian neighbors prepared the way for a form of culture, of which we yearn in vain for some history. But though the incidents of that busy and restless time are gone irrevocably, the infinite grace and beauty of its culture are preserved to all time in the Homeric poems.

The increasing power of the Ionians began in time to be felt northward. Nearly on the boundary between Aeolis and Ionia lay the river Hermus, and doubtless they often looked with longing eyes to the fertile strip south of the Hermus, which was wanting to their geographical integrity. Still the accession of Smyrna to the Ionic confederation was not due to any concerted action of the Ionians as a whole, but to the treachery of exiles from a single Ionian city.[3] The Smyrnaeans had sheltered some citizens of Colo-

[1] Steph. Byz. s. v. Βρίσα; Etymol. M. s. v. Βρισαῖος. Cf. also O. Jahn ad Persii scholl. 1, 76.

[2] Strab. 14, p. 622.

[3] Her. 1, 150.

phon who had been banished from their town in a civil dissension; these exiles, watching their chance, while the natives were celebrating the Dionysia outside the town, suddenly closed the gates and gained the mastery. The news of this treachery brought the whole Aeolic league to the assistance of Smyrna, but singular to relate, the twelve cities united were not able to make head against the exiles — unassisted for all that we are expressly told. Probably, however, the Ionic confederation had come to the aid of the exiles, since Herodotus in speaking of the original capture of the town calls them "Colophonian men," but afterward in speaking of the agreement of the two contending parties speaks of "Ionians." [1]

This was the downfall of the Aeolic town. The worsted Aeolians were allowed to take their movable possessions and scatter among the remaining eleven Aeolic towns. Henceforth Smyrna appears in history as the thirteenth town in the Ionic league, to which it was admitted on the motion of the Ephesians.[2]

When did this important transfer take place? Herodotus gives no clue to the time, and Pausanias, whose brief notice is substantially the same with Herodotus, is equally dark. It was evidently before Ol. 23=688, B. C., since Pausanias (5, 8) and Eusebius (Can. Chron., p. 285) mention as the victor in the first boxing-match in the Olympic games one Onomastos, an Ionian Smyrnaean; Pausanias adding that Smyrna had at that time passed over into the hands of the Ionians. We have, therefore, a decided terminus ante quem. But is Ol. 23 the earliest terminus? May it not have occurred long before Ol. 23? There is certainly no proof to the contrary; and there are strong considerations in favor of the earlier epoch. Herodotus speaking in another place

[1] Suidas finds in this compact the explanation of the name of Homer, from *ὅμηρος*, hostage.

[2] Her. 1, 143. Paus. 7, 5, 1. Strab. 14 init. The name ΠΑΝΙΩΝΙΟC (Mionnet, Descr. de Méd. III. p. 207, No. 1124) found on coins of Smyrna probably refers, as Eckhel I. 2, p. 509, has seen, to the Panionian Apollo. Vitruvius, 4, 1, makes an enormous blunder about the incorporation of Smyrna into the Ionic league, which is not worth repeating.

of the Ionian Smyrna, calls it "the Smyrna which was founded from Colophon."[1] Probably this second foundation, so to speak, or colonization, was the occasion on which the population of the city was augmented. Eusebius[2] says "Samos condita et *Smyrna in urbis modum ampliata.*" This event he puts 233 years before the foundation of Rome, i. e., 986 years B. C. If, now, this[3] augmentation of the city was the result of the Colophonian capture — and there is no other period in the history of Smyrna to which it can be referred — we have arrived by a different way at the point Müller labors to establish by the assumption of a colony from Ephesus, namely, we find in Smyrna Ionic men and Ionic ways about the time of Homer. Thus we can explain why his "heart beats with an Ionic beat;" we can find with the critics of antiquity Aeolic usages still lingering in his poems, and yet decide with Aristarchus that these poems are the work of an Ionic hand. We do not overlook what Eusebius himself says (on p. 171) that all Greek chronography before the Olympiads is necessarily uncertain. The precise date, 986, B. C., is by no means certain; but still the great probability remains that Smyrna passed over to the Ionians some three hundred years before the era commonly assumed.

We hear nothing more of the city till the dynasty of the Mermnadae begins to extend the domain of Lydia, and to press hard on the Greek colonies in the west. The first king of the Mermnad line, Gyges, in his war with the Ionians took Colophon. His attack on the allied Smyrna was less successful. He had taken the town, and was already within the walls, when the Smyrnaeans chased him out in a way that became proverbial; "the Smyrnaean fashion"[4] was used to indicate a fierce, invincible onset, a

---

[1] 1, 16.

[2] Chron. Can. p. 153.

[3] Scaliger, Animad. ad Eus. p. 59, is inclined to interpret this augmentation of the city as meaning the Amazonian settlement, which supplanted the Tantalean Naulochon. But in another place (p. 61) he admits that Eusebius, or his translator, has the Ionians in mind: "noster vero velle videtur *ab Ionibus* ampliatam."

[4] Arist. Σμ. Πολ. I. p. 373: *ὥστε καὶ τῶν ποιητῶν ἤδη τισὶ Σμυρναῖον τρόπον τὸ τοιοῦτον εἰρῆσθαι.* The *ποιητῶν*, I think, refers to Mimnermus, who probably used the "*Σμυρναῖον τρόπον*" in his *ἐλεγεῖα.*

charge of the Six Hundred. On the subject of this charge the poet Mimnermus is said to have written ἐλεγεῖα, and a noble fragment preserved by Stobaeus,[1] undoubtedly refers to the valor of the Smyrnaean chief; "not such," he says, "was the valor of that man, as I learned from my elders, who saw him dashing at the thick phalanxes of the horse-fighting Lydians in the plains of Hermus, the ash-bearing hero. Pallas Athene never chid the fierce impulse of his heart when he charged round among the van." The time of this attack is pretty well fixed by a story told by Pausanias; in the second Messenian war, when the Messenians looked on their cause as foregone, Aristomenes and Theoclus held the Smyrnaeans up to them as an instance of what heroic desperation could do. From the context it is evident that Aristomenes is speaking of a recent event;[2] and as he fled from Messenia to Rhodes shortly after, Ol. 28, 668, B. C., Gyges's attack must have been a few years previous.[3]

We know that the allied Colophonians made peace with Gyges after these events. That the Smyrnaeans did is nowhere recorded. But we may infer it from the intimate relations between king Gyges and his favorite Magnes of Smyrna. The subsequent effeminacy of the Smyrnaeans, which Mimnermus hints at, may undoubtedly be traced in great part to the corrupting effect of the Lydian civilization.

At the death of Gyges followed his son Ardys.[4] His long reign was somewhat troublesome to the Greek colonies, but he was himself too much disturbed by his wars with the Cimmerians to annoy the Smyrnaeans. Alyattes, however, after warring with the Medes, and expelling the Cimmerians from Asia, at last succeeded in taking the town.

---

[1] Fr. 12, Schneidewin.

[2] Cf. Palmerii Exercc. p. 388.

[3] Dositheus, in the Lydiaca, fr. 6 Müller, relates an incident of the wars with Lydia. The Sardians who were besieging the town refused to go unless the Smyrnaean women were delivered up to them. A female slave proposed to Philarchus to send slaves in the guise of free women. This led to the establishment of the Ἐλευθέρια at Smyrna, a commemorative festival in which the slaves were drest as free women. Possibly this may have occurred in Gyges's time.

[4] Her. 1, 15 and 16.

Here ends the history of the genuine Smyrna. The Lydians razed the walls;[1] the proverbial insolence and wealth of Smyrna, had, like those of Colophon, been her destruction. Theognis says (1102):

> Ὕβρις καὶ Μάγνητας ἀπώλεσε καὶ Κολοφῶνα
> Καὶ Σμύρνην:[2]

and for several hundred years we hear no more mention of the town. At Strabo's time hardly a vestige of the old Smyrna was remaining. The inhabitants were in part scattered in little hamlets around, in part distributed among the other Ionian towns; many of them went to Colophon, where they were admitted to citizenship. Hence two votes were allowed the Colophonians in the Panionion in case of a tie; and "putting on the colophon" (*τὸν κολοφῶνα ἐπιτιθέναι*) is interpreted by some of the ancients as referring to the vote allowed for Smyrna.[3]

With his usual carelessness about Smyrna, Strabo declares that the town lay in ruins for four hundred years. This would make four hundred years between Alyattes and Antigonus. Now, as the reign of Alyattes certainly does not begin before Ol. 39, 1=620 B. C.,[4] and as Antigonus died 301 B. C., after the battle at Ipsus, we can hardly make out 400 years, taking the extreme limit on each side. Strabo adds, to be sure, *περί*; and yet we are inclined to think there is in the text an error of *τετρακόσια* for *τριακόσια*.

The precise year of the destruction of Smyrna is nowhere given. Mr. Schmitz says vaguely that "Alyattes B. C. 627, destroyed the town." Müller[5] concludes it must have been

[1] Strab. 14, p. 646. Raoul-Rochette (Hist. de Col. III. p. 101) questions this, but he confounds Alyattes with Gyges.

[2] On the *ὕβρις* of the Colophonians Diogen. 5, 79: Κολοφων ἰαῦβρις· ἐπὶ τῶν πλουσίων καὶ ὑβριστῶν. The *ὕβρις καὶ ἀγερωχία* of the later Smyrnaeans is spoken of by Philostr. Vitt. Soph. 1, 25, 2.

[3] Schol. Plat. Theaet. p. 897 Orelli; Apost. 16, 92 Leutsch, Paroem. Gr. II. p. 684.

[4] So Westermann. Others put it later, as Zumpt, Annales, Ol. 42, 2, = 611 B. C.

[5] Greek Lit. p. 115.

in the first part of the long reign of Alyattes. This he infers, first, from the order of the events in Herodotus's narration, Herodotus mentioning the conquest immediately after the battle with Cyaxares, who died 594; and secondly, from Strabo's 400 years, above referred to. How much reliance is to be placed on the 400 years, we have just seen; and with respect to the first argument of Müller it must be observed, that he, as well as other historians, has overlooked two very important passages in this connection, which will incline us to put the date considerably later than it has hitherto been put. Pausanias[1] relates that Bupalos of Chios, made statues of Fortune and the Graces for the Smyrnaeans. Bupalos was a contemporary of Hipponax, as is well known from the anecdotes of the relations between the two; Hipponax flourished Ol. 60, =540 B. C. Bupalos further was engaged in his art in 520 B. C., that is, 74 years after the death of Cyaxares. To suppose, therefore, that he made these statues before Cyaxares's death is an absurdity; still more absurd is it in Mr. Schmitz to put 627 as the probable era of the destruction of the town. Nor is it at all likely that he made the statues for the remnants of the Smyrnaeans, who dwelt in the hamlets around, after the town was destroyed. Assuming, then, that Bupalos practised his art as late as the eightieth year of his life, and that he made the statues referred to in his extreme youth, say when twenty years old, it only carries us back to the year 580, or 14 years after Müller, and 47 years after Mr. Schmitz.

The same era may be deduced from the fragment of Hipponax quoted at the beginning. It is clear from the context that Smyrna was still standing when Hipponax wrote. The period of Hipponax is, to be sure, variously given; but the most authentic accounts set him not Ol. 23, but as we have seen, Ol. 60=540 B. C. Pliny says (36, 4, 2) certum

[1] 4, 30, 4 and 9, 35, 2; in Schneidewin's Phil. 1851, p. 70, an attempt is made by Ten Brink to refer these to Ephesus. An obvious absurdity to suppose that Pausanias would call the Ephesians Smyrnaeans; and secondly, the Nemeses were not worshipped at Ephesus but were at Smyrna.

est LX Ol. fuisse; Proclus says (Chrest. 7) he flourished (ἤκμαζεν) in the times of Dareius, i. e., after 521. If, now, the period of Hipponax's culmination falls in the reign of Dareius after 521 B. C., as Proclus says, he could hardly have written the lines about Smyrna at the time of Cyaxares's death, in 594, or 73 years before the accession of Dareius. From 580 to 521 we have an interval of 59 years, and this is hardly within the range of possibilities. It is just barely possible that Hipponax may have written of the still standing Smyrna in 580, and have lived on to distinguish himself still further after the year 521.[1]

The conclusion, then, to which we are forced is, *that the year* 580 *is the earliest possible date* we can assume for the destruction of Smyrna; and that all the probabilities are in favor of a later date, somewhere between 580 and 560, when Alyattes died. Hence, the error of Strabo, or of Strabo's text, is the more apparent.[1]

In the general destruction of the town the temples seem to have been spared. "Bear this in mind," says Hercules to Philoctetes in Sophocles, "when you waste the land, to respect the possessions of the gods." Examples enough from Greek history show this was a common thing; for instance, when the Argives razed the city of Asine they left standing the temple of Apollo; when Thebes was levelled, in Sulla's time, the temples were left, and remained till the age of Pausanias. The inhabitants of the city, therefore, who remained in the hamlets round, as well as their descendants, had at least one bond of union besides the community of ancient associations; they were united by common deities, common religious observances, common temples. To gather them together again after a lapse of centuries was no difficult task.

We come now to the third great epoch in the history of Smyrna, the Alexandrian town. "Two great and fair cities," says Aristides,[2] "Alexander the Great left as his

[1] Grote's assumption (Hist. of Gr. III. p. 252) that Smyrna must have existed in Pindar's time on account of fragment 115 (not 155, as he quotes it), is totally unwarranted. Pindar must have been speaking of some past event.

[2] Προσφ. Σμ. I. p. 440.

monuments, Smyrna and Alexandria." Whether the new Smyrna was founded by Alexander in person, or by his successors, has been a disputed question in ancient and modern times. The fullest account is given by Pausanias;[1] when Alexander was once on a hunting expedition on Mt. Pagos, and came to the temple of the Nemeses, these deities appeared to him in a dream, and bade him found a city on the spot where he lay, and establish the Smyrnaeans there. The Smyrnaeans thereupon sent to consult the Clarian Apollo, and meeting with a favorable response, they gladly moved into their new abode beyond the Meles.[2]

The same story is given by Aristides[3] in other places, who also mentions the dream of Alexander, and by Pliny;[4] and on the coins of Smyrna it is represented not infrequently.[5]

On the other hand Strabo (14, p. 646) is of opinion that the new city was not founded till the times of Antigonus and Lysimachus. But both Pausanias and Strabo agree in asserting that the new city was at a considerable distance from the old, according to Strabo's estimate, twenty stadia.[6]

These discrepant statements may be reconciled by the supposition that Alexander's plan was carried out by Antigonus, and after him by Lysimachus.[7] But so far as the scanty evidence will allow us to judge, the relations between the Smyrnaeans and Lysimachus were not of the most cordial nature; when he was trying to subjugate the cities of Asia Minor the Smyrnaeans assisted the Colophonians, and the grave of slaughtered Colophonians and Smyrnaeans existed till Pausanias's day on the road to Claros.

---

[1] 7, 5, 1.

[2] *Τρισμάκαρες κεῖνοι καὶ τετράκις ἄνδρες ἔσονται*
Οἳ Πάγον οἰκήσουσι πέριν ἱεροῖο Μέλητος.

[3] Πολ. ἐπὶ Σμ. p. 436 and p. 431. [4] N. H. 5, 31.

[5] Mionnet III. n. 1277, 1296, 1410; Supplém. VI. 1707; Eckhel. I. 2, p. 548.

[6] This point of topography is discussed by Prokesch, Wiener Jahrbb. LXVIII. Anzeigeblatt p. 55, and Welcker, Ep. Cycl. I. p. 147.

[7] Cf. Palmerii Exercitt. p. 346; Hegewisch, Gr. Kolon. p. 21. The passage of Strabo, 13, p. 594, on the city of Ilion, which seems to have had nearly the same fate with Smyrna, is instructive. If the date of the comic poet Diphilus's death were known, it might help to settle this question, since he died at Smyrna;

This makes the story of Lysimachus's participation a little improbable, though not impossible; a parallel may be found in the history of Ephesus, which Lysimachus took, and afterwards adorned with many new buildings. Still the idea of re-building Smyrna looks like Alexander, and accords well with his Homeric tastes; and there is nothing in Pausanias's account to lead us necessarily to reject it.[1] The account of the dream, and indeed of his sleeping at all on Mt. Pagos, while on his way from Sardis to Ephesus, may be merely the embellishments of a later and wonder-seeking age, while the real fact at the bottom may be true. If the picture of the Grace,[2] which Apelles painted for the Smyrnaeans, was the work of the great Apelles, Alexander's contemporary, which there is no reason for doubting, it is certainly a strong argument in favor of Alexander. While we cannot hope, therefore, to decide the question beyond a doubt, the joint evidence of Pausanias, Pliny, and Aristides is not to be rashly set aside.

The plan and adornment of the new town were not unworthy of a kingly hand; Strabo says with enthusiasm "Smyrna is the fairest of all cities."[3] A part of the town was built on the side of the mountain; the greater part, however, was on the plain near the gulf. The streets were laid out in rectangles, and paved; the market-place was laid out in like manner with rectangular lanes, covered with arches, and with a row of shops on each side, after the fashion of a modern Oriental bazaar.[4] Many large and splendid public buildings decorated the streets, such as porticos, the gymnasium, the library, and the Homereum, a hall contain-

---

Scholl. in Aristoph. Proll. III. 85 Dübner. And if it were certain that Antiphanes, the poet of the Middle Comedy, lived at Smyrna (Meinecke I, p. 304), it would be still more decisive.

[1] The objections of Raoul-Rochette, III. p. 121, are truly French.

[2] Paus. 9, 35, 2.

[3] 14, p. 646, καὶ νῦν ἐστι καλλίστη πασῶν. Reiske overlooks this passage in doubting the text of Aristid. Μον. ἐπὶ Σμ. I. p. 425: καὶ λογίων περιηγήσεις ἀναγραφόντων καλλίστην τῶν ἁπασῶν. Aristides obviously refers to this passage of Strabo.

[4] Aristid. Σμ. Πρλ. I. p. 376.

ing a shrine and image of Homer. The harbor could be closed at will. One great defect, however, in the plan of the city is censured by Strabo, the want of subterranean sewers, which made the streets all but impassable in wet weather.

The change in the external aspect of the city was small compared with the change in the character of the inhabitants and their relations to other cities and states. Since the reign of Alyattes whole dynasties had been subverted. Croesus had made the Greeks on the shore of Asia tributaries, and been himself overthrown by the Persians. The Persians in turn had yielded to the new power of Macedonia. The Ionic league still existed, but only in name, not in real significance. Hence, though the Smyrnaeans enjoyed a nominal and sickly autonomy, since the wealth and importance of the city made it a tempting bait for aggression, their only resource lay in the alliances formed with other cities. And, though frequent mention is made of the city in the subsequent history of Asia Minor, it offers little that is interesting, and appears only as a fragment of the changing and crumbling dynasties that followed upon Alexander the Great.

From the silence of the historians it would appear that the growth of the new town was very gradual. For a considerable time the name of the place is hardly mentioned. But Smyrna must have shared the freedom which all Ionia received at the hands of Alexander, and when Ionia was annexed to the satrapy of Lydia, it must have passed through the hands of Menander and Clitus, until it finally fell with the rest of the Ionian states, under the rule of Antigonus. All this, however, is conjectural, and the only special mention of the town is the passage of Pausanias above quoted.

Down to the time of Antiochus Theos another gap occurs. Antiochus restored to the other cities of Ionia their liberty,[1] and appears to have done many good turns to the Smyrnaeans, in requital for which they displayed signal

[1] Joseph. Antt. 12, 3, 2.

loyalty to him, and dedicated a shrine to him and his mother Stratonica.[1]

Smyrna is next mentioned in connection with Seleucus Callinicus, and his war with Ptolemy Euergetes, of Egypt. The participation of the Smyrnaeans in this war is not attested by any historian. An inscription, however, fortunately preserved, informs us that when Seleucus was hard pressed by Ptolemy, and was on his way to Seleucis, the Smyrnaeans showed themselves loyal subjects, and were not intimidated by the approach of Ptolemy's forces to their city. Seleucus showed his gratitude by "confirming the autonomy and democracy of the demos," and by making the city an asylum. Not long after a treaty, offensive and defensive, was made with the Magnesians ad Sipylum, which seems to have lasted till the Roman period.[2] By the terms of this treaty the stronghold of Palaemagnesia was conceded to the Smyrnaeans.

Not long after followed the war between Attalus I., king of Pergamus, and Achaeus, the cousin of Antiochus the Great, which was carried on with various success for five years. In this war the Aeolian cities and those near Aeolis at first yielded through fear to Achaeus; afterwards, however, when Achaeus was absent on an expedition against Selge in Pisidia, Attalus availing himself of the opportunity, went to Aeolis, and gained possession of the Aeolic cities, partly by diplomacy, partly by force. The first who went over to him voluntarily were the cities of Cyme, Smyrna, and Phocaea; and the Smyrnaean ambassadors were received by Attalus with special marks of his regard.[3]

Smyrna is then involved in the great quarrel between

---

[1] C. I. 3137, vs. 8. This was said to have been done at the command of Apollo; Tac. A. 3, 63. The temple which was situated without the walls (C. I. 3156) enjoyed the privilege of an asylum given it by Seleucus Callinicus, till the period of the Roman empire (C. I. 3131, and Tac. l. l.); and was a place of deposit for important public documents; C. I. 3131, vs. 83.

[2] Boeckh on C. I. 3157. The coins of Smyrna mention many alliances with other cities. Plut. de adul. et amic. 22, speaks of aid sent them by the Spartans, the time of which is not known.

[3] Polyb. 5, 77

Antiochus the Great, and Rome. The immediate cause of contention between this monarch and the Romans was the interference of the Greeks with the affairs of the Asiatic cities.[1] Most of the cities were averse to the rule of Antiochus, and yet from fear of an attack, gave in to him. Three cities, however, held out, Smyrna, Lampsacus and Alexandria Troas, and sent for aid to T. Quinctius Flamininus, the Roman commander; and the amity between the Smyrnaeans and the Romans, established on this occasion (196) was preserved inviolate, so that Cicero[2] calls the Smyrnaeans fidelissimi atque antiquissimi socii. Antiochus on his part sent ambassadors to the Roman commander,[3] and was ordered, in reply, "to keep away from the free cities, and not to attack them." The important lead taken by Smyrna at this period among the neighboring towns is attested by the action of Antiochus; he was afraid that, if these cities were allowed their liberty, the cities on the Hellespont would follow Lampsacus, and the Aeolic and Ionic cities would join Smyrna; he therefore sent forces from Ephesus to attack Smyrna.[4] About the same time the Smyrnaeans established the first temple of the city of Rome ever founded by any foreign state.[5]

The siege effected nothing; four years after (192, B. C.), when Antiochus was on the point of crossing over to Europe, he was unwilling[6] to leave these three cities behind him, which he had not been able to take, up to that time, nor to induce to make peace on favorable terms. When the Romans crossed over to Asia two years after (190 B. C.), Antiochus sent Heraclides[7] as an ambassador to P. Scipio. In this embassy the city of Smyrna is mentioned as the cause of the war, and Antiochus volunteered to surrender his claims on the city to the Romans.[8] This, however, was

[1] App. Syr. 1 and 2. [2] Phil. 11, 2. [3] Liv. 33, 34.
[4] Liv. 33, 38. [5] Tac. A. 4, 56. [6] Liv. 35, 42.
[7] Polyb. Excc. Leg. 21, 10; Liv. 37, 34; App. Syr. 29. In the conference before L. Corn. Scipio for deliberation with the citizens of Smyrna and Lampsacus there were present on the part of the Smyrnaeans *οἱ περὶ Κόϊρανον*; Polyb. 18, 35.
[8] Diod. 5, 29, 7.

not satisfactory to the Romans; they demanded that he should not only leave Aeolia and Ionia, but all Asia west of the Taurus. At the conclusion of the war the Smyrnaeans were complimented in the highest terms by the Roman senate for preferring to suffer all extremities rather than surrender to Antiochus, and were rewarded by the adjudication of lands which they claimed as their own.[1] The struggle had indeed called upon the Smyrnaeans for no inconsiderable sacrifices; they had supplied the Romans with ships and auxiliaries,[2] and the gates and walls of the town gave evidence of the violence of the siege down to the times of Aristides.[3]

The friendly relations established in this war between Smyrna and Rome remained ever after unbroken. We find accordingly the Smyrnaeans on the side of Rome in the war with Aristonicus, when Attalus of Pergamus presented his kingdom to the Romans, and Smyrna, like the neighboring cities of Myndus, Samos, and Colophon, appears to have stood another siege;[4] and with the same success, it would appear, as in the war with Antiochus, since Smyrna was selected as the burial place of Crassus, the Roman commander.[5] And soon after, in the Social War, the Romans were indebted to Smyrna for important reinforcements.[6]

Not even the terrors of the Mithridatic wars could shake the Smyrnaean allegiance to Rome. When this monarch had subjugated Phrygia and Mysia, and was on his way to Ionia, the Smyrnaeans closed their gates against him;[7] and when it was announced in the assembly at Smyrna that Sulla was reduced to great straits by the severity of the climate and the difficulties of procuring supplies, all present stript off their garments and sent them to the Roman army.[8]

---

[1] Liv 38, 38; Polyb. 22, 27, 10; Eutrop. 4, 4, 2. [2] Liv. 37, 16.

[3] Περὶ Ὁμ. I. p. 766. [4] Flor. 2, 20; Arist. l. l. [5] Eutrop. 4, 20; Aristid.

[6] Tac. 4, 56. Just before this P. Rutilius was presented with the freedom of the city for defending the provincials against the exactions of the publicani; Cic. Brut 22; p. Balb. 11, 28; Tac. A. 4, 43.

[7] Orosius, 6, 2, p. 241.

[8] Tac. l. l. Aristides adds (Ἐπιστ. περὶ Σμ. 1, p. 766) that the slaughtered

The importance of the town in Cicero's age is attested by him,[1] and Strabo[2] speaks of the Erasistratean school of medicine under Hicesius, as renowned before his day, though he implies it had subsequently died out. In the civil war (44, B. C.) the province of Asia was given to C. Trebonius. The year following Dolabella surprised him with his army, besieged the city, destroyed a great part of it, and slew Trebonius in a night attack.[3]

During the period of the Empire, Smyrna enjoyed to an unusual degree the favor and protection of the imperial court, and in Augustus's time it was accounted among the finest cities of Asia Minor. Augustus was entitled the Founder of the city in consequence of his liberality, and even before his death Tiberius was treated with the customary adulation of the age.[4] On Tiberius's accession to the throne, Smyrna was selected out of all the cities of Asia Minor as the seat of a temple to the emperor, on account of her long-standing connection with Rome.[5] In Pliny's time it was the seat of a conventus juridicus, to which a large part of Aeolia, the Macedones Hyrcani, and the Magnetes ad Sipylum had resort.[6] The schools of rhetoric perhaps contributed more than any external patronage toward the fame of the town in this rhetorical age; rhetoricians and sophists enjoyed at Smyrna an immunity from taxes;[7] it was a sort of university town, to which youths resorted in large numbers from all parts of Asia, Africa and Europe.[8] In the reign of Trajan[9] the citizens received the priestly title of neocori,

---

leader was buried in the city. The relations of Smyrna to Mithridates would assume a different guise if the head on the coin in Mionnet. III. p. 217, were really that of Mithridates, as Visconti, Icon. Gr. ad tab. XLII. thinks. But the Victoria with the crown and palm points rather to Seleucus Callinicus.

[1] Phil. 11, 3. [2] 12, p. 580.

[3] Vell. Pat. 2, 7, 9; Cic. Phil. 11, 15; Strab. 14, 646; Appian. Bell. Civ. 3, 26.

[4] Cf. Boeckh on C. I. n. 3172.

[5] Tac. A. 4, 15 and 56. Arist. Ἐπ. π. Σμ. I. p. 767, gives the vote on this occasion.

[6] N. H. 5, 31; cf. Cic. p. Flacco, 29, 71.

[7] C. I. 3178; Masson, de Aristid. vit. p. cxxx.

[8] Philostr. Vitt. Soph. 1, 21. 5; cf. Arist. Σμ. Πολ. I. p. 376.

[9] The father of Trajan erected the aqueducts at Smyrna; C. I. 3146, 3147.

(*νεωκόροι τῶν Σεβαστῶν* or *θεᾶς Ῥώμης*), an honor that was twice repeated, under Hadrian and Septimius Severus.[1] Indeed Hadrian was so popular with the Smyrnaeans that he was called, like Augustus, Savior and Founder of the city,[2] and an effort was made to call the city Hadriana, after his name.

With all its advantages, natural and others, among which the Christian Church and Polycarp will not be forgotten, Smyrna was subject to the two great scourges of the East, pestilences[3] and earthquakes; in the reign of M. Antonine it was almost overthrown by the great earthquake of the year 177.[4] By the liberality of the emperor, however, it was rebuilt on so extensive a scale that on the whole the earthquake was regarded as a beneficial thing.[5]

The new city of M. Antonine lasted till the division of the Roman Empire, when it was attached to the Eastern Empire. But as all traces of the original Greek city are lost, to pursue the history further would be a fruitless task, and we leave it with this, contented if we have shown that the historical facts are not quite so familiar or so well established as they are thought to be.

---

[1] Krause, Civitt. Neocorae, p. 50.

[2] C. I. n. 3174; Eckhel. I. 2, p. 544; Mionn. III. 1109; Suppl. VI. 1548.

[3] C. I. 3165.

[4] Aristides composed on this occasion his *Μον. ἐπ. Σμ.*

[5] Philostr. Vitt. Soph. 2, 9, 2; Aristid. *Πολ. ἐπὶ Σμ.* I. p. 465; Syncell. p. 353, D. The passage in Aristides, *Ἱερ. Λόγ. γ.* I. p. 497, will perhaps explain the obscure allusion in the Oracula Sibyllina 5, p. 334. Other prophecies on S. are found 3, p. 243; p. 244; 5, p. 311.