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Abstract

Modern historiography on the ancient world has focused in the last few decades on the problems of Greek identity and self-awareness, as well as Greek relations to the non-Greek populations. In the light of the reassessment of the most ancient historical sources, this paper investigates the representation of the Illyrian tribes in the Greek literary tradition. Roman Illyricum was entirely different from Illyria in Hecataeus of Miletus, when it was confined to a small portion of South-East Adriatic coast; Pliny the Elder and Pomponius Mela were probably well aware of this difference. Herodotus offers some interesting historical information, but his text is not so illuminating for the Greek perspective as Thucydides. He speaks of the “great cries” of the Illyrian tribes facing the Spartan army, just like Aristophanes in the Birds compares the hungry barbarian gods to the “shrieking Illyrians”. However, this is only one side of the Greek perspective; it appears from these same authors that the role played by the Illyrian populations in Greek politics was not to be neglected.
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Izvleček

V okviru raziskav problematike grške identitete in stikov Grkov z negriškimi ljudstvi so v članku komentirani najstarejši grški zgodovinski viri, ki osvetljajo eno od negriških ljudstev (ethnos), namreč Ilire. Rimski Ilirik je bil bistveno večji od Ilirije, omejene na majhno območje jugovzhodne jadranske obale, kakršno je pozna Hekataj iz Mileta; Plinij Starejši in Pomponij Mela sta se verjetno dobro zavedala te razlike. Herodot prinaša nekaj zanimivih zgodovinskih podatkov o Ilirih, vendar je za osvetlitev grških predstav o tem ljudstvu zanimivejši Tukidid, ki omenja “strašno kričanje” ilirskih vojakov, ko so napadli spartansko vojsko. Podobno je Aristofan v Ptich primerjal lačne barbarske bogove z “vreščečimi Iliri”. Vendar je to le en vidik grških predstav o Ilirih; iz istih avtorjev namreč tudi izhaja, da v različnih okoliščinah vloga ilirskih ljudstev v politiki grških držav ni bila zanemarljiva.

Kljucne besede: Iliri, grška identiteta, Hekataj iz Mileta, grška geografska tradicija. Herodot, Tukidid

Isaiah Berlin, the English philosopher, wrote that rethinking the 20th century brings forth the feeling that it was “the most terrible century in Western history” (in Agosti, Borgese 1992, 42). In such circumstances the debate over ethnicity and national identity has been, and today still remains an important issue. E. Hobsbawm, in a lecture given on 23 November 1991, said that “every separatist movement in Europe that I can think of bases itself on ‘ethnicity’, linguistic or not, that is to say on the assumption that ‘we’ – the Basques, Catalans, Scots, Croats, or Georgians are a different people from the Spaniards, the English, the Serbs or the
Russians, and therefore we should not live in the same state with them" (Hobsbawm 1992, 4).

On the writing of history (historiografein), Benedetto Croce wrote that "practical need, which is at the base of any historical judgement, grants to every history the characters of 'contemporary history', because, even if the facts that are treated in such a history could appear chronologically remote or distant, it is actually a history always referring to the present needs and situations where such facts spread their vibrations". Considering Croce's words on historiography, as well as Arnaldo Momigliano's teaching, we can easily understand how contemporary history has led many classicists to work on ethnic problems related to the ancient world, both Greek and Roman. Investigations of Greek literature have revealed many facets of such issues. The first Greek author who wrote specifically on the subject of ethnicity and self-awareness is Herodotus. For him Greekness, to Ἑλληνικόν, could be defined in terms of common blood, language, religion, and customs (8.144.2). He not only had to omit political institutions, which differed greatly from one community to another, but also had to place on the same level a variety of issues that can be defined mainly as cultural features (language, religion, and customs). It is widely accepted that the Greek self-definition in Herodotus is an invention of sorts elaborated in the years after the Persian wars. The Greek identity, or rather the Greek identities, changed as they matched the diversity of the actual political and historical situations. Borrowing Catherine Morgan's words (2003), ethnic identity is not a 'natural' condition, but rather a self-conscious statement that adopts selected cultural features as critical markers.

The classification of the non-Greeks, i.e. barbarians, was closely linked to the self-definition: social and political identity is ex definitione egocentric, "we" as opposed to "others" (see e.g. Nippel 1996). The term barbaros, being an onomatopoeic form to denote stuttering (bar-bar), originally referred to those who did not speak Greek or spoke Greek badly. Only in the course of the later opposition to the Persian Empire did it acquire a negative connotation.

In terms of self-definition and identity, the notions of polis and ethnos play a considerable role; the polis is a specific Greek creation, while the term ethnos ("tribe", German "Stamm") is considered a synonym for primitive tribalism, as opposed to the polis. The polarity of these two terms seems to have been already in effect in the Archaic period and persists among the historians of the 5th century BC, Herodotus and Thucydides. The ethnos is sometimes regarded, particularly in German scholarship, as the precursor of the federal state (in Greek: koinon), which evolved in Greece from the 4th century BC onwards. However, we

2 Croce 1938, 5: "Il bisogno pratico, che è nel fondo di ogni giudizio storico, conferisce a ogni storia il carattere di 'storia contemporanea', perché, per remoti e remotissimi che sembrino cronologicamente i fatti che vi entrano, essa è, in realtà, storia sempre riferita al bisogno e alla situazione presente, nella quale quei fatti propagano le loro vibrazioni".

3 Momigliano, who was influenced by Croce (cf. Gigante 2006), is the best representative of this kind of historiography, see his Contributi alla storia degli studi classici e del mondo antico, 1955–1992. As his friend and colleague Moses I. Finley wrote: "No contemporary has devoted so much energy, or contributed so much, to the study and understanding of the western historiographical tradition from its beginnings down to our own day", Finley 1975, 75. Cf. also the interesting discussions in Polverini 2006.

4 See esp. Hall 2000; different conclusions, in particular on Greek colonization, in Malkin 2001; cf. Cartledge 1993; for a more sociological approach, see Ruby 2006; an excellent overview in Freitag 2007.

5 On this famous and debated passage of Herodotus see recently Zacharia 2008 and Funke 2009.

6 The problem of the blood-relationship (ὁμαμος) in Hdt. 8.144.2 is contested; less than a century later Isocrates, in the Panegyricus, considered blood relations as superfluous in the definition of identity and gave priority to the cultural education, especially in his hometown, Athens (4.50). The question of blood relations is better analysed in Roman studies, see Guastella 1985, esp. 84–86 and 113–114; Giardina 1997.

7 For this and other examples of Greek self-consciousness, see Asheri 1997, esp. 23–26.

8 The word βάρβαρος is not attested in Homer, who speaks only of the Carians as βαρβάροφωνοι, Il. 2.867; on the etymology, see DELG, s.v. βαρβάρος, "Il s'agit d'une formation fondée sur une onomatopée". See also De Luna 2003, esp. on the Carians in Homer, 37–44.

9 In addition to the above mentioned bibliography on ethnicity, see Hall 1989.

10 The most important ancient source for such statements is of course Aristotle, see esp. Pol. 1324b–1326b. See Aeschines. 3.110 for the Amphictyonic oaths of the Archaic period; cf. Giovannini 1971, 14–16 with n. 21, 22 for the ancient sources emphasizing the opposition polis-ethnos. For both Herodotus' and Thucydides' use of polis and ethnos, Jones 1996, 319–320.

11 German scholarship bases such theories on its own national history and contemporary politics of federal states, see Freitag 2007, 383–389 with further bibliography. On the so-called Bundesstaaten, see Funke 2007.
should be careful in interpreting the antithesis polis-ethnos within the historical development of Greek language and society.\textsuperscript{13}

In this paper I shall discuss only some aspects of ethnic identity and relations between Greeks and barbarians, focusing on one specific ethnus, the Illyrians, whose role in Greek history has been significant, but at the same time often neglected. Basing my research on the literary, mainly historical, tradition, I will try to offer an account of the knowledge of the ancient Greeks about the world on their northwestern borders during the 6th and 5th centuries BC. Beginning with the earliest mention of the Illyrians in Hecataeus, I will discuss the importance of the Ionian geographical knowledge and its influence on later interpretations. Herodotus offers some interesting geographical information, but he focused on the conflict between the Greeks and the Persian Empire, and there is little about the Illyrians in his Histories. Finally some important passages in Thucydides will be thoroughly analysed.

My paper is not a history of pre-Roman Illyria, but only a historical investigation of those Greek authors who had some interest in the Illyrian tribes and were thus obliged, in one way or another, to mention them. Even if their perspectives were based on certain real information, a modern researcher is faced with major problems in trying to define an Illyrian ethnus or Illyrian ethne. It is in fact quite certain that a homogeneous and centralized Illyrian ethnus did not exist before the 3rd century BC, and an Illyrian state (the \textit{état illyrien} of Fanula Papazoglou) from Bardylis to Gentihow must be regarded as a modern construction. Almost fifty years ago Papazoglou (1965) wrote an important contribution to this issue, but her ideas are far from widely accepted.\textsuperscript{14}

Some preliminary remarks are important: (a) no Illyrian epigraphical text has survived, probably because no such text ever existed; (b) no exhaustive Illyrian “history” has survived, apart from Appian's \textit{Illyrike} (an appendix to his \textit{Macedonian History}), which mainly deals with the Roman conquest of the province later known as \textit{Illyricum};\textsuperscript{15} (c) many works of ancient Greek historians are lost: in Luciano Canfora’s words, we are working on “\textit{un intero infranto}”;\textsuperscript{16} (d) few Greek authors mentioned Illyrian peoples and/or tribes, and much of their works survives only through indirect tradition, i.e. in fragments.

\textbf{ROMAN ILLYRICUM AND THE \textit{Illyrii proprie dicti: THE EVIDENCE OF POMPONIUS MELA AND PLINY THE ELDER}}

In order to grasp the Greek perspective of the Illyrians in the 6th and 5th centuries BC, we have to start from the Roman province of Illyricum that provides, even if only incompletely, geographical and chronological limits.

It is not easy to give a foundation date for Roman Illyricum. According to G. Zippel (1877, 189), who misunderstood Appian (\textit{Illyr.} 10.30–11.30), Illyricum was established around the year 118 BC, that is, after the victorious campaign of L. Caecilius Metellus, consul in 119 BC, against the Delmatae and, as Zippel erroneously thought, against the Segestani. Mommsen (in CIL 3, 279–280) regarded Sulla as the founder of the province, while other scholars ascribed the foundation of Illyricum to Caesar. However, it is hardly possible that a province in an administrative sense of the word ever existed before Octavian's campaign in Illyria in 35–33 BC.\textsuperscript{17} After the Pannonian-Dalmatian uprising (6–9 AD) had been crushed by Tiberius,\textsuperscript{18} the whole region from the Adriatic coast to the Sava and the Pannonian plain, which was probably since ca. 33 BC the official \textit{provincia Illyrica}, was divided into \textit{Illyricum superius} (later Dalmatia) and \textit{inferius} (later Pannonia).

This digression on Roman politics is useful to understand the geographical limits of what was

\textsuperscript{13} Fraser 2009, 4–5 whose acute analysis of these issues should be reconsidered with Bourriot 1976.

\textsuperscript{14} For a reply to Papazoglou’s thesis, see Hammond 1966; Carlier 1987; Cabanes 1988, 87–90; Šašel Kos 2007.

\textsuperscript{15} The mythological introduction of the \textit{Illyriké} contains very interesting but also controversial information on the Greek perspective of the Illyrian world; see a valuable discussion in Šašel Kos 2005, 120–132; on the \textit{Illyriké}, see also Marasco 1993.

\textsuperscript{16} Canfora 2000, viii; see also Canfora 1995, 184–199. On fragmentary Greek histories, see Strasburger 1977, esp. 14–15, where the author gives the astonishing ratio of surviving to lost literature, which corresponds to 1:40.

\textsuperscript{17} See Freber 1993, 125–132, citing earlier literature; for the most recent contribution to the debate, especially on the importance of Illyricum in Caesar’s plans, see Šašel Kos 2000, 283–286; see also Šašel Kos 2005, 238–245.

\textsuperscript{18} The so-called \textit{Bellum Batonianum}, from the name of the leader of the revolt, Bato; on 5–7 November 2009, the conference was held at Zagreb University, titled \textit{Bellum Batonianum MM. Rat protiv Batona: dvije tisuće godina} [The War Against Baton: Two thousand years]; the Acts are forthcoming. See also Sordi 2004.
known in Roman times as Illyricum: it covered a vast territory from the Adriatic to Pannonia and from Moesia to Noricum and the Roman Regio X (Venetia et Histria) (Fig. 1). Pliny the Elder (N. H. 3.139), who also deals with these issues, writes: Arsiae gens Liburnorum iungitur usquem ad flu- men Titium. Pars eius fuere Mentores, Himani, Encheleae, Bulini et quos Callimachus [fr. 107 Pfeiffer] Peucetios appellat, nunc totum uno nom- ine Illyricum vocatur generatim. “The Liburnian people stretch from Arsia to the river Titius. It once included the Mentores, Himani, Encheleae, Bulini and those known to Callimachus as Peucetti; at present these are all called only with the name of Illyricum”. Thus the entire region, which included many different populations, gained the name of Illyricum: from an ethnic definition, Pliny arrives at a geographical connotation.

These were the boundaries of Roman Illyricum, but what do the Latin sources tell us about the Il- lyrians before the Roman conquest? We rely again on the authority of Pliny. In a famous passage on the territory between Epidaurum and Lissos on the Adriatic coast (N. H. 3.144), the Latin ency- clopaedist records: …praeterea multorum Graeciae oppidorum deficiens memoria nec non et civitatium validarum: eo namque tractu fuere Labeatae, Senedi, Rudini, Sasaei, Grabaei; proprièque dicti Illyri et Taulanti et Pyraei retinent nomen19 (“… and also the memory of many a town founded by the Greeks is fading away as well as that of a lot of powerful cities: in this region were situated the Labeatae, Senedi, Rudini, Sasaei, Grabaei, while the Illyrians properly called so, the Taulantii and the Pyraei, retain their names”). Pliny is referring to the regions situated to the north of Epirus, in present-day Albania and Montenegro.

19 The manuscript tradition of Pliny’s Naturalis historia is extremely complicated, especially when we take into consideration the first books where a great number of geographic names are mentioned, as reported in Mayhoff’s edition: “iniqua est negotii critici condicio, ut saepe dubitati- tioni locus relinquuntur, maximeque in his libris primis, qui plus sex milibus nomen geographicorum largissimam errandi et depravandi materiam praebuerunt” (praef. v). For the Latin text I used Mayhoff 1906, but see also the most recent work on Pliny’s third book, Zehnacker 1998.
The reference to the much discussed *proprie dicti Illyrii* finds a parallel in the *Chorographia* of Pomponius Mela, written between 43–44 AD. Mela (2.55–56) writes that *hoc mare* [the Adriatic], *magno recessu litorum acceptum et vaste quidem in latitudinem patens, qua penetrat tamen vastius, Illyricus usque Tergestum, cetera Gallicis Italici<ci>sque gentibus cingitur. Partheni et Dassareti prima eius tenent, sequentia Taulantii, Encheleae [corr. Olivar- ius : encele V]. Phaeaces. Dein sunt *quos propri e Illyrios vocant, tum Piraei et Liburni et Histria.* 20

(“This sea [the Adriatic], situated in a large recess of the coast and widely open in its width, in the place where it penetrates for an extensive stretch, is surrounded until Tergeste by Illyrians and on the remaining sides by Italians and Gauls. Partheni and Dassareti hold its first part, then follow Taulantii, Encheleai, and Phaeaces; thereafter come the properly named Illyrians, the Piraei, Liburni and Histria.”)

Both Pliny and Mela preserve a significant tradition about the Illyrians: in their opinion there was an original tribe called *Illyrii* that occupied just a small portion of the southern Adriatic coast. This could perhaps reveal that the term *Illyrii* originally referred only to a small *ethnos* in the area between Epidaurum and Lissus. 21 There are varied modern opinions on this matter. According to the already quoted Papazolgou (1965), the Illyrians *proprie dicti* would be an obscure reminiscence of the once powerful Illyrian kingdom, while Mate Sušić (1976) believed that the name could refer to the time of Agron and Teuta, whose territory was subdued by the Romans in 228 BC and became a Roman protectorate. 22 Our sources on the *Illyrii proprie dicti* are too scanty to be conclusive, but perhaps something could be understood from the analysis of Pliny’s and Mela’s sources and from the geographic tradition that these two authors collected.

The study of the sources of Pliny and Mela has always been problematic. The reasons are obvious. Pomponius Mela is the first Latin author dealing with geography whose text has been preserved, whereas Pliny used Mela’s text along with many others. Parroni, following Detlefsen, suggested the use of many sources, including Greek ones, transmitted through Latin mediation. 23 To sum many hypotheses up, it may be claimed that Mela had read various authors, from M. Terentius Varro to Cornelius Nepos and perhaps Agrippa’s lost *Chorographia.* It has further been suggested that these authors depended on Greek sources: Apollodoros of Athens, Eratosthenes of Cyrene, Posidonius of Apamea, and the anonymous *Periplus Hannonis* for the coast of Africa. Mela thus indirectly preserved the Greek geographic tradition. 24 Similar sources have been proposed for book III of Pliny’s *Naturalis historia,* except that he also used Mela’s own work and Augustus’ *Commentarii,* describing his Illyrian War. 25 A long tradition of descriptive geography merges in these two Latin works and it is difficult to understand where Mela and Pliny found the reference to the *Illyrii proprie dicti.* In the following pages, along with the analysis of the oldest Greek testimonies regarding the Illyrians, I will also try to answer this last question.

**HECATAEUS OF MILETUS AND THE IONIAN TRADITION**

For a better understanding of the Greek perspective of the Illyrian world, it is necessary to start from the beginning of the ancient geographical tradition, which is represented by Hecataeus of Miletus, the author of *Γενεαλογίαι* (*Genealogies*) and of *Περίοδος Γῆς* or *Περιήγησις* (*Description of the Earth*).

Hecataeus is the first to mention the Illyrians, a barbarian tribe which appears several times in his *Periegesis.* He has been regarded as the founder of Greek historiography, notably by Felix Jacoby, 26

---

20 For the Latin text see Parroni 1984, 143; cf. also the *Belles Lettres* edition, Silberman 1988. The last word of the passage, *Histria,* could perhaps be corrected with *Histri,* as proposed by Ranstrand in his edition of Mela (1971), *ad loc.*; cf. also the perplexities in Šašel Kos 2005, 231; however Parroni 1983, *ad loc.* gives some good arguments to maintain the *lectio* of the *Vat. lat.* 4929.


23 Parroni 1984, 44: “Ma è certo più vero simile che non si debba pensare ad un’unica fonte, bensì a più fonti, anche greche, sia pure giunte a Mela (e Plinio) attraverso la mediazione di quelle latine, come ha mostrato il Detlefsen”; cf. Detlefsen 1877.


26 See Jacoby 1909, 83: “Die griechische Historiographie (...) beginnt mit Hekataios und seinen beiden Werken, den *Γενεαλογίαι* und der *Περιήγησις,* deren Entstehung aus und im Gegensatz zum Epos ein unbestrittenes und unbestümbares Faktum ist”. Thus already Creuzer 1806.
but this opinion has recently been challenged.\textsuperscript{27} Dionysius of Halicarnassus, as well as other ancient writers, regarded Hecataeus only as one of the many historians that preceded Thucydides.\textsuperscript{28} Even if it is possible that Herodotus and Thucydides obfuscated the part that Hecataeus played in the origins of historiography, why should we disregard the opinion of the ancients on this matter?\textsuperscript{29}

What seems to be important is the number of Hecataeus’ fragments: thirty-five belong to the \textit{Genealogies}, while over three hundred belong to the \textit{Periegesis}. This probably means that Hecataeus’ work on mythological matters, even if explained

\textsuperscript{27} Nicolai 1997 and 2007; these matters were already discussed in Pearson 1939, esp. 96–98.

\textsuperscript{28} Dion. Hal. \textit{De Thuc.}, 5, p. 330.7–18 U(sener)–R(ademacher) (= \textit{FGrHist} I 1 T 17a). Jacoby tended to look with suspicion on the ancient treatment of these matters, notably the above mentioned passage of Dionysius.

\textsuperscript{29} Cf. Porciani 2001 who, after an acute analysis, gives little credit to Dionysius: “Tutte le ragioni che abbiamo fin qui esposto tolgo all’informazione antica, ci sembra, il peso dell’assoluta autorità.” 63; Porciani’s concerns with Dionysius, although important, are not relevant to my study.
in a rational way,\textsuperscript{30} was perhaps overshadowed by later logographers and historians like Hellanicus of Lesbos and Herodotus.\textsuperscript{31} The most important and lasting work in the Greek literary and geographical tradition was his \textit{Periegesis}, a fact that is corroborated by Strabo and Agathemerus.\textsuperscript{32} Both Strabo and Agathemerus show how strong the link was between Hecataeus and Ionian science, which provided the impetus for a scientific approach to geography. It is undeniable that Herodotus took a great deal of information for his \textit{Histories} from Hecataeus and similar works on geography. The importance of the \textit{Periegesis} for both literary history and the history of geography is thus evident, and it is not surprising to find so many quotations from it in later works. The role of Hecataeus, and in general the Ionian geographical and scientific tradition, was important both in the fields of historiography and geography. These two fields of knowledge overlapped each other in Hecataeus, thus producing an ambiguity in later writers between historiographical and geographical concepts. Such a tendency can be noticed in the above mentioned text of Pliny (\textit{N. H.} 3.139), or even Mela (2.56, for the term Histria),\textsuperscript{33} and more examples will be cited in the subsequent pages.

Another important preliminary remark in terms of understanding the ancient Greek (and Roman) writing on geography concerns the representation of geographical space. The ancients had a different perception of space, which was more \textit{hodological}, strictly linked to the territory and the routes one had to cover. Our concept of a chartographic space is only a later development, mainly derived from the Italian Renaissance. Pietro Janni raised objections to any modern reconstruction of ancient maps because there is no concrete evidence for them in the sources, and the only authentic copy of an ancient map that has been preserved, the \textit{Tabula Peutingeriana}, seems more likely to be a route map than an example of ancient chartography.\textsuperscript{34}

Texts of authors, preserved \textit{only} through indirect tradition, are difficult to assess. In the case of Hecataeus, the majority of the fragments are transmitted in the geographical lexicon of Stephanus of Byzantium (6\textsuperscript{th} century AD),\textsuperscript{35} of which we possess only a later abridgment (\textit{epitome}).\textsuperscript{36} The epitome quickly gained a greater reputation than the original work, but a manuscript from the 11\textsuperscript{th} century preserves some non-epitomized portions of the text.\textsuperscript{37} This manuscript, along with some passages of the \textit{Excerpta Constantiniana} (10\textsuperscript{th} century)\textsuperscript{38} and the commentaries of Eustathius of Thessalonica (12\textsuperscript{th} century),\textsuperscript{39} makes it clear that a great deal of information, mainly dealing with legends and myths, has been lost, while linguistic formulae and quotations of ethnic names have been extensively preserved in the epitome (cf. Fraser 2009, 321).

David Whitehead (1994) systematically studied Stephanus’ reliability as a compiler by comparing the maps in Gallazzi, Kramer, Settis 2008 and to Talbert 2009, who believes it to be an ancient map and not a 19\textsuperscript{th} century forgery (as Canfora asserts), but thinks that this papyrus offers very little information on ancient chartography.

\textsuperscript{35} Meineke 1849 is the classical edition of Stephanus’ text. In the last few years M. Billerbeck and her team in Freiburg have been working on a new edition; so far only two volumes appeared (Billerbeck 2006 and 2011). I shall cite Stephanus from the Meineke's edition (page and line) and refer to Billerbeck’s by using Greek letters, number and name of the new editor.

\textsuperscript{36} The epitome was made by a certain Hermolaos, γραμματικός in the Court Schools of Constantinople, known only to Suid. ε 3048 Adler: Ερμόλαος γραμματικός Κωσταντινουπολίως: γράφας τήν ἐπιτομήν τῶν ἔθνων Στεφάνου γραμματικοῦ, προσφηνηθείσαν Ιουστινιανῷ ("Hermolaos, scholar of Constantinople: wrote the epitome of the Ethnica of the scholar Stephanus, dedicated to Justinian"). Diller 1938 suggested that Hermolaos might have been a younger colleague of Stephanus; see, however, Honigmann 1929, who regarded the epitome as the work of several epitomators during a long period of time.

\textsuperscript{37} It is the codex \textit{Parisinus Coislinianus} 228, S in Billerbeck’s edition, including the end of the letter Δ and the beginning of E (folia 166–122); the letter E is only reported as an index of the entries.

\textsuperscript{38} In particular in \textit{De administrando imperio} and \textit{De thematibus}, see Billerbeck 2006, 6–7 with the reference to Stephanus’ entries.

\textsuperscript{39} Eustathius used, if not the original text, at least a better edition of the abridgment, see Billerbeck 2006, 34–35, and the \textit{Praefatio} to van der Valk's edition of Eustathius (1971, § 83–84). Differently Fraser 2009, 314, who, however, relied on the outdated study by Knauss 1910 and did not seem to take into consideration van der Valk’s opinions. On Eustathius, in addition to van der Valk’s \textit{Praefatio}, see Wilson 1996, 196–204.
extant historical works such as those of Herodotus, Thucydides, and Xenophon with the quotations in the Ethnica. He concluded that Stephanus is by and large a reliable source; however, Hecataeus can only be judged indirectly. This preliminary analysis of the work of Hecataeus is essential for a better understanding of the fragments involved. Let us now turn to the Illyrians proprie dicti.

As was already pointed out, Hecataeus is the earliest author to have mentioned the Illyrians. It must be emphasized that neither the Homeric poems, nor Hesiod’s extant and fragmentary works mention this ancient people.

The fragments that refer explicitly to the Illyrians are quite scarce: FGrHist 1 F 86 (= 97), 98, 100, 119, 172. Of these, all come from Stephanus except one (F 119), which is transmitted by Strabo (7.7.1 C 321): “Now Hecataeus of Miletus says, regarding the Peloponnesus, that before the Greeks this region was inhabited by barbarians” and he continues: “actually one could say that in ancient times the whole of Greece (ἡ σύμπασα Ἑλλάς) was a settlement of barbarian peoples, if one takes for true the ancient tradition”. Then, after discussing various mythological figures like Pelops and Cadmos, Strabo concludes that “even in the present day the Thracians, Illyrians and Epirotes live on the side of the Greeks (οἱ δὲ Θρᾴκες καὶ Ἰλλυριοὶ καὶ Ῥηγείρωται καὶ μέχρι νῦν ἐν πλευραῖς εἰσίν), although this was more the case in the past than it is today; and indeed most of the territory that is now incontestably Greece is held by the barbarians: Macedonia and certain parts of Thessaly by the Thracians; the upper part of Acarnania and Aetolia by Thesprotians, Cassopaei, Amphilochi, Molossi, Athamanites, all Epirotic tribes”.

Strabo’s statements are indicative of his geographic and ethnic notions of what was Greece. His view does not differ from earlier Greek authors who, while depicting the barbarians, actually described their own archaic and remote history (cf. Prortera 1991). It will suffice to recall Herodotus’ passages on the Pelasgians as the earliest inhabitants of Greece (1.57–58) or Thucydides’ interpretation of ancient customs through the features of the present-day barbarians (1.6.5–6). We have already mentioned the self-awareness of the Greeks vis-à-vis the non-Greek populations. And indeed, the tradition regarding the Dorians invaders, i.e. the Peloponnesians, as opposed to the autochthonous Athenians was debated already in the 6th and 5th centuries BC, and Hecataeus regarded the pre-Dorian tribes of the Peloponnese as barbarians. Strabo’s perspective is already “Romanized” and even though he probably consulted many a work of lost historians and geographers, he cannot be of use for the present study.40 However, it is clear that in his view the Illyrians were semi-peripheral tribes of the Greek world, just like the Epeirotes and Thracians.

Turning now to the other fragments, I shall begin with Hecataeus’ reference to Iapygia: “Two cities; one in Italy and the other in Illyria, as (writes) Hecataeus. The ethnic name is Iapyx, Iapygios and Iapygia”.41

This passage has caused many problems to modern commentators. Hecataeus, or better Stephanus, here refers to the Italian coast and then gives a hint about another Iapygia in Illyria. The first problem is represented by the term polis, which could be an interpolation by Stephanus. In any case, it is difficult to regard these Iapygian poleis as similar to the Greek poleis of the 5th century BC;42 it would be more reasonable to think of a small settlement. There is another polis of Iapygia in Hecataeus’ fragments, Chandane, otherwise unknown (F 88), and we also find the Eleut Choi, an ethnos of the Iapygians (F 87).43 We see here that polis and ethnos are ambiguous definitions already in Hecataeus.

We know of Iapygia as the name of a region corresponding to the peninsula south of the isthmus between Tarentum and Brundisium, which corresponds to the modern Salento in southern Italy,44 but there is no evidence for a polis named Iapygia. It is thus difficult to accept uncritically Hecataeus’ statement δύο πόλεις, “two cities”; probably we must reckon with Stephanus’ direct intervention in the text, which distorted Hecataeus’ diction.

---

40 On Strabo and Illyricum, see Šašel Kos 2005, 240 who stressed that the definition of the region in Strabo, especially in book II, was “very superficially defined” and “intended as a broad geographical orientation”; see also Dzino 2006.
41 FGrHist 1 F 86 apud St. Byz. Χανδάνη, πόλις (writes) Hecataeus; δύο πόλεις, μία ἐν τῇ Ἰταλίᾳ καὶ ἑτέρα ἐν τῇ Ἰλλυρίδι (FGrHist 1 F 97), ὡς ἔκαταν, τὸ ἑθνικὸν Ἴαπνεοῦ καὶ Ἴαπυγίου καὶ Ἴαπυγία.
42 The bibliography on the origins and development of the Greek polis is too extensive to be reproduced here; I shall refer only to the most recent approaches: Murray 2000; Giangiulio 2001; Hansen, Nielsen 2004, esp. 12–22.
43 FGrHist 1 F 88 apud St. Byz. Χανδάνη, πόλις Ἴαπυγίας. FGrHist 1 F 87 apud St. Byz. Χανδάνη, πόλις Ἴαπυγίας.
44 Ἡ Ἰαπύγια δύο πόλεως ἢ τῆς Ἴαπυγίας."
The “Illyrian” Iapygia mentioned in Hecataeus’ fragments (F 86, 97) would suggest that he referred to the Iapodes (or Iapudes) settled from the 9th/8th century BC onwards in present-day Croatia (notably Lika) and western Bosnia. One could even associate the two ethne, Iapygian and Iapodian, as belonging to a same “Urstamm”, thus connecting both sides of the Adriatic Sea. According to Irad Malkin, the Strait of Otranto connected, rather than separated, the Greeks and non-Greeks. The idea that the Adriatic coasts did not communicate was a later concept developed in the early Byzantine world and subsequently enhanced during the domain of the Ottoman Empire. However, several difficulties arise, such as the fact that the Iapodes were a tribe settled in the hinterland, not directly on the coast, or the great distance between the Straits of Otranto and the Iapodian regions in the north. Moreover, no other passage of Hecataeus places Iapygia on the eastern Adriatic coast, and it is thus difficult to see any direct reference to the Iapodes in F 86 (and F 97).

Coming back to Iapygia in Hecataeus, Lionel Pearson ascribed its mention to Stephanus, although it is probable that already Hecataeus had an erroneous perception of the Adriatic and its length. His inaccurate information was taken for granted in the later tradition. This same tradition survived partly in the Ethnica of Stephanus. Regrettably, other relevant passages were omitted from the epitome.

Other fragments in Stephanus are even less clear and offer few elements for inquiry. However, the comparison with other lemmata in the Ethnica could cast some light on the historical value of our source.

The Chelidonians, mentioned in Hecataeus’ Periegesis of Europe, are regarded as an Illyrian ethnos situated north of the Sesarethians. Of these Sesarethians, Hecataeus seems to have known a polis, Sesarethos, in the territory of the Taulantii. The Taulantii are mentioned in Stephanus as an Illyrian people, but the Ethnica does not preserve any reference to Hecataeus’ Periegesis. The Abroi may have been a Taulantian ethnos settled in the Adriatic; they are called neighbours of the Chelidonians.

These are Hecataeus’ fragments, which seem to belong to a context of description of the Illyrian peoples. With the exception of the Taulantii, all the names of the other Illyrian tribes mentioned above are preserved only in Hecataeus. The Taulantii, on the other hand, are very well known to the Greeks from Thucydides to Procopius of Caesarea; this is probably the reason for the lack of a quotation from Hecataeus in Stephanus: his authority had been superseded. The ancient sources generally locate them near Epidamnus and Apollonia in Epirus (Thuc. 1.24.1; Ps.-Scyl. 26, p. 32–33 Müller; Strabo 7.7.8 C 326; etc.). A further note on the ethnic name Chelidonians should be added. An Oxyrhynchus papyrus (P. Oxy. 2389) bears a commentary on the Parthenion by the lyric poet Alcman. In spite of the poorly preserved state of the papyrus,
some fragments lead us to consider a geographical context in northwestern Greece because it mentions the Aetolians, Molossi of Epirus, Chaonians, and Thesprotians. Claude Calame in his edition of Alcman (1983), has proposed to integrate col. II, 6 (11) with χ[ελι]δών, thus interpreting it as an ornithological metaphor common in lyric poetry and especially in Alcman: the swallow, in Greek χελιδών, was a synonym for sweetness and charm in Homer, Anacreon, and Simonides, but gained a negative connotation in later authors, such as Aeschylus and Aristophanes, who compared it with the meaningless speech of the barbarians. It is thus interesting to link this papyrus to Hecataeus’ fragment (F 100) and to the negative perception of the Illyrians as barbarian tribes.57

It is difficult and probably superfluous to try to give the fragmentary historiographical data from Hecataeus a real geographical frame, but we can clearly see the interest of this author for the Adriatic and Illyrian regions. Furthermore, it is important to stress that if later authors, such as Thucydides and Strabo, regarded these tribes unanimously as barbarian tribes,57 Hecataeus seems to distinguish between separate ethne.58

There are more lemmata in Stephanus quoting Hecataeus’ authority, such as Oidantion, a polis of the Illyrians, mentioned in the thirty-eighth book of the Philippica of Theopompus, for which Hecataeus gives the ethnic name, Oidantes.59 On the one hand, it has been demonstrated by Jacoby that Theopompus mentioned this polis in the description of Philip’s war against the Illyrian Pleuratos;60 the other, we can only suggest that Hecataeus, when mentioning the ethnic name, meant an Illyrian tribe.

Finally, Hecataeus refers to a polis Organe on the river Istrus (the ancient name of the Danube), to which Stephanus remarked that a similar polis, called Orgomenae, was situated in Illyria.61 Possibly he preserved Hecataeus’ comment; however, nothing is known of this polis.

Despite the fact that so little has been preserved of Hecataeus’ knowledge of the Illyrians, his fragments indicate that there was some interest in the Adriatic and Illyrian regions, and that the Ionians had a wide geographical competence even if it often did not correspond exactly to actual geographical data. However, if the Illyrian tribes mentioned in Hecataeus are placed in a geographical context, their territory seems to have been restricted to the hinterland of Apollonia and Epidamnus and, in the north, up to Lake Shkoder or even further north (fig. 3). We have previously discussed the passages by Pliny (3.144) and Mela (2.55–56) on the Illyri proprie dicti.62 In these authors, the Taulantii and the Illyrians are two distinct ethne, while Hecataeus’ fragments had already been contaminated, and it is no longer clear what should actually be ascribed to Stephanus’ geographical and cultural overlapping: the fact that the lemma on the Taulantii (St. Byz. 607.14–17) lacks the name of Hecataeus could be due to Stephanus’ use of later sources. However, it may be suggested, with great caution, that what Pliny and Pomponius Mela knew of the Illyri proprie dicti could be indirectly derived from Hecataeus’ Periegesis, known to some of their Latin sources.63 In fact the area where the Latin authors situate those primigenial Illyrians is very similar to the place where Hecataeus locates them. Only

56 Calame 1983, 70–71, fr. 24; for the interpretation, see 392.
57 According to Antonetti 1995, the commentary preserved in P. Oxy. 2389 contains much information from Theopompus of Chios, a historian of the 4th century BC with wide ethnographical interests: it is clear from the remaining fragments that Theopompus dealt with the Illyrians in his Philippica (see Flower 1994, 119–121). Data on peripheral areas of the Greek world in the papyrus could thus belong to a 4th century framework.
59 FGrHist 1 F 98 apud St. Byz. 485.1–2: Οἰδάντιον, πόλις Ἰλλυρίας. Θεόπομπος (FGrHist 115 F 182) Φιλιππικῶν τριακοστῷ ὀγδόῳ ὄνομα, τὸ ἐθνικὸν Οἴδαντες, ὥς φησιν Ἐκαταῖος. In Herodian’s Catholike prosodia, a work belonging to the age of Marcus Aurelius, one can read: Οἰδάς οἱ κατοικοῦντες Οἰδάντιον πόλιν Ἰλλυρίων, ὥς φησιν Ἐκαταῖος, Lentz 1867, 54. However, this is not another fragment of Hecataeus because the Catholike prosodia as we read it in Lentz 1867 is a patchwork by its editor; the first part of the quotation comes from a fragment of Choroboscus, which Lentz found in Gaisford’s edition of the Canones of Theodousius (1842), page 34, while the second is the verbatim quotation of St. Byz. 485.1–2. On Lentz’s method and on the misusage of his edition, see Dyck 1993.

60 FGrHist 115 F 182, Kommentar, 381–383. For Philip’s campaign against the Illyrians see Diod. 16.69.7; Trog. prol. 8; Just. 8.6.3 and in particular Didym. in Demosth. 12.64 – 13.2 Harding. For the discussion of this last source, see, in addition to Jacoby’s Commentary, the last edition of Didymus’ text in the Berlin papyrus (P. Berol. 9780): Harding 2006, esp. 239.
61 See above.
62 On Pliny’s and Mela’s sources, see above.
with the Roman intervention in the eastern Adriatic, and especially after Octavian’s Illyrian War of 35–33 BC, the name of a small tribe or group of tribes would eventually define a region which, as N. Vulić (1914) wrote, “erstreckte sich ungefähr vom Adriatischen Meere bis zum Morawafüssle (...) und von Epirus bis zur mittleren Donau.”

What we certainly do miss in Stephanus’ epitome is any ethnographical hint about the Illyrians. What remains of Hecataeus’ *Periegesis* offers only some scanty geographical information. If in Stephanus the word *ethnos* bears almost invariably a tribal connotation, for the λογογράφοι and λογοποιοί of the Archaic and Early Classical periods what was important was the location of the tribes, not the tribes themselves (Fraser 2009, 5). Therefore we should turn to the writings of later historians, starting with Herodotus, in order to have a better view of the Greek geographical notions and their perspective.

**HERODOTUS’ GEO-ETHNOGRAPHICAL INTERESTS**

The historian regarded by Cicero as the “father of history” (*De leg. 1.5*) mentions the Illyrians in heterogeneous contexts. Herodotus’ interests in ethnography and in the customs of non-Greek communities are a familiar fact to anyone who has read even only portions of his text. It has been proved that Herodotus knew of both the *Periegesis*...
and Geœalories of Hecataeus. 65 Behind Herodotus, born in Halicarnassus on the southeastern coast of Asia Minor, there was a tradition of Ionian knowledge, which he inherited and assimilated in his own work.

The first mention of certain Illyrians occurs at the end of book I (1.196.1). There Herodotus, explaining the Babylonian custom of the annual sale of young girls ready to get married (αἱ παρθένοι), remarks that the same custom exists among the Illyrian Eneti (τῷ καὶ Ἰλλυρίων Ἐνετῶν πυνθάνομαι χρᾶσθαι). Apart from this, the only other mention of the Eneti in Herodotus occurs in the fifth book. This time the context is completely different (5.9): an excursus about the northern regions (πρὸς βορέω) to the river Istros and further, a region described as desolate and boundless. Herodotus refers to the Sigynni, that live on the Adriatic

and boundless. Herodotus refers to the Sigynni, a tribe that lived beyond the Istros (μοῦνοις δὲ δύναμαι πυθέσθαι οἰκέοντας πέρην τοῦ Ἴστρου, τοῖσι οὔνομα εἶναι Σιγύννας). After a century BC (see Hecat. FGrHist 1 F 36b, 127, 300, 302b, 324b).

and for his text; nevertheless, see for the Ἀδρίας as the innermost part of the Adriatic s.vv. Λιβυρνοί (415.7–8) and Ἀδρία (α 65 Billerbeck), but cf. Ἀβροί (α 14 Billerbeck), while for the Ἰόνιος κόλπος as the whole Adriatic as well as only the southern part of the Ἰόνιος κόλπος the sea around Epi-

damnus and Apollonia (6.127.2) and refers to the Ἰόνιος κόλπος as the whole Adriatic as well as only the southern part of it, s.v.Τἰτορος (340.22), Καυλικοῖ (369.12–13), Τίρικος (709.16).

66 See the monumental article of Jacoby 1913, esp. § 29, 419–467; most recently, Nicolai 2007. The fragments of Hecataeus in Herodotus are FGrHist 1 F 36b, 127, 300, 302b, 324b.

67 Mainly Strabo’s data, see 12.3.8 C 543 and 25 C 553, cf. 5.1.4 C 212; in the codex Marc. gr. Z.454 (= 822), the famous Venetus A of the Iliaod, a marginal note to 2.852 gives δια τῆν ἑράκτον κράτησιν ἕκαστην Ἐνετῶν καὶ Ἁλπινῶν Ἀγροτεράων, “The Paphlagonians were led by the strong-hearted Pylaimenes from the land of the Eneti, the place where the wild mules come from.”

68 See Asheri, Antelami 1988, 380; there is an English translation of this commentary revised by the authors: Asheri, Lloyd, Corcella 2007, 210. For the fifth book, see Nenci 1994, 165. See also How, Wells 1912, 4, where the authors regard the mention of the “Ενετοὶ on the Adriatic” as different from Homer’s Paphlagonian Eneti and at the same time maintain that Herodotus believed them to be Illyrians.

69 Clearly we cannot judge Hecataeus’ data objectively, for, as has been repeatedly stated, we possess almost only the Ethnica for his text; nevertheless, see for the Ἀδρίας as the innermost part of the Adriatic s.vv. Διβρονοί (415.7–8) and Ἀδρία (α 65 Billerbeck), but cf. Ἀβροί (α 14 Billerbeck), while for the Ἰόνιος κόλπος as the whole Adriatic as well as only the southern part of it, s.v.Τἰτορος (340.22), Καυλικοῖ (369.12–13), Τίρικος (709.16).

70 Herodotus calls Ἰόνιος κόλπος the sea around Epidamnus and Apollonia (6.127.2) and refers to the Ἰόνιος πόντος as the whole Adriatic (7.20.2); Ἀδρίας, iconic form of Ἀδρίας, seems always to refer to the far northern part of this sea (1.163.1: οἱ δὲ Φωκαιέες τῆς Μικρᾶς Ἀδρίας παρθένῳ ἐκσκέψις αὐτῶν, καὶ τοῖς ἄχρι πρὸς Ἀδρίας, καὶ τὴν Τύρσην, καὶ τὴν Κυκλάδα, καὶ τὸν Πελάγην καὶ τὸν Ἀδριατικόν βαθύνατο). A similar tale is narrated in Vergil’s Aeneid (1.242–246) and reported by Livy (1.1–3) who says that Antenor and his people after the fall of Troy venisse in intimum maris Hadriatici sinus, “came to the most interior part of the Adriatic gulf”. Here Strabo, Vergil and Livy are talking about the same region, Venetia, part of the Augustan 10th Italian region, later called Venetia et Histria.

The most recent commentaries on Herodotus tend to equate the two passages that mention the Eneti (1.196 and 5.9), regarding them as a reference to the Veneti in northern Italy. 68 But such an approach does not take into account that Herodotus gives two very different definitions of the Eneti. The solution lies in the terminology used to denote the Adriatic Sea. In the 6th and 5th century BC the term Ἰόνιος κόλπος seems to refer to the entire Adriatic, while Ἀδρίας, deriving its name from the polis of Adria founded in the 6th century BC (see Hecat. FGrHist 1 F 90), denotes only the northern part of this sea: such seems to be the opinion of Hecataeus69 and Herodotus.70

altered the Homeric text and wrote an adjective in place of the ethnic name.

65 See the monumental article of Jacoby 1913, esp. § 29, 419–467; most recently, Nicolai 2007. The fragments of Hecataeus in Herodotus are FGrHist 1 F 36b, 127, 300, 302b, 324b.
Only from the 4th century onwards, in conjunction with the rising prosperity of Adria, Ἰόνιος κόλπος denotes the Gulf of Otranto while Ἀδρίας refers to the whole Adriatic Sea.71

After these considerations, we understand that Herodotus, when speaking of the Ἐνετοὶ ἐν τῷ Ἄδρια, is referring to a population in the upper part of the Adriatic, just like Strabo (κατὰ τὸν μυχὸν τοῦ Ἀδρίου) and Livy (in interitu maris Adriatici sinus) when talking of the migrations of the Eneti. Thus, when Herodotus speaks of the Ἰλλυριῶν Ἐνετοί, he wants to distinguish them from the other Eneti who live in the far north. This is the opinion expressed by Hans Krahe in a short paper (1939), where he also adduces a passage in Appian (Mith. 55 [§224]) that mentions the Eneti, together with the Dardani and Sinti, as a population residing in the region around Macedonia (Ἐνετοὺς καὶ Δαρδανέας καὶ Σιντοῦς, περίοικα Μακεδονῶν ἔθνη).

Apart from Herodotus and Appian, two historians with ethnographic interests, there is also Eustathius of Thessalonica who, in his commentary on the Iliad, informs us that the Ethnica of Stephanus spoke of some Eneti among the Triballi, a people settled north of the Illyrians.72 The extant text of the Ethnica does not preserve this information, but we have already seen that Eustathius consulted, if not the original, a much better version of Stephanus’ work. So we know that both Herodotus and Appian mentioned the Eneti, as did also a source of Stephanus of Byzantium, which we know from Eustathius.

From these observations we can conclude that Herodotus knew of a group of Illyrians called the Eneti – also known to Appian – whose boundaries could be identified in the southeast with the Dókima and in the west with the Gulf of Otranto and the Adriatic Sea (cf. Prosdocimi 1965–1966, 567–568). It is not clear where exactly Herodotus places these Illyrians, or whether he identified all the tribes on the eastern Adriatic coast as Illyrians.

We only know that he regarded the customs of the Illyrians called Eneti to be in some way similar to those of the Babylonians.

If these passages give only a partial geographical definition, a reference to the tributaries of the Istros can offer a better evaluation (4.47–50). In the long list of these rivers, which make the Istros the largest of all the rivers known to Herodotus (Ἰστρός μὲν ἔων μέγιστος ποταμὸν πάντων τῶν ἡμεῖς ἴδομεν), there is also a reference to the Illyrians: “from the territory of the Illyrians the river Angros runs to the wind of Borea [i.e. the north] and flows into the Triballian plain and the river Brongos; the Brongos eventually flows into the Istros”.75

The location of the rivers and the plain mentioned in the text can help us to understand the location of the Illyrians. The geographical position of the Angros river and of the Triballi has been a matter of debate over the past few decades. The Balkan tribes in pre-Roman times were studied by Fanoula Papazoglou (for the results of her investigation, see fig. 4). In her opinion the Triballi lived on the west bank of the Istros, and the Angros River can be identified with the modern western Morava River which flows into the Great Morava at Varvarin (Serbia). The Great Morava would correspond to Herodotus’ Brongos.74 Theodossiev, who based his thesis almost entirely on archaeological evidence, believed that the Angros should correspond to the present-day southern Morava, and the Triballian tribes should be located further to the south.75 The Triballi are mentioned in many subsequent sources, particularly for their wars against Philip II and Alexander.76

In order to grasp the reliability of Herodotus’ information, one should inquire which were his sources; these can be grouped into two categories: (a) passages where no direct source is mentioned, but where the identity of the source can be inferred, and (b) passages introduced and concluded by a common formula (like “it is said” λέγεται, or “they

---

71 Hdt. 4.49.2: Ἐξ Ἰλλυριῶν δὲ ῥέων πρὸς βορὴν ἄνεμον Ἀγγρος ποταμός ἑσβάλλει ἐς πεδίον τὸ Τριβαλλικὸν καὶ ἐς ποταμὸν Βρόγγον, ὁ δὲ Βρόγγος ἐς τὸν Ἰστρὸν.


73 For the collection of the ancient sources on the Triballi, see Papazoglou 1978.
say "λέγουσιν") suggesting a direct dependence.\textsuperscript{77} The German Quellenforschung on Herodotus produced the best results with Jacoby’s Quellenanalyse des Werkes (§ 29), which is a masterly investigation of the sources of the Histories book by book.\textsuperscript{78} Nevertheless, such an approach is no longer practised in contemporary scholarship and we should speak of “intertextuality” rather than Quellenforschung (cf. Hornblower 2002). Furthermore there is a complex geographical system in Herodotus that does not always correspond to the actual facts, but has an intrinsic “reality” in Herodotus’ own world: indeed, we should regard each author as “his own best interpreter.”\textsuperscript{79} Herodotus’ knowledge of the

\textsuperscript{77} See Hornblower 2002. The number of studies on Herodotus are, as one might expect, ever growing; a vast bibliography can be found in Bakker, de Jong, van Wees 2002.

\textsuperscript{78} See Jacoby 1913; the author states that the description of the river system at 4.46–58 is not conceivable without the employment of a map ("Ohne Benutzung einer Karte nicht denkbar ist der Abschnitt über die Natur des Landes"), 432, but see above the considerations of Janni 1984.

\textsuperscript{79} This maxim was generally thought to come directly from the Alexandrian grammarian Aristarchus in this form:

---

**Fig. 4:** Ancient hydrography and the Triballi (Papazoglou 1978, insert).

**Sl. 4:** Ozemlje Tribalov in reke, ki pritekajo iz Ilirika (Papazoglou 1978, pril.).
tributaries of the Istron seems to be quite specific, but cannot guarantee an accurate geographical description. This leads to the conclusion that we are probably asking too much from Herodotus. What we do infer from this historian is that the Illyrians were situated south of the Triballian territory. Trying to go further in our inquiries would only lead us far from the evidence and onto the slippery ground of speculation.

Herodotus in the eighth book again talks about the Illyrians, this time in relation to the Macedonian royal family. Referring to Alexander's ancestors, the historian says that "the seventh progenitor of this Alexander is Perdicas, who is the founder of the Macedonian royal house in the following way: three brothers, Gauanes, Aeropos and Perdicas, descendants of Temenos, fled from Argos to the Illyrians, and then from the Illyrians went to upper Macedonia and to the city of Lebaea." The narration goes on with the deeds of the three brothers for the king of Lebaea, the doubling of the bread, the solar symbology, Midas's gardens, and other fantastic elements. This tale of the origins, "favola delle origini," as D. Asheri has called it, has a clear political aim: Herodotus, who probably got his information in Macedonia, refers to the Argeads as a dynasty of Greek origins, thus presenting Alexander as a true Greek descendant of Temenos, a Heraclid. These were matters of great importance to the Macedonian kings in the age of the Persian wars and later in the 5th century, since claiming a Greek forefather meant also that they could legitimately rule over Greek cities, as did Philip II and his son Alexander. Another tradition, which can be ascribed to the 4th century, reports a very similar tale again concerning the Peloponnese and the Heraclids, and implying the Greekness of the Argead monarchy; only the name of the mythological ancestor is different, Caranos. However, of all the ancient sources, only Herodotus mentions the Illyrians having been implicated in the foundation myth of the Macedonian monarchy. In the 4th century, when the clashes between Macedonians and Illyrians were much stronger and the need for a complete integration in the Greek world was essential, the presence of a non-Greek tribe in the foundation mythology could have been regarded as embarrassing.

The Illyrians appear finally in another passage of the historian from Halicarnassus, Mardonius, before the battle of Plataea (9.42), asked all the Persian and Greek commanders of his army, whether anyone knew of some prediction about the fate of the Persians in Greece. Since nobody answered, Mardonius himself reported that if the Persians were to plunder Delphi, they would be annihilated by angry gods. "I know", says Herodotus, "that this oracular response, which Mardonius thought to be meant for the Persians, had been given to the Illyrians and the Encheleian army, not the Persians." Writing many years after the end of the war, Herodotus knew perfectly well, as all the Greeks did, how the battle of Plataea had ended. He also knew that the Persians had not plundered the Delphic sanctuary. Therefore when he re-

83 On the political value of the Heraclids, see the excellent commentary of Huttner 1997, particularly for Philip and Alexander, 65–123.
84 The first to report this tale was Theopompus (FGrHist 115 F 393), who was directly involved in the politics of 4th century Macedonia; see also the historian Marsyas, FGrHist 135–136 F 14; Iust. 7.1.7 (deriving probably from Theopompus); Plut. Alex. 2.1; Suid. κ 356 Adler. On Caranos see Momigliano 1931, who proposes to read in the name Κάρανος, or better Κόρανος in Macedonian dialect, not the name of a sovereign, but the transformation into a proper name of a royal title; see for this opinion and for further bibliography Mari 2002, 159–163.
85 For the sources and a historical analysis, see Landucci Gattinoni 2004, 23–52.
86 Hdt. 9.43.1. Τούτον δ' ἐγώει τόν χρησμόν, τόν Μαρδώνιον εἶπε ἐς Πέρσας ἔχειν, ἐς Ἡλλώνδους τε και τῶν Ἐγγέλεων στρατον ὁδόν πεποιημένον, ἀλλ' ὡς ἐς Πέρσας.
87 He knew, however, of a story implying an unsuccessful attempt to plunder the sanctuary in 480 BC (Hdt. 8.35–39): this was probably an official (and fictitious) version that Herodotus heard in Delphi.
ported Mardonius’ words, he had to intervene in the dispute and tell his audience the correct interpretation of the oracle: it was intended for the Illyrians and the Enchelei.

The Herodotean revision of the facts has its roots in the Delphic sanctuary itself. Before and during the Persian wars, the Delphic oracle maintained an ambiguous attitude towards the Persian Empire, an attitude which could be considered philobarbaros by some Greeks. Mardonius’ interpretation might have circulated among the Greek elite and it was therefore necessary to reassess the credibility of the sanctuary by giving the “amended” version of the oracle.

A significant marker of the importance of the Illyrians and the Enchelei is their presence in the oracular context at Delphi. The Persians, Illyrians and Enchelei were always named with the same word by the Greeks: βάρβαροι. We have already met the Enchelei in the description of the Illyrian coast in both Pliny and Mela, and they are mentioned in other sources, always as Illyrians.91 Herodotus also seems to be talking about two different peoples. The text says ἔς Ἰλλυριούς τε καὶ τὸν τῶν Ἐγχελέων στρατόν. 90 Hecataeus, however, seems to have had a different opinion: he reports that the Dexari, a Chaonian ethnos, who were settled near Mount Amyros (modern Tomor, in Albania), lived in the vicinity of the Enchelei.92 Herodotus also seems to be discussing the Illyrians in the fragmentary passages in the Histories where, after the famous mention of the Cadmeian letters (γράμματα) at 5.58, Herodotus speaks of a certain Laodamas, a son of Eteocles, who held power in Thebes, and remarks that during his reign “the Cadmeians where expelled by the Argives and moved towards the Enchelei”93. There is no reference to any Illyrian affiliation.

In conclusion, Herodotus, and probably Hecataeus before him, knew of the Enchelei as a people from the north, but did not regard them as Illyrians. It is not an easy task to elucidate the historical veracity of the Cadmeian legend, but at least it may be inferred that Herodotus knew a version of this myth and that he speaks on the one hand of the Illyrians, and on the other of the Enchelei.

There is lastly a fragment of Sophocles’ Triptolemus, staged in 468 BC, which mentions some Ἰλλυρίς γονῆ, “of Illyrian birth”.94 The context of the fragment is probably the moment when the goddess Demeter sends forth Triptolemus on a magic chariot drawn by dragons with the task of spreading the plough and the art of agriculture among all the people on the Earth.95 Even if the tragedy is no longer extant, we can assume that this is the earliest mention of the Illyrians in a poetical context; what it shows us about the Greek perspective relating to this tribe is only meagre evidence. Whether there was any link between the staging of the Triptolemus and the mention of the Illyrians in the Histories, is a question that will remain unanswered.

On the basis of the Herodotean text, we can only speak of the Ἰλλυρίς as an ethnos, not as a region. Herodotus never mentions an Ἰλλυρία (or Ἰλλυρίς) as we have seen in Hecataeus (although Stephanus’ intervention in the text should be borne in mind). It is difficult to identify a precise ethnical and/or geographical categorization: all we know about the Illyrians in Herodotus is that they were barbarians inhabiting a region on the northern, or better northwestern edge of Greece.
THE “SHRIEKING” ILLYRIANS: BETWEEN REALITY AND REPRESENTATION

In all eight books of Thucydides’ Peloponnesian War there are only two passages bearing an explicit reference to the Illyrians, and both are also implicitly important for our study.

The first refers to the beginning of the war and to its causes: the affair of Corcyra.96

Thucydides starts his narration with the geographical description of Epidamnus: “It is a city on the left entering the Ionian gulf; neighbours of this city are the barbarians Taulantii, an Illyrian tribe” (1.24.1: ἔπειτα μὲν ἐστι πόλις ἐν δεξιᾷ ἐσπλέοντι ἐς τὸν Ἰόνιον κόλπον· προσοικοῦσι δ’ αὐτὴν Ταυλάντιοι βάρβαροι, Ἰλλυρικὸν ἔθνος).97 Dionysius of Halicarnassus (Comp. 4.27, p. 18–19 U–R) regarded the style of this passage as direct (ὀρθός) and suited for forensic oratory (ἐναγώνιος); U–R) regarded the style of this passage as direct

We cannot be sure that Thucydides acquired this information from a periplus, but we are aware of the importance of these facts for the development of the subsequent actions.

96 An overview on the relations between Corinth and Corcyra in Salmon 1984, 270–280.
97 The terms ἐν δεξιᾷ ἐσπλέοντι ἐς τὸν Ἰόνιον κόλπον emphasize the hodological aspect of ancient geographical perception, see above.
98 Cf. Ps.-Scyl. 26, p. 32–33 Müller: Ταυλαντίων δὲ ἐστὶ τὸ Ἰλλυρικόν ἔθνος, ἐν ψ’ ἐπειδάμνου ἐστὶ, καὶ ποταμὸς παρὰ τὴν πόλιν παραφθαὶ κτλ. (“the Taulantii are an Illyrian ethnos, where Epidamnus is situated; a river flows near the city etc.”). The source of Thucydides could have even been Hecataeus, as Hammond 1967, 449 suggested. For the “Homeric” opening see Hornblower 1987, 116.
99 On the foundation of Epidamnus and the importance of the oikistes from Corinth, see Malkin 1987, 132–133, and 204 ff., for the founders in the Greek colonization. On the stasis at Corcyra, see also Intrieri 2002.

In fact, the instability of the political situation in Epidamnus in recent times was a significant issue: “After the internal struggles which lasted, as they say, for many years, a war against the neighbouring barbarians was disastrous for them and the city was deprived of most of its power” (1.24.4: σταυρόραςας δὲ ἐν ἀλλήλων ἐτη πολλά, ὡς λέγεται, ἀπὸ πολέμου τινὸς τῶν προσοικῶν βαρβάρων ἐφήθησαν καὶ τῆς δυνάμεως τῆς πολῆς ἐσπλήθησαν). The influence of the Illyrians in the politics of Epidamnus must have been a very important factor. When the demos of the city expelled the aristocratic faction (called oi δυνατοὶ in Thucydides), the exiles joined the barbarians and started ravaging the coast and their own city as well. Diodorus Siculus (12.30.2–3), who probably used Thucydides’ text and other later accounts, also states that the exiles (οἱ φυγάδες) joined the Illyrians and sailed against Epidamnus; he is even more explicit in the description of the attacks and asserts that, “the barbarians, attacking with great strength (πολλῆ δυνάμει), were holding the territory and besieging the city, etc.” (Diod. 12.30.3). From these accounts, we understand that the Illyrians attacked Epidamnus with a great military force. Besides, if the exiled Epidamnians went immediately to the Illyrians and fought together with them against the demos, it probably means that the relationships between some Epidamnians and the Illyrians must have been good even before the events of 435 BC. Maybe some kind of philia connected the pre-eminent families of the non-Greek populations with the Epidamnians (cf. Bakhuizen 1986 and Intrieri 2002, 44). It is important to remark that there is no mention of a payment, of a misthos, in the relations between Greeks and Illyrians, and thus we cannot talk of Illyrian mercenaries – this is only a later phenomenon. Noteworthy, finally, is the good relationship between the barbarian inhabitants of the inner regions to the north of the Corinthian Gulf and the Corinthians themselves, mentioned again by Thucydides in the description of the battle of Sybota.100

Going back to Thucydides’ account of the Corcyra affair, we know that after the attacks of the exiled and the barbarians, the Epidamnians who were still in the city, sent for help to Corcyra, but the Corcyreans denied any kind of assistance (1.24.6–7).101 The
next obvious choice for the Epidamnians was to seek help from Corinth, their metropolis. After questioning the oracle of Delphi about the right course of action, the Epidamnians delivered the city to the Corinthians, stating that their founder was from Corinth – the aforementioned Phalios. The Corinthians agreed to help them because on the one hand the colony (ἀποικία) of Epidamnus belonged to them as much as to the Corcyreans, and on the other hand, Corcyra was becoming too powerful and neglected its mother-city (1.25.1–4).

In the meantime, “The Corcyreans attacked Epidamnus with forty ships, together with the exiles, whom they intended to restore, and taking with them the Illyrians” (1.26.4: ἀλλὰ στρατεύουσιν ἐπ᾽ αὐτοὺς οἱ Κερκυραῖοι τεσσαράκοντα ναυσί, καὶ τοὺς Ἰλλυρίους προσλαβόντες). This was a declaration of war against Corinth, which immediately set out, together with many allies.102 The battle resulted in a great victory for the Corcyreans and during the whole of the next year Corinth gathered new forces to regain control of the sea.103 The Corcyreans decided to ask the Athenians for help and this, in the Thucydidean analysis, was one of the causes of the Peloponnesian War: when the Athenians joined the Corcyrean fleet, this was an implicit declaration of war against Corinth and the Peloponnesians.

It is clear from Thucydides, as well as from Diodorus’ account, that the Illyrians played a considerable part in the events related to Corcyra and Epidamnus.104 They participated in the naval conflict against Corinth, where the latter lost fifteen ships. We see therefore that the barbarians were not just some tribes in the mountains far away from Greek civilization: they had strong ties with the Greek cities and participated actively in their politics. Thucydides does not explain in detail the Illyrian role in the affairs of Corcyra probably because his readers were supposed to be familiar with the interrelations between the Epidamnians and Illyrians. The other passage in which Thucydides mentions the Illyrians is related to the northern campaign of Brasidas, king of Sparta.

In the year 423 BC, after the treaty between Athens and Sparta, Brasidas started a campaign, together with Perdiccas II, king of Macedonia, against Arrhabaeus, king of the Lyncestai.105 These were a population situated north of Macedonia, and were later to become a district of the kingdom of Philip II.106

In these circumstances, the Illyrians appear at the beginning as allies of Perdiccas (Thuc. 1.124.4): “…they stopped for two or three days waiting for the Illyrians, who had been hired by Perdiccas and were shortly expected to come” (…)δύο μὲν ἢ τρεῖς ἡμέρας ἐπέσχον, τοὺς Ἰλλυρίους μένοντες, οἳ ἔτυχον τῷ Περδίκκα μισθοῦ μέλλοντες ἥξεν). But in a short time Perdiccas and Brasidas found out that the Illyrians, betraying Perdiccas, had fled to Arrhabaeus.107 The Macedonians decided then to leave the camp during the night because they feared the Illyrians, “being a war-like people (ἄνθρωποι ἀνταράξοντες) and, left Brasidas and the Peloponnesians alone. In this difficult situation, Brasidas gave a speech in order to exhort his troops against the threat of the Illyrians and Lyncestai (Thuc. 4.126.1–6).108

The problem of the speeches in Thucydides is a topic of great debate and involves modern attitudes towards ancient historiography. The most important passage is the so-called Methodenkapitel at 1.22.1–3, where Thucydides speaks of the λόγοι (the direct speeches), which he reported “as it seems to me that each would have appropriately spoken” (ὡς δ’ ἀν ἐδόκουν ἐμοὶ ἕκαστοι περὶ τῶν αἰεὶ παρόντων...

102 See Thuc. 4.83; 4.124–128. For Arrhabaeus, see also Arist. Pol. 1311b and especially Strabo 7.7.8 C 326; this king seems to have stipulated an alliance with Perdiccas and Athens; the dating of the treaty is uncertain, see IG I 1 1.89.
103 See Diod. 16.1–4, where there is no actual mention of the Lyncestai, but we can suppose that the terms καὶ τάντα τὰ πλησιόχωρα ἔθνη include them as well (Diod. 16.1.5); we later find the Lyncestai in Alexander’s army, see Diod. 16.57.
104 Thuc. 4.125.1: καὶ ἐν τούτῳ διαφερομένων αὐτῶν ἀγέλθη ὅτι οἱ Ἰλλυρίοι μετ᾽ Ἀρραβαίου προδόται Περδικκικῶν γεγένηται.
105 The speech begins with the vocative ἄνδρες Πελοποννησίων, even if it cannot be referring to the Peloponnesians alone, because Brasidas’ army was mostly composed of Chalcidians, roughly 1800 soldiers out of 3000. Gomme 1956, 614 suggested that “it may be simply conventional simplification” to use only the term Peloponnesian for the whole army, but I’m more persuaded by Hornblower 1996, 397, who emphasizes the rhetorical purpose of Brasidas in treating the whole army as a cohesive unit against the enemy.

106 For the list of allies and the number of ships in the Corinthian army, see Thuc. 1.27.2.
108 It is useful to mention the indifference of the most prominent modern commentators, A. W. Gomme and S. Hornblower, to the importance of the Illyrian element in the Corcyra episode.
tὰ δέοντα μάλιστ' εἶπεῖν) and “keeping as close as possible to the general meaning of what was actually said” (ἐχομένῳ ὅτι ἐγγύτατα τῆς ἐξουσίας γνώμης τῶν ἀληθῶς λεχθέντων). In this passage Thucydides seems to contradict himself, but if we look carefully we might understand that he kept as close as possible to the general meaning (ἐξουσία γνώμη) and has necessarily elaborated the speeches in his own style, appropriately to the situation where the speeches were uttered. The speech itself (4.126) gives us a good insight into the Spartan (or better Thucydides’) perception of the Illyrians.Heartening his troops before the battle, Brasidas says that “Now as for these Illyrians, for those who have had no experience of them, the menace of their attack has terror; for their number is indeed dreadful to behold and the loudness of their battle-cry is intolerable (βοής μεγέθει ἀφόρητοι), and the idle brandishing of their arms has a threatening effect”.

Brasidas’ campaign in Amphipolis and the subsequent involvement against the Lynkestai can be placed in the years 424/3 BC. In those years Thucydides himself was strategos in Amphipolis and when the city defected in November 424 (Thuc. 4.127.1–4), he was tried in Athens, probably in 423 BC, but remained in charge until June of that year, as June was the month when the election of the strategoi for the following year was held. That means that Thucydides was well acquainted with the situation in Thrace and Macedonia in 424/23 BC and that he might well have heard a precise account of Brasidas’ battle against both the Lynkestai and Illyrians from a well informed source, perhaps even an eye-witness. Hence the speech delivered by Brasidas is “as close as possible to the general meaning of what was actually said”.

Going back to Brasidas’ speech, there are two contradictory opinions on the matter. M. H. Hansen (1993) thinks the speech was made up by the historian, while W. K. Pritchett opts for its authenticity. I agree with Pritchett’s opinion in the light of the above mentioned interpretation of 1.2.21–3, but I should like to add another fact that might hopefully persuade the sceptical readers, those who believe that Thucydides and other ancient historians invented their speeches.

Brasidas’ campaign in Amphipolis and the subsequent involvement against the Lynkestai can be placed in the years 424/3 BC. In those years Thucydides himself was strategos in Amphipolis and when the city defected in November 424 (Thuc. 4.106.3–4), he was tried in Athens, probably in 423 BC, but remained in charge until June of that year, as June was the month when the election of the strategoi for the following year was held. That means that Thucydides was well acquainted with the situation in Thrace and Macedonia in 424/23 BC and that he might well have heard a

109 So much so that Hornblower 1987, 45, considered that “the speeches offer further evidence that two hearts beat in Thucydides’ breast”.

110 The bibliography on this passage is, as one would expect, immense; I follow mainly Porciani 1999, who gives an excellent philological and historiographical interpretation of the passage; see also Hornblower 1991, 59–62; Sacks 1986, 392–393; contributions of T. Rood and J. V. Morrison in Rengakos, Tsakmakis 2006 with previous bibliography; see lastly Scardino 2006, 403–410.

111 Pritchett 1994, § 2; his statements are accepted by Hornblower 1996, 396.

112 Thucydides does not speak of his twenty-years exile, where one would expect it, i.e. in connection with the affair at Amphipolis in book IV, but only in the so-called “second introduction” at 5.26.5: “I was brought to exile for twenty years after my command in connection with Amphipolis” (καὶ Ἰξυιεῖν μοι φεύγοντα τῶν ἐμαυτοῦ ἔτη εἴκοσι μετὰ τῆς Ἀμφίπολιν στρατηγίαν); cf. also Marcellin. Vit. Thuc. 46 and a reference, if not to Thucydides himself, to “those who betrayed the Thracian front”, in Ar. Vesp. 288–89. On these matters and the problems of the “second introduction”, see Canfora 2006, 13.

113 Thuc. 4.126.5: οὐτὶ δὲ τὴν μέλλησιν μὲν ἔχουσι τοῖς ἄπειροις φοβηράν· καὶ γὰρ πλῆθει ὀφέρας δεινοντι καὶ βοῆς μεγέθει ἀφόρητοι, ἥ τε διὰ κενῆς ἐπανάσεις τῶν ὀπλῶν ἔχει ταῖν ὑδρῶν ἀπελίζεις.

114 Thuc. 4.126.5: οὗτοι δὲ τὴν μέλλησιν ἔχουσι αἰσχυνθείν ἀν λιπεῖν τινὰ ὑδρῶν ἀπελίζουσιν.

115 Thuc. 4.127.1: οἱ δὲ τὰς ἀρρήτους πολλῆς βοῆς καὶ θαυμάζουσα προσέκειντο (…).

Illyrians. Prometheus (Av. 1515–24), speaking to the main character Peisetairos, notes that men no longer sacrifice to the gods and no smoke rises from the sacrificial altars; he also complains that “The barbarian gods are hungry and they’re shrieking like Illyrians and threaten to come down to war against Zeus” (1520–22: οὗ δὲ βαρβάροι θεοί / πεινῶντες ὥσπερ Ἰλλυριοὶ κεκριγότες / ἐπιστρατεύσειν φάσ᾽ ἀνωθὲν τῷ Δίῳ). Line 1521 could produce some difficulties in interpretation and translation because πεινῶντες could be referred to the barbarian gods as well as to the Illyrians, and this is also true for the second verb of the sentence, κεκριγότες.117 However, the Thucydidean passages quoted above (4.126.5 and 127.1) about the great cries of the Illyrians before the battle, resemble very much the Athenian (and perhaps Greek) vision of this northern tribe.118 We should thus regard the lines in Aristophanes’ The Birds as the Athenian perspective of the Illyrians at the end of the 5th century BC: a tribe of “shrieking barbarians.”

Going back again to Thucydides, Brasidas’ speech contains an insight into the Illyrian (as well as Lynkestian) political organization and some material for the discussion of the Greeks’ self-awareness. The Spartan king, when addressing his troops, says at one point (4.126.2): ἀγάθοις γὰρ εἶναι υἱῶν προσέχει τὰ πολέμια ὅπερ ὁμοίως προσέχειν ἔκαστοτε, ἀλλὰ δὲ οἰκείως ἀρετήν, “Your quality in battle should have nothing to do with the presence or absence of allies – it is a matter of your own native courage” (transl. M. Hammond). Then the speech continues with καὶ μηδὲν πλῆθος περιβόησαι ἐτέρων, οὐ γε μηδὲν ἀπὸ πολειτιῶν τοιούτων ἱκετε, ἐν αἷς οὐ πολλοὶ ὀλίγων ἄρχουσι, ἀλλὰ πλεόνων μᾶλλον ἐλάσσους, οὐκ ἄλλω τινι κτησάμενοι τὴν δυναστείαν ἤ τῷ μαχόμενοι κρατεῖν. Brasidas encourages his soldiers by saying that their strength does not rest on the presence of allies, but lies in their own excellence (ἀρετή) at war. Some textual difficulties arise in the second part of the quoted speech. It has been interpreted as Brasidas’ praise of a few brave Peloponnesian oligarchs who reign (δυναστεία) by force over a majority. Consequently some editors, in the passage ἐν αἷς οὐ πολλοὶ ὀλίγων ἄρχουσι, have proposed to change the negative οὐ with the article οἱ, hence interpreting as “where the many rule the few”119 while others regarded οὐ as superfluous or inserted δὲ before the negative particle.120 However, A. W. Gomme has demonstrated that all these suggestions are wrong because of a misunderstanding of Thucydides’ text.121 His view, later accepted by all editors,122 is based on the assumption that Brasidas is talking not about the Spartans, but about the barbarians, i.e. Illyrians and Lynkestians, and about their political and social organization. “(…) And do not be afraid of the great number of enemies, for they, unlike you, come from governments (πολιτεία) where the few rule over many, and not the many over few, and these few having acquired power (δυναστεία)123 by no other means than by superiority in fighting”. This is quite a difficult passage, but it is worth a longer discussion for its importance. We understand thus that the Spartans, the most “conservative” of all the Greeks communities, regarded themselves as “free men, neither a ruling clique nor tyrants nor the subject of such, but of vôoι agreed to by all”124 Brasidas himself, in another Thucydidean passage, says of the Peloponnesian soil, “always free through its courage” (5.9.1: … διὰ τὸ εὔψυχον ἐλευθέρας). The organization of the Illyrian tribes, on the other hand, is based on different principles: a small elite whose power rests on military predominance (cf. Carlier 1987).

This is eventually the Greek perception of the Illyrians in the last quarter of the 5th century BC:

---

117 The alternative translations of the line, as proposed by Sommerstein 1987, are (a) “are as hungry as shrieking Illyrians”, (b) “are shrieking like hungry Illyrians” or (c) “are as hungry as Illyrians, and shrieking”, though his own translation is almost the same as the one I have given above: “and the barbarian gods are so hungry, they’re shrieking like Illyrians and threatening to march from up-country against Zeus” (175 and 297). For the verb κεκριγότες, see Dunbar 1995, 701 and Schol. ad Ar. Av. 1521c–d Holwerda, where it is stated that this verb reproduces the obscurity (άσάφεια) of the language of the barbarians.

118 As pointed out already by Sommerstein 1987, 297 and Dunbar 1995, 700–701.

119 This is the suggestion of Henri Estienne, the famous French philologist of the 16th century, see Stephanus 1564.

120 For the first opinion, see Hude’s edition maior (1913), while the second was a clever suggestion of van Herwerden (1877–82).

121 See Gomme 1951, 135–136; the article was used in Gomme’s commentary on Thucydides, Gomme 1956, 614–615.


123 The term δυναστεία has a negative connotation in Thucydides: it is used in reference to barbarian customs, like Brasidas’ speech, or neither democratic nor oligarchic constitutions, see 3.62.3; 4.78.3; 6.38.3.

124 Thus Gomme 1956, 136.
fearful barbarian tribes whose type of government differs enormously from the Greek polis-model. Nevertheless, they are neighbours of the Epidamnian and cooperate with them and with the Corcyreans. We may conclude that on the one hand we have the Greek interpretation, the interpretation of members of the ruling class such as Thucydides, while on the other we find military cooperation and alliance between Greeks and Illyrians, reflected in the facts reported by the historian.

EPILOGUE

Concluding this paper, it might be useful to retrace the stages of the inquiry. We have seen that what remains of Hecataeus’ work gives us only partial historical and ethnographical knowledge, but at the same time we can catch a glimpse of the Ionian geographical science of the 6th and 5th centuries BC through his fragments. Acquaintance with the Adriatic regions and northwestern Greece is neither complete nor precise, but it nonetheless shows an interest in the peripheral regions of the Greek world. Also of great importance is the lasting role of the Periegesis in the geographical tradition of both the Greek and Roman worlds. On the one hand we find Stephanus of Byzantium in the 6th century AD still quoting widely from Hecataeus, and on the other we have postulated an important, however indirect, tradition of the Periegesis in the Latin texts of Pliny the Elder, one of the “teachers of ancient knowledge” in Edward Gibbon’s opinion, and Pomponius Mela. A mention of the Illyrii proprii dicti in both Pliny (N. H. 3.144) and Mela (2.55–56), two almost contemporaneous authors, signifies that this information belongs to the same ancient tradition that we have in Hecataeus’ fragments.

The contribution of Herodotus appears to be more interesting, as he knew of some Illyrian Eneti, a population that should be distinguished from the Eneti/Veneti of northern Italy in the light of other ancient and Byzantine testimonia like those of Appian and Eustathius of Thessalonica. Furthermore, we can assume that the Illyrians, according to Herodotus, were settled somewhere between the Adriatic and the Triballian region; he also speaks of the role played by the Illyrians in the foundation myth of the Argead monarchy in Macedonia (8.137.1), a tradition that seems to disappear in the late 5th century BC. This was most probably due to the Macedonian struggles against the Illyrians and later to the hegemonic ambitions of Philip II over the Greek poleis and his political propaganda. Another passage in Herodotus links the Illyrians with the Enechelei in the context of the Delphic oracle. This demonstrates once again the importance of the Illyrians in 6th–5th century Greek politics. Herodotus gives us some geographical and historical hints, but his Histories are not of much importance for the study of the Greek ideas about the Illyrians, apart from the fact that they where regarded as barbarian tribes whose customs could be related to some populations of the East.

The last author examined in the context of this study is also the most remarkable. The part that the Illyrians played in the Corcyra affair of 435 BC is surely not to be neglected, while on the other hand some other Illyrians are mentioned, together with the Lynkestai, in the northern campaign of the Spartan King Brasidas. The Thucydidean passage and especially Brasidas’ speech at 4.126, well expresses the Greek self-representation as opposed to the barbarians: we get the image of dreadful tribes whose battle shouting and threatening charge are frightful sights. This perception is well represented in Aristophanes’ The Birds, staged in 414 BC, where the expression ὥσπερ Ἰλλυριοὶ κεκριγότες (“shrieking like Illyrians”) perfectly resembles the Thucydidean account.

We shall not cross the boundaries of the Peloponnesian War, for this was an important historical turning point, giving rise to many different problems. In the 4th century the history of the Illyrian peoples is at first closely connected with Macedonia, until its final conquest by Alexander,125 while later on we find the Illyrians most of all on the Adriatic coast. This is a prelude to the so-called Illyricum regnum of Agron and Teuta and to the following submission to the Roman rule. From the end of the 5th century BC until the Roman conquest – which was actually an impetus for the subsequent conquest of Greece – the significance of the Illyrian peoples in Macedonian and Greek contexts is surely not to be neglected.
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**“Vreščijo kot Iliri”**

Zgodovinska geografska in grške predstave o ilirskem svetu v 5. stoletju pr. Kr.

**Povzetek**

Sodobno zgodovinopisje, ki se ukvarja z antiko, se je v zadnjih nekaj desetletjih osredotočilo tako na problematiko grške identitete in samozavedanja kot tudi na stike Grkov z negrškimi ljudstvi. Opredelitev barbarskih ljudstev, torej ljudstev, ki niso grška, je tesno povezana z definicijo Grkov samih. Prispevek v okviru ponovnega ovrednotenja najstarejše grške literarne tradicije obravnava tiste grške pisce, ki so pokazali (bolj ali manj obrobro) zanimanje za ilirska ljudstva in podatke o njih vključili v svoja dela; to so predvsem Hekataj iz Mileta, Herodot in Tukidid.
Za boljše razumevanje grškega pogleda na Ilire pa je potrebno začeti pri rimski provinci Ilirik, ki se je v svojem velikem obsegu izoblikovala v avgusteoskem času; ta nam torej nudi tako geografske kot časovne meje. Ustanovitev rimske provincije Ilirika v administrativnem pomenu besede se vse bolj argumentirano poslikala v čas po Oktavijanovi ilirski vojni (35–33 pr. Kr.). Ilirik pa je bil nedvomno razdeljen na dve provinci po velikem panonsko-dalmatinskem uporju (Bellum Batonianum in letih 6–9 po Kr.), na Gornji Ilirik (Illyricum superius), ki je ustrezal Dalmaciji, in Spodnji Ilirik (inferius), ki je ustreza Panoniji.

V času svojega največjega obsega je ime Ilirik označevalo ozemlje od Jadranskega morja do Norika in desete italske ta prostor imenuje z enim imenom Ilirik (tota uno nomine Illyricum vocatur generatim). Rimski enciklopedist je prostor najprej opredelil z “Illyrii totum uno nomine Illyricum vocatur generatim.”

To je pogosto všeč, da je Plinij (Naturalis hist. 3, 139) podaja geografsko razmejitev Ilirika, ki je poučna: “Ljudstvo Liburnov se razteza od reke Arsije do reke Titija. Nekoč so k njim spadali Mentorji, Himani, Enhelejci, Bulini in tisti, ki jih Kalimah pozna kot Pevcetije; zdaj pa se ves ta prostor imenuje z enim imenom Ilirik (nunc totum uno nomine Illyricum vocatur generatim).” Rimski enciklopedist je prostor najprej opredelil z “prvobitne Ilire” (proprie dicti Illyrii) na območju med Epidavrom in Zalej, kot grška tradicija, je pa vendarle ohranila nekaj pomembnih značilnosti.

Ne bi imelo smisla dodajati nove hipoteze, pač pa je potrebno začeti pri rimski provinci Ilirik, ki je imela Hekataj napačno predstavo o jadranskem morju. Prvi pisec, ki je omenil Ilire, je Hekataj iz Metela, ki načeloma velja za prvega grškega geografa in zgodovinarja. Njegov Opis sveta (Periiegises) je bil izgubljen, ohranjjenih pa je nekaj dragocenih fragmentov, večina v poznoantičnem geografskem leksikonu o ljudstvih, Ethnica Štefana Bizantinskega; ta je Hekataja prepisoval poljubno, ne sistematično. Vendar tudi Štefanovo delo ni ohranjeno v celoti, temveč le “epitome”, okrašan izvod njegovega leksikona, v katerem so bili tudi navedki iz Hekataja ponovno okrašani.

Fragmentov, v katerih so omenjeni Iliri, je le malo: FGrHist 1 F 86 (= 97), 98, 100, 119, 172. Vsi izvirirajo iz Štefanovega leksikona, razen enega (F 119), ki se je ohranil pri Strabonu (7, 1, C 321). Strabonove trditve so zelo zanimive za presojanje njegovega pojmovanja Grčije in Grkov, hkrati pa iz Hekatajevega navedka pri Strabonu izvemo, da so že v 6. in 5. stoletju pr. Kr. živahno razpravljali o izvoru Grkov in o izročilu, ki se je nanašalo na dorskino pojav. Kar pa se Ilirov tiče, je razvidno, da je Hekataj šel za ljudstvo, ki je živelo na neposredni periferiji grškega sveta, podobno kot Epirci in Tračani.


Preostali fragmenti so še bolj nejasni. Če pa nanje gledamo kot na celoto, lahko sklepamo, da so bili podatki o Helidonijcij, Šesaretič, Tavljantijcij in Abrih postavljeni v kontekst opisa ilirskih ljudstev in njihovih sosev. S Hekatajevim fragmentom F 100, ki se nanaša na Helidonije, lahko povežemo zanimiv papyrus, vsebuje komentar k Alkmanovi pesniti Parthenion (P. Oxy. 2389 = MP3 81): Grki

Še preden je Herodot začel javno nastopati in predavati o temah, ki jih je raziskoval v svoji Zgodovini, so v Atenah leta 468 pr. Kr. uprizorili Sofoklovo dramo Triptolemos, ki je ohranjena le v fragmentih; v njej najdemo najstarejšo omembo Ilirov v poeziji (TrGF 4 F 601 apud Hsch. t 580 Latte). Vendar je podatek, ki je ohranjal zgolj v Hezijhevetem leksikonu, zelo nepoveden, omenja le nekoga “ilirskega rodu”.


Zadnji avtor, ki je obravnavan v članku, je Tukidid. V vseh osmih njegovih Peloponeške vojne se le dva odlomka nedvoumno nanašata na Ilire. Prva omemba je povezana z afero Korkire in nas-
Epidauninos)” (12, 30, 3). Pomembno je dodati, da se v odnosih med Grki in temi barbari nikjer ne omenja plačilo (misthos), zato bi lahko domnevali, da je šlo za obojestransko politično podporo in prijateljstvo (philía), ki je povezovalo del prebivalstva Epidamna z Ilirii.

Po prvih napadih so Epidamnijci, kot nadaljuje Tukidid, sklenili prositi za pomoč v Korkiri in pozneje tudi v Korintu (1, 24–25). Prebivalci Korikira se povezali z izgnanci in z Ilirii, medtem ko so Korinčani stopili na stran ljudske stranke (demos) v Epidamnu. Po prvi bitki, ki je potekala v vodah okoli Epidamna, se je Korkira odločila prositi za pomoč Atene; to je dejansko pomenilo vojno napoved Korintu in njihovim peloponeškim zaveznikom, kar je po Tukididovi razlagi dogodkov predstavljalo enega od vzrokov za peloponeško vojno. Kot lahko povzamemo iz zgodovinarjevega poročila, Iliri niso bili le barbarjsko ljudstvo, ampak so bili tesno povezani z grškimi mestnimi državami (poleis) in so bili aktivno udeleženi pri njihovem političnem delovanju.

Druga omemba Ilirov je povezana z vojaško odpravo spartanskega kralja Brasida na sever. To se zgodilo leta 423 pr. Kr., ko je Brasidas skupaj z makedonskim kraljem Perdikom II. (Perdicas) začel vojno proti kralju Linkestov Arabeju (Arrhabaeus). Linkesti (Lynkestai) so bili ljudstvo, ki je prebivalo severno od Makedonije; njihova dežela je bila pozneje eno od območij v Makedonskem kraljestvu Filipa II. Iliiri se najprej pojavijo v Makedonskem kraljestvu Filipa II. Iliiri se najprej pojavijo kot zavezniki Perdike in Spartanev: “... za dva ali tri dni so se ustavili in čakali na Ilire, ki jih je bil najel Perdikas in naj bi vsak čas prisepel” (4, 124, 4). Toda Perdikas in Brasidas sta bila nato obveščena, da so Iliiri izdali svoje nedavne zaveznike in zbežali k Arabeju (4, 125, 1). Ker so se zbali tega “bojželnega ljudstva”, so Perdikas in njegovi Makedonci v tem primeru Tavantijci, kar med drugim kaže na velike razlike med ljudstvi, ki so jih Grki imenovali Iliire.

Na podlagi zbranega gradiva smemo zaključiti, da so v poznem 5. stoletju pr. Kr. Iliiri igrali pomembno vlogo v politiki grških držav, istočasno pa lahko ugotovimo, da je bila v grški literaturi zasidrana tudi negativna predstava o barbarih, ki so jih imenovali Iliire.

Podobno slike Ilirov kot množice glasno kričečih barbarov je najti v več oblikah, vendar je najjednostavnije najti v Aristofanovih komedijah, kot je zg. Ptiči, ki je bila izdelana leta 414 pr. Kr. v rimska edina. Zgodaj iz tukididovega naravnega izvira iz vodi Epidamna se zdaj podobno sliko. Tukidid si je verjetno zgodaj tudi svedok, da je bila v grški literaturi zasidrana tudi negativna predstava o barbarih, ki so jih imenovali Iliire.
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