



Religion and power in Europe : Conflict and Convergence / edited by Joaquim Carvalho. – Pisa : Plus-Pisa university press, c2007
(Religious and philosophical concepts : thematic work group 3 ; 2)

322.1094 (21.)

1. Religione e politica – Europa I. Carvalho, Joaquim de

CIP a cura del Sistema bibliotecario dell'Università di Pisa



This volume is published thanks to the support of the Directorate General for Research of the European Commission, by the Sixth Framework Network of Excellence CLIOHRES.net under the contract CIT3-CT-2005-00164. The volume is solely the responsibility of the Network and the authors; the European Community cannot be held responsible for its contents or for any use which may be made of it.

Cover: Giorgio Vasari and assistants (16th century), *Battle of Lepanto*, fresco, Sala Regia, Vatican. © Photoscala, Florence

© Copyright 2007 by Edizioni Plus – Pisa University Press
Lungarno Pacinotti, 43
56126 Pisa
Tel. 050 2212056 – Fax 050 2212945
info.plus@adm.unipi.it
www.edizioniplus.it - Section "Biblioteca"

Member of



Association of American
University Presses

ISBN 978-88-8492-464-3

Manager

Claudia Napolitano

Editing

Francesca Petrucci, Eleonora Lollini, Francesca Verdiani

Informatic assistance

Massimo Arcidiacono, Michele Gasparello

Genealogical Myth and Political Propaganda in Antiquity: the Re-Use of Greek Myths from Dionysius to Augustus

MARIA PAOLA CASTIGLIONI

University Pierre Mendès France, Grenoble II

ABSTRACT

The tight relationship between religion and politics in ancient times are fully witnessed by the role of Myth, used for purposes of legitimization and celebration of the reigning power.

The chapter proposes to offer through the presentation of some examples of re-use of genealogical myths (the myth of Aeneas in Rome, of Neoptolemus in Epirus and, first of all, of Polyphemus and Illyrios during the tyranny of Dionysius of Syracuse) a reading of the mechanisms of the historical period that led poets and historians of the court to use Myth as a privileged means in the political propaganda of the ruling classes.

L'utilisation des mythes pour la justification et la célébration du pouvoir constitue l'une des manifestations les plus éloquentes de la profonde imbrication entre religion et politique dans l'Antiquité. Le chapitre se propose ainsi de questionner la façon dont le discours mythique s'imposa comme l'instrument privilégié de la propagande politique et de la recherche du consensus pour différents souverains.

*Notre réflexion se référera en particulier au mythe généalogique, récit visant à légitimer des choix militaires, politiques ou diplomatiques sur la base de la reconstitution d'une ascendance mythique reliant directement un peuple, une famille ou un seul individu à un héros du passé légendaire, de façon à lui conférer une sorte de *titulus nobilitatis* authentifiant son autorité.*

L'exemple le plus célèbre de ce phénomène demeure sans aucun doute la récupération du mythe du débarquement et de l'installation d'Enée et de sa souche sur les côtes du Latium. Promise à une renommée immortelle grâce aux vers virgiliens, la légende de la descendance de la gens Iulia du fils du héros troyen, Iulus Ascanius, participa pleinement à la promotion du principat d'Auguste (27 av. J.-C. - 14 ap. J.-C.), qui, par le biais de Jules César, son père adoptif, fut directement associé à cette prestigieuse lignée.

*Le cas romain n'est pourtant pas isolé et la littérature ancienne témoigne d'autres exemples significatifs d'exploitation du patrimoine mythique par les dynasties au pouvoir. La famille royale des Molosses, en Epire, fit elle aussi appel à un *nostos* (récit du retour de la*

guerre de Troie) en exaltant ses origines à la fois achéennes et troyennes et sa filiation de Pyrrhos Néoptolème, le fils d'Achille, et d'Andromaque, la veuve d'Hector, arrivés sur les rivages épirotes après la destruction de Troie. La légende, déjà attestée au V^{ème} s. av. J.-C., connut son apogée sous le règne de Pyrrhos (307-303, 297-272 av. J.-C.), roi homonyme de son ancêtre mythique. La version traditionnelle subit alors quelques changements afin de mieux s'adapter aux visées militaires anti-romaines du roi, en vantant surtout la souche grecque du sang du souverain.

Une variante du même mythe mirait à exalter de façon plus générale la descendance ethnique de Néoptolème, d'Andromaque et d'Hélénos, le devin troyen qui remplaça l'Eacide sur le trône épirote, en établissant des liens généalogiques entre plusieurs peuples, dans le but de justifier les alliances et les conquêtes molosses. Un schéma identique se retrouve dans le récit de la descendance commune des Illyriens, des Celtes et des Galates, du cyclope Polyphème et de la nymphe Galatée. Le chapitre s'intéresse tout particulièrement aux rapports entre cette légende et la politique étrangère de Denys de Syracuse (405-367 av. J.-C.), en mettant en avant les causes de la récupération d'un personnage que la tradition homérique présentait sous une lumière incontestablement négative, et les éléments qui ont contribué à la genèse de ce récit de propagande.

Il est à cet égard important de remarquer l'existence d'un mythe concurrent, selon lequel l'éponyme des Illyriens Illyrios n'était pas le fils du cyclope sicilien, mais du héros thébain Cadmos, devenu après son exil de la Béotie roi légendaire des Enchéléens, tribu établie en région illyrienne. Cette variante pourrait être l'expression d'une volonté d'autocélébration de la dynastie enchéléenne qui se serait servie, à l'instar de sa voisine épirote, du caractère anoblissant du mythe grec. Cette hypothèse d'une circulation des thèmes mythiques, ensuite adaptés en fonction des situations spécifiques, entre Epire, Illyrie et Sicile, nous paraît du reste confirmée par la tradition selon laquelle Philistos, historien et conseiller de Denys, composa son œuvre pendant son séjour chez le roi molosse Alcétas.

A la lumière de ces différents exemples, il apparaît évident que le discours mythologique, habilement façonné par la plume des poètes et des historiens de cour, constitua un instrument de propagande particulièrement important pour les classes dirigeantes de l'Antiquité, surtout dans les régions « périphériques ».

In the preface to the proceedings of the conference “Mythe et Politique” held in Liège in 1989, F. Jouan and A. Motte wrote²:

Dans le champ varié de l'expérience humaine, c'est peut-être le politique qui mobilise le plus continûment et le plus impérativement les instances mythopoétiques de l'esprit. Pour se donner une identité, pour légitimer ses formes d'existence et conjurer ses conflits latents, toute société éprouve le besoin de se forger une généalogie lointaine, de se raconter des histoires qui, en s'auroolant des prestiges du sacré et du divin, rendent prégnants certains événements du passé et s'efforcent de les soustraire à la contingence: genèse d'un empire rattaché à l'organisation du monde ou d'un panthéon, origine divine ou divinisation post mortem de héros fondateurs, rôle dévolu à des législateurs inspirés, interventions surnaturelles dans la trame de l'histoire, etc...Chaque communauté aspire de la sorte à se donner des noms propres, des lieux, des temps privilégiés, et à les magnifier, quitte à en corriger l'image au gré de son évolution et des chocs qui la secouent³.

Such a comment can surely be applied to humanity throughout time and to a phenomenon such as the creation of political myths, whose characters are still visible and present in contemporary societies. However, due to what may be termed the symbiotic and indissoluble link between politics and religion and between the sacred and the profane, it is easier to identify its mechanisms and peculiarities in the ancient world. Precisely because of its powerful political potential, ancient religion was capable of serving propaganda and political ideology and, as it was easily moulded, myth in particular became the favoured means of achieving this.

Examples of the use of myth in the political structures of antiquity are particularly numerous: each Greek city-state was placed under the protection of a divinity described as “poliadic” and mythical tales recorded in detail the origins of this protector of the civic community (see, for instance, the myth of the contest between Athens and Poseidon for the patronage of Athens). *Poleis*, ethnic groups and colonial settlements all identified with a founding hero, whose cult united all their members and helped strengthen the sense of collective descent from a famous ancestor (see, again, the case of Athens or Erechtheus, or the case of Kadmos with regard to Thebes)⁴.

Whilst this process generally works spontaneously and collectively, it can, on various occasions, become a more personal instrument of a power in order to legitimate, confirm and strengthen the power base and provide it with convincing and effective foundations. Myth then becomes a powerful means of affirmation and a propaganda tool for individuals and/or family groups whose authority, asserted in some cases through violent, non-traditional means, requires the support and consent of their subjects.

The most suitable term to describe such a process of self promotion, whose aim is to win the favour and support of the widest consensual mass, is that of “propaganda”, a concept that historiography also naturally applies to the ancient period and to its means of searching for forms of public approval, being deeply sensitive to the authority of mythological argument⁵.

GENEALOGICAL MYTH IN THE SERVICE OF POWER: THE CASES OF AENEAS IN ROME AND PYRRHUS NEOPTOLEMUS IN EPIRUS

The most famous example of a fruitful recovery, for the purposes of political propaganda, of characters and events from mythology is, without doubt, that of Aeneas, famous since the Homeric epic. The story of the flight from Troy – a town laid waste by the enemies of the Achaeans – by the son of Venus and Anchises, accompanied by his old father and the young Iulus Ascanius, and his adventurous trip to the coasts of Latium, the final point in his wanderings and the site of his new kingdom, remained famous for centuries after, due to the poetic genius of Virgil⁶.

The legend of the prestigious royal Trojan lineage of the Roman *gens Julia* celebrated by the Mantuan poet duly featured in promoting the Augustan Principate (27 BC-14

AD) and its acknowledgement by the population of the *Urbs*. Aeneas was presented as the ancestor of Romulus, the founder of Rome and of the Roman people, who could therefore boast of being descended from the glorious race of heroes of Greek mythology⁷.

His dynastic line, closely linked to the figure of the emperor and his political structure, featured alongside the civic meaning of this mythological discourse. The Trojan legend, in fact, considered Augustus a direct descendant, through Caesar his adopted father, of the Trojan hero and son of Venus and, consequently, emphasised his divine origins. Moreover the figure of “*pious Aeneas*” provided a clever symbolic legitimisation of Augustus’ aspirations. Far from being considered a disturbing change, this turning point in the Principate assumed the form of a kind of second founding of Rome and Augustus, with his efforts to restore ancestral moral virtues, a new Aeneas.

This political exploitation of the myth of Aeneas and, particularly, of his “genealogical” revival is not an isolated case in the ancient world and the dynastic contest between the classic and Hellenistic age which inspired Augustus. One of the most significant cases remains that of the Epirote Royal Family of Molossians, whose mythological origins are also linked to the myth of the return of a Homeric hero, in this case Achaean, namely Pyrrhus Neoptolemus⁸, and were developed from Euripides’ *Andromache* into an important amplification and enrichment of the original version, through which the Trojan legend was introduced⁹.

The genesis of this genealogical myth is self-explanatory, as in the Roman case. It first involves the diffusion of a legendary tale connected with the events following the war of Troy, and in this particular case, the memory of the return of Achilles’ son from the Trojan war and his ephemeral Epirote kingdom¹⁰. This first version assumes properly genealogical features only when the episode, recorded for the first time by Euripides, of the affiliation of Aiakides and Andromache, Hector’s widow, an Achaean prisoner of war, is introduced. In the version by the Athenian dramatist, the heir’s name is not spoken, even though Euripides describes the extraordinary character of the young boy, whose blood is both Greek (and partly divine, through the union between Peleus and the immortal Thetis) and Trojan and whose birth effectively guarantees the continuation of both Peleus’ line and the Trojan race, as Thetis emphasises in the prophecy that she makes in the tragedy¹¹:

Γυναιῖκα δ’ αἰχμάλωτον, Ἀνδρομάχην λέγω,
Μολοσσίαν γῆν χρῆ κατοικήσαι, γέρον,
Ἐλένω συναλλαχθεῖσαν εὐναίοις γάμοις,
καὶ παῖδα τόνδε τῶν ἀπ’ Αἰακοῦ μόνον
λελειμμένον δῆ. Βασιλέα δ’ ἐκ τοῦδε χρῆ
ἄλλον δι’ ἄλλου διαπερᾶν Μολοσσίας
εὐδαιμονοῦντας· οὐ γὰρ ᾧδ’ ἀναστατον
γένος γενέσθαι δεῖ τὸ σὸν κάμῶν, γέρον,
Τροίας τε· καὶ γὰρ θεοῖσι κάκείνης μέλει,
καίπερ πεσοῦσης Παλλάδος προθυμῆ.

[And that war-captive dame, Andromache,
 In the Molossian land must find a home
 In lawful wedlock joined to Helenus,
 With that child, who alone is left alive
 Of Aeacus' line. And kings Molossian
 From him one after other long shall reign
 In bliss; for, ancient, nowise thus thy line
 And mine is destined to be brought to naught:
 No, neither Troy; the Gods yet hold her dear,
 Albeit by Pallas' eager hate she fell]¹².

The Nereid's insistence points to the future prosperity and the continuation of her nephew's line within Molossian land and establishes an important link between the myth and history. It is not necessary to stress that the contents of these verses conceal a political aim and reveal Euripides' explicit desire to exalt the Molossian dynasty, the precious ally of the Athenians during the Peloponnesian war¹³.

The celebration of the famous Aiakides ancestors of Molossian dynasty afterwards became clearer and at the same time limited to a strictly family sphere. It reached its peak in the case of Pyrrhus (307-303, 297-272 BC), the homonymous king and mythical founder of the Molossian royal family. Plutarch's biography dedicated to the Epirote king illustrates the tendency to underline the direct affiliation between Pyrrhus (Neoptolemus) the founding hero, and Pyrrhus the king, in order to bring the mythical age closer to the historical age and due to Pyrrhus' exceptional character, reincarnating the values and virtues of his famous ancestor.

In his *Epitome of the Histories Philip by Pompeius Trogus* Justin also inserts a digression on Molossian genealogy, corresponding to the tale of Pyrrhus' expedition to Italy, as he wanted to legitimate and enhance the bravery of the Epirote king through his relation to Neoptolemus, the warrior-hero and civilizer in the broader and more celebratory digression by Pompeius Trogus rather than the weak Justinian compilation¹⁴:

Sed quoniam ad Epiri mentionem ventum est, de origine regni ejus pauca narranda sunt. Molossorum primum in ea regione regnum fuit. Post Pyrrhus, Achillis filius, amisso per absentiam Trojanis temporibus paterno regno, in his locis consedit, qui Pyrrhidae primo, postea Epirotea dicti sunt. Sed Pyrrhus, cum in templo Dodonae Jovis ad consulendum venisset, ibi Lanassam, neptem Herculis, rapuit: ex cujus matrimonio octo liberos sustulit. Ex his nonnullas virgines nuptum finitimis regibus tradidit opesque adfinitatum auxilio magnas paravit. Atque ita Heleno, filio Priami regis, ob industriam singularem regnum Chaonum et Andromacham Hectoris e matrimonio suo, quam in divisione Trojanae praedae acceperat, uxorem tradidit: brevique post tempore Delphis, insidiis Orestis, filii Agamenonis, inter altaria dei interiit. Successor huic Piales filius fuit. Per ordinem deinde regnum ad Tharybam descendit, cui, quoniam pupillus et unicus ex gente nobili superesset, intentiore omnium cura servandi ejus educandique publicae tutores constituentur: Athenas quoque erudiendi gratia missus. Quanto doctior majoribus suis, tanto et populo gravior fuit. Primus itaque composuit: et ut a Pyrrho sedes, sic vita cultior populo a Taryba statuta. Hujus filius Neoptolemus fuit, ex quo nata est Olympias, mater magni Alexandri, et Alexander, qui post eum regnum Epiri tenuit et, in Italia bello gesto, in Brutiis interiit. Post ejus mortem frater Accidas regno successit, qui, adsiduis

adversus Macedonas bellorum certaminibus populum fatigando, offensam civium contraxit; ac propterea in exilium actus Pyrrhum filium, bimum admodum parvulum, in regnum reliquit.

[But since I have come to speak of Epirus, a few particulars should be premised concerning the rise of that kingdom. The first regal power in this country was that of the Molossi. Afterwards Pyrrhus, the son of Achilles, having been deprived of his father's dominions during his absence in the Trojan war, settled in these parts; the inhabitants of which were first called Pyrrhidae, and afterwards Epirots. This Pyrrhus, going to the temple of Jupiter at Dodona to consult the oracle, seized there by force Lanassa, the granddaughter of Hercules, and by a marriage with her had eight children. Of his daughters he gave some in marriage to the neighbouring princes, and by means of these alliances acquired great power. He gave to Helenus, the son of King Priam, for his eminent services, the kingdom of the Chaonians, and Andromache the widow of Hector in marriage, after she had been his own wife, he having received her at the division of the Trojan spoil. Shortly after he was slain at Delphi, at the very altar of Apollo, by the treachery of Orestes the son of Agamemnon. His successor was his son Pielos. The throne afterwards passed in regular descent to Arrybas, over whom, as he was an orphan, and the only survivor of a noble family, guardians were publicly appointed, the concern of all being so much the greater to preserve and educate him. He was also sent to Athens for the sake of instruction; and, as he was more learned than his predecessors, so he became more popular with his subjects. He was the first, accordingly, that established laws, a senate, annual magistrates, and a regular form of government; and as a settlement was found for the people by Pyrrhus, so a more civilized way of life was introduced by Arrybas. A son of this king was Neoptolemus, the father of Olympias (mother of Alexander the great), and of Alexander, who occupied the throne of Epirus after him, and died in Italy in a war with the Bruttii. On the death of Alexander his brother Aeacides became king, who, by wearying his people with constant wars against the Macedonians, incurred their dislike, and was in consequence driven into exile, leaving his little son Pyrrhus, about two years old, in the kingdom.]

It is not the case that the sources which celebrate the Epirote king aim to reduce to secondary importance or even remove the character of Andromache, who was more important in Euripides than Neoptolemus. His death in Delphi removes him prematurely from the mythological Epirote scenes, making him an actor with a profile that is not uniformly positive¹⁵. In the Athenian tragedy it is, therefore, the Trojan sections, through Andromache and Helenos (the fortune-teller son of Priam and the new husband of Hector's widow and adopted father of Neoptolemus' son) which prevail. On the contrary, the literary sources probably depended more directly on the version in fashion during Pyrrhus' reign in order to exalt the Achaean features of the Epirote king's blood. In some versions, the character of Andromache as Neoptolemus' ancestor, is even replaced by a certain Lanassa, presented as a descendant of Heracles (and therefore Greek) and, not by chance, sharing the same name as Agathocles' daughter, the despot of Syracuse and wife of Pyrrhus in 295 BC. It is difficult not to perceive the signs of propaganda aiming, on the one hand to please the mother's family and, on the other hand, to establish as ancestors of Pyrrhus, not one but two Greek heroes (following the example of Alexander the Great, the descendant of Achilles and Heracles) with the advantage of creating a more complete "Hellenization", without Trojan "defilement".

We are in this case faced with a tendency that contradicts the Roman legend. Perhaps the “purification” of the Trojan element from the blood of the Epirote *condottiero* was not irrelevant to Pyrrhus’ desire to set himself and his people against his enemy, the *Urbs* and its “Trojan” inhabitants.

The role of Pyrrhus’ biographer, Proxenus, was likely to have been decisive in disseminating this celebration of Pyrrhus and his mythological ancestors¹⁶.

THE LOVE STORY OF POLYPHEMUS AND GALATEA AND DIONYSIAN PROPAGANDA

The Aiakides genealogy not only provides an explanation for the origins of the ruling dynasty but, like the Latin legend of Aeneas, it aims to be an instrument of ethnic aetiology. Therefore, in Neoptolemus’ myth, the name that the sources have given to Neoptolemus’ descendant (who is anonymous in Euripides) is filled with deep significance. According to the version reported by Pausanias, Andromache begat three sons by Neoptolemus, (Molossos, Pielos and Pergamos) and Cestrinos by Helenos. Molossos succeeded Helenos after his death, and reigned over the people named after him, the Molossians. Cestrinos was the king of a country near that of his half-brother. Pielos remained in Epirus and became the founder of a branch of the Molossian royal family; Pergamos instead moved to Asia Minor, where he founded the homonymous city of Pergamos¹⁷:

Πρῶτος γὰρ δὴ οὗτος ἀλούσης Ἰλίου τὴν μὲν ἐς Θεσσαλίαν ὑπερεῖδεν ἀναχώρησιν, ἐς δὲ τὴν Ἠπειρον κατάραξ ἐνταῦθα ἐκ τῶν Ἑλένου χρησμῶν φέκησε. Καὶ οἱ πᾶσι ἐκ μὲν Ἑρμιόνης ἐγένετο οὐδεὶς, ἐξ Ἀνδρομάχης δὲ Μολοσσός καὶ Πίελος καὶ νεώτατος ὁ Πέργαμος. Ἐγένετο δὲ καὶ Ἑλένω Κεστρίνος· τούτῳ γὰρ Ἀνδρομάχη συνώκησεν ἀποθανόντος ἐν Δελφοῖς Πύρρου. Ἑλένου δὲ ὡς ἐτελεύτα Μολοσσῶ τῷ Πύρρου παραδόντος τὴν ἀρχὴν Κεστρίνος μὲν σὺν τοῖς ἐδέλουσιν Ἠπειρωτῶν τὴν ὑπὲρ Θύαμιν ποταμὸν χώραν ἔσχεν, Πέργαμος δὲ διαβάς ἐς τὴν Ἀσίαν Ἄρειον δυναστεύοντα ἐν τῇ Τευθρανίᾳ κτείνει μονομαχήσαντά οἱ περὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς, καὶ τῇ πόλει τὸ οὐνομα ἔδωκε τὸ νῦν ἄφ’ αὐτοῦ· καὶ Ἀνδρομάχης – ἠκολούθει γὰρ οἱ – ἐστὶν ἡρῶον ἐν τῇ πόλει. Πίελος δὲ αὐτοῦ κατέμεινεν ἐν Ἠπείρῳ, καὶ ἐς πρόγονον τοῦτον ἀνέβαινε Πύρρος τε ὁ Αἰακίδου καὶ οἱ πατέρες, ἀλλ’ οὐκ ἐς Μολοσσόν.

[Now Pyrrhus was the first who after the capture of Troy disdained to return to Thessaly, but sailing to Epeirus dwelt there because of the oracle of Helenus. By Hermione Pyrrhus had no child, but by Andromache he had Molossus, Pielos, and Pergamus, who was the youngest. Helenus also had a son, Cestrinus, being married to Andromache after the murder of Pyrrhus at Delphi. Helenus on his death passed on the kingdom to Molossus, son of Pyrrhus, so that Cestrinus with volunteers from the Epeiros took possession of the region beyond the river Thyamis, while Pergamus crossed into Asia and killed Areius, despot in Teuthrania, who fought with him in single combat for his kingdom, and gave his name to the city which is still called after him. To Andromache, who accompanied him, there is still a shrine in the city. Pielos remained behind in Epeirus, and to him as ancestor Pyrrhus, the son of Aeacides, and his fathers traced their descent, and not to Molossus]¹⁸.

Beneath this mythical genealogy it is not hard to trace the signs of a policy designed to stress the links between the different Epirote *ethne* and the Molossian king and the At-

talid family ruling in Troad. This process represents an enlargement of the mythological category called by I. Malkin “heroic genealogy” (self-attribution by royal families of heroic ancestors for the purposes of self-glorification¹⁹) and is part of a diplomatic strategy aimed at justifying alliances and domination on a genealogical basis.

A more complex but no less fascinating case is that of the myth of the origin of the Illyrian, Celtic and Galatian peoples, related by Appian: this again, through a device similar to those used in the Roman and Epirote myths, shows the recovery of a Homeric character, the Cyclops Polyphemus²⁰.

In recording the history of Rome the Alexandrian historian focuses on the Illyrian wars in his tenth book. In order to clarify the geographic and human pattern of the Roman powers, at the beginning of the book (second paragraph of the first chapter) the writer refers in the following terms to the mythical origins of the three aforementioned peoples:

Φασὶ δὲ τὴν μὲν χώραν ἐπάνυμον Ἰλλυριοῦ τοῦ Πολυφήμου γενέσθαι· Πολυφήμῳ γὰρ τῷ Κύκλωπι καὶ Γαλατείᾳ Κελτὸν καὶ Ἰλλυριὸν καὶ Γάλαν παῖδας ὄντας ἔξορμησαι Σικελίας, καὶ ἄρξαι τῶν δι' αὐτοὺς Κελτῶν καὶ Ἰλλυριῶν καὶ Γαλατῶν λεγομένων, καὶ τότε μοι μάλιστα, πολλὰ μυθευόντων ἕτερα πολλῶν, ἀρέσκει.

[They (i.e. the Greeks) say that the country received its name from Illyrius, the son of Polyphemus; for the Cyclops Polyphemus and his wife, Galatea, had three sons, Celtus, Illyrius, and Galas, all of whom migrated from Sicily, and ruled over the peoples called after them Celts, Illyrians and Galatians. Among the many myths prevailing among many peoples this seems to me the most plausible]²¹.

Whilst there is no doubt in the Homeric poems that neither Aeneas nor Neoptolemus distinguish themselves either in warcraft or in human terms (Neoptolemus sullies himself with brutal crimes during the taking of Troy), the Appian myth presupposes the recovery of a character who appears in the verses of the *Odyssey* without any ambiguity whatsoever as one of the most cruel and ferocious rivals of Odysseus. The description that Odysseus himself gives during his long wanderings in his report to the Phaeacians, unhesitatingly depicts a savage and bestial character. A monstrous and lonely being of immense size and thoroughly unfriendly manners, the son of Poseidon is impious, cannibalistic and stupid²². It is scarcely an edifying portrait in which, it may be supposed, no people or king, even barbarians, would want to recognise their ancestor. What then were the reasons for reviving it and what did it mean for genealogical purposes?

We must first and foremost stress that other literary sources show an image of the same character which totally contradicts the Homeric description. In the verses of the Hellenistic poets Callimachus (see Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistes*, VII, 20,18), Bion (*Epithalamium Achilles et Deidameiae*, 2,3) and Theocritus (*Idylls*, 11) a sensitive, tender and at times innocent and touching personality emerges. In particular, in Theocritus' idyll called “The Cyclops”, Polyphemus becomes a prototype or, more precisely, a grotesque caricature of the unrequited lover, consumed by desire for the

Nereid Galatea who tries to find refuge and relief from his sufferings by devoting himself to the noble art of singing, dreaming that one day his beloved will return his passionate sentiments.

This characterization, at the same time poetic and derisory, was actually introduced into Greek literature one century before Theocritus in the famous *Cyclops or Galateia* (Κύκλωψ ἢ Γαλάτεια) by the dithyrambic poet Philoxenus of Cythera, who lived between the second half of the 5th and the beginning of the 6th century BC and arrived, after many adventurous trials at the court of Dionysius I of Syracuse (405-367 BC)²³.

Tradition says that the artist fell out of favour with the Syracusan tyrant and was locked up in *latomia* for causes which remain unexplained: he may have expressed a less than flattering opinion of the tyrant's poetry or aroused his jealousy because of a hetaera, or may have composed a parody in which the Syracusan tyrant is compared to the Cyclops Polyphemus and his lover to Galatea. We do not know whether this last supposition caused the tyrant's anger, since all we have inherited concerns the approximate contents of the dithyramb in which Polyphemus has the character of a gentle creature who finds relief from his passionate love in singing, as in Theocritus' later verses²⁴. We cannot exclude the fact that the composition contained ironic and satirical allusions that may have provoked the tyrant's rage. Moreover, the episode also reveals the existence of another version differing from the Homeric text and probably preceding Philoxenus' composition, perhaps a local Sicilian tradition with a tendency to delete the more embarrassing characteristics and behaviour in order to show Polyphemus in a favourable light.

It remains for us to define the genesis of the genealogical appendix recorded by Appian which, imagining a happy end to the love story of Polyphemus and Galatea, crowns it with three births and establishes a bond between the distant countries inhabited by the Illyrians, Celts and Galatians and Sicily, the departure point for the migration of the three sons of Polyphemus.

The central role given to Sicily in this tradition is surely not unplanned and it is therefore appropriate to enquire into the political intentions hidden behind this particular genealogical myth.

As critics have unanimously emphasised, the legend of Polyphemus' ancestry is a part of the many myths that were made to serve the consensus policy promoted by the Dionysian regime, with the aim of enhancing the Greek origins of the people with whom the Syracusan tyrant made agreements²⁵.

The merely political role assigned to myth by the Syracusan tyrant became particularly important at the time when Dionysius, having subdued the Carthaginian threat (the third war against Carthage ended favourably for Dionysius in 391 BC), extended his expansionist ambitions to the Sicilian borders and devised a plan to establish the most powerful dynasty in Europe (μεγίστην τῶν κατὰ τὴν Εὐρώπην δυνασσειῶν²⁶). The reference to the Gauls and Illyrians is clearly linked to two specific moments in Dionysius' expansion policy: his agreement with the Celts and his alliance with the Illyrians.

The first part of Dionysius' plan was closely linked to the Gallic invasion of the Po-Valley and Central Italy at the expense of the Etruscans in 388 BC: the anti-Etrurian alliance was probably made not long after and led to two attacks against Caere, the first by land using mercenaries led by the Syracusan tyrant and the second by sea, led by the Syracusan ships at Caere²⁷. This was the first step in the Tyrrhenian plan for hegemony which the tyrant of Syracuse was only partly able to achieve²⁸.

Close contact with the Celts during these years led to many fruitful Adriatic relationships which also assumed the form of an ambitious plan for a Balkan dominion which aimed, according to Diodorus' reports, to sack the Delphic sanctuary, after passing through Epirus²⁹.

Even though the sources are sometimes problematic, traces of this intention are clearly stated in the literary evidence and reported in particular by Diodorus. This historian states that the Sicilian tyrant, through Alcetas, the Molossian Tharybas' son expelled from his land by the pro-Spartan party and in exile in Syracuse, entered into an alliance with the Illyrians and sent them a contingent of two thousand soldiers and five hundred panoplies³⁰. The Illyrian king to whom the western dynasty gave this help was probably Bardyllis, the king of the Dassaretii, one of the most powerful Illyrian tribes established on the border between Macedonia and Epirus³¹. Military cooperation reinstated Alcetas on the Molossian throne and led to the final coalition victory³².

There is no doubt that this result created an eastern Adriatic balance of power which favoured Dionysius who, as reported by Diodorus, decided to intensify his colonial ambitions in the north, offering help to the Parians in the founding of Pharos in Dalmatia on the site of the present-day Starigrad, in 385/4 BC³³. Dionysius' cooperation in the founding of Pharos was motivated and, according to Diodorus, made easier by the fact that Dionysius himself had, some years earlier, made a colonial incursion into this region; the text records the toponym Lissos and, immediately afterwards, an embarrassing and conspicuous blank.

In a brief aside on the tyrant's work in Syracuse, Diodorus reverts to the story of events in Illyria. Greek colonialists and native Illyrians lived together on the same island, although in two different centres (the natives in a well-defended place, probably on the island, and the Greeks by the sea). After cohabiting for one year the natives could no longer tolerate the Greeks and asked their fellow countrymen living on the continent for help. They intervened in great numbers in small boats. The unexpected assault took the colonialists by surprise and many fell. However, the situation was reversed by the intervention of the *eparchos*, the governor having been installed by Dionysius at Lissus, or more probably Issa, much closer to Pharos than the centre of Lissus and presented by Pseudo-Scymnos as a colony of Syracuse³⁴.

Dionysius' interventions in Illyrian territory are well substantiated and provide evidence of a policy of diplomacy (alliance with the Dassaretii king), colonialism (the founding of Lissus and/or Issa) and military intervention (in favour of the Pharii), which was doubtless deep-rooted on the eastern side of the Adriatic sea and possibly an

intermediate stage in the ambitious plans of the western dynasty which must have led to an extension of influence in the Balkans.

In this vast programme of conquests and entente with peoples considered barbarian, myth surely plays a primary role in justifying the tyrant's choices and, at the same time in a less overt way, consolidating his supremacy over his allies.,

In establishing a particular relationship between the memory of the Homeric Sicilian Cyclops and the eponymous Illyrian and Celtic peoples, the myth recorded by Appian would seem to be a part of this propaganda plan.

The fact that Dionysius gave importance to the privileged relationship between Sicily and the Celtic line is confirmed by another legendary tale, a fragment of Philistus preserved by Stephanus of Byzantium. The Sicilian fortune tellers called Galeotes who predicted to Dionysius' mother the *diuturna fortuna* of her unborn baby while she was pregnant³⁵, were descendants of Galeote, son of Apollo and Temisto, who was the daughter of Zabius³⁶. He was the king of Hyperboreans, the mythical people associated with the Celts.

This is an illustrative fact as it provides evidence of the role played by Philistus in expanding (and perhaps in creating) a range of legendary information destined to fuel Dionysius' propaganda, and this was, without doubt, the source from which Appian obtained information on Polyphemus' ancestry.

The Syracusan historian in fact composed a *History of Sicily*, handed down to us only in fragments. The first part traced the island's history up to the seizure of Agrigento in 406/405 BC, whilst the second part narrated the events that took place under the Syracusan tyranny of Dionysius. It is well known that Philistus was not only the dynasty's annalist, but also the theorist and propagandist of the tyranny.

If Philistus, as it seems likely, was the first to record the myth of Sicilian descent from the Illyrians, Celts and Galas, he was surely also its author, conscious of the symbolic power of mythical stories and their efficacy in supporting and successfully promoting the Sicilian tyrant's political choices and will.

ILLYRIUS' ORIGINS: A DIONYSIAN RECOVERY OF A COMPETING MYTH?

The mythical-poetical activity of the Sicilian historian probably drew inspiration from some pre-existing elements, whose sources may be hypothetically traced

The mention of the Cyclops as a symbolic reference to Sicily and to a past celebrated by Homer may be inspired by Philoxenus' anti-Dionysian pamphlet, rewritten in celebratory fashion, whilst the idea of ancestry may have been Balkan in origin and may be connected with the trend, already established in the Molossian lands, towards self-celebration through a hero-genealogy.

This is also discernable, probably in the same period (end of 5th century), in Illyrian ter-

ritory, as shown in a significant passage from Strabo. Speaking about the Epirote people of southern Illyria and western Macedonia, the Greek geographer writes³⁷:

Ταῦτα δὲ πρότερον μὲν κατεδυναστεύετο ἕκαστα, ὧν ἐν τοῖς Ἐγγελέαις οἱ Κάδμου καὶ Ἄρμονίας ἀπόγονοι ἦρχον, καὶ τὰ μυθεύμενα περὶ αὐτῶν ἐκεῖ δείκνυται. Οὗτοι μὲν οὖν οὐχ ὑπὸ ἰθαγενῶν ἤρχοντο· οἱ δὲ Λυκησταὶ ὑπ' Ἀρραβαίῳ ἐγένοντο, τοῦ Βακχιαδῶν γένους οἴοντι· τούτου δ' ἦν θυγατριδῆ ἢ Φιλίππου μήτηρ τοῦ Ἀμύντου Εὐρυδίκη, Σίρρα δὲ θυγάτηρ· καὶ τῶν Ἠπειρωτῶν δὲ Μολοττοὶ ὑπὸ Πύρρῳ τῷ Νεοπτολέμου τοῦ Ἀχιλλέως καὶ τοῖς ἀπογόνους αὐτοῦ, Θετταλοῖς οὖσι, γεγονόντες· οἱ λοιποὶ δ' ὑπὸ ἰθαγενῶν ἤρχοντο.

[In earlier times these peoples were ruled separately, each by its own dynasty. For instance, it was the descendants of Cadmus and Harmonia who ruled over the Enchelei; and the scenes of the stories told about them are still pointed out there. These people, I say, were not ruled by men of native stock; and the Lyncestae became subject to Arrabaeus, who was of the stock of the Bacchiads (Eurydice, the mother of Philip, Amyntas' son, was Arrabaeus' daughter's daughter and Sirra was his daughter); and again, of the Epeirotes, the Molossi became subject to Pyrrhus, the son of Neoptolemus the son of Achilles, and to his descendants, who were Thessalians. But the rest were ruled by men of native stock]³⁸.

The Molossian case is here remembered and preceded by the mention of the case of Lyncesti, in which the *titulus nobilitatis* was acquired by recovering connections with a dynasty of lesser mythological status (that of the Bacchiads, a Corinthian dynasty whose descendants were the Cypselids from Corinth and whose fame throughout the Balkan hinterland was, without doubt, connected with Periander's colonial activities within the eastern Adriatic and in the Chalcidian peninsula, the approaches to the continent inhabited by the Macedonians and Illyrians). Nevertheless, Strabo was an example for the people of Enchelei, established on the border between Macedonia and Epirus, whose royal family proclaimed itself the descendants of Kadmos and Harmonia. There are few references to the Enchelei in literary sources and they are always connected with the myth of Kadmos and Harmonia who, according to the legend reported by Euripides, were banished from Thebes and had to take refuge with a barbaric population, later identified by as that of the Enchelei, or, more generally, the Illyrians³⁹.

Apollodorus adds that the continuity of Kadmos' and Harmonia's kingdom was assured by the birth of their heir Illyrius⁴⁰:

Καὶ βασιλεύει Κάδμος Ἰλλυριῶν, καὶ παῖς Ἰλλυριὸς αὐτῷ γίνεται. αὐτῆς δὲ μετὰ Ἄρμονίας εἰς δράκοντα μεταβαλὼν εἰς Ἠλύσιον πεδίον ὑπὸ Διὸς ἐξεπέμφθη.

[And Kadmus reigned over the Illyrians, and a son Illyrius was born to him.]

This refers to a son of Polyphemus who shared his name and is clearly a “competitor” myth.

None of the literary accounts enable us to establish the comparative age of the versions but some clues allow us to make certain assumptions. The legend of Kadmos' and Harmonia's kingdom in Illyria certainly comes before the Dionysian legend, even though it is probably not much earlier. The genealogical appendix attached to Kadmos has been reported in some quite late sources, although it could have drawn on older traditions.

One sign of the antiquity of the tradition is the reference to the Enchelei, a tribe known in the 6th century BC, located at Hecataeus in the neighbourhood of the Chaones (a northern Epirote population) and often referred to as the Illyrians⁴¹. This region, occupied by the Enchelei, had been inhabited by the Dassaretii since at least the beginning of the 6th century. The Enchelei population had been subdued or integrated into the Dassaretii, who, nevertheless, allowed the legend to survive.

Illyrius's myth should logically depend on the story of the Kadmean kingdom and could reasonably be included within the same propaganda framework as that of the nearby Molossian dynasty.

We may wonder, then, whether the privileged contact between Dionysius (and his historian) and the Molossian and Illyrian leaders inspired Philistus to create the alternative legend in which the rising ascendant of the Illyrian ally was no longer connected with his Theban ancestors (or, alternatively, his Phoenician ancestors, which would have been even more embarrassing for an enemy of Carthage such as Dionysius), but with a Sicilian ancestor, an emblem of the Dionysian tyrant.

As a further detail, we must also refer to the fact that the historian and counsellor of Dionysius, according to Plutarch⁴², lived for a certain period in Epirote society: in fact, as an expatriate, he fled to Epirus and the Court of King Alcetas, "where it seems he composed the greater part of his history". During his stay in Epirus Philistos learned of the local Illyrian legend from which he drew his inspiration for the version adapted for Dionysius' propaganda purposes and expansionistic aims.

Ranging over the centuries from Dionysius to Augustus, myth based on genealogical legends which to a certain extent circulated locally, was used by particular leading personalities with the aim of legitimising and justifying their political, military and diplomatic decisions.

The efficacy of these legendary tales seems directly proportional to the geographical distance from the country where Aeneas, Neoptolemus, Polyphemus and Kadmos first found fame through Homer, the ancient poets and the Athenian tragedians. Beginning in the 6th century BC their success became increasingly linked to the growing importance of the historical role of some of the "peripheries" in the Greek world. The strength of these regions and their rulers was also based on their ability to re-use and shape myth and its evocative powers, enhanced by the talents of poets and historians serving powerful figures, as an essential propaganda tool.

NOTES

* The translation of these pages has been possible thanks to the precious help of Angela Fallacara and Anna Provenzano, to whom I express my most sincere gratitude.

¹ *Mythe et politique: actes du colloque de Liège, 14-16 septembre 1989, organisé par le Centre de Recherches mythologiques de l'Université de Paris X et le Centre d'Histoire des Religions de l'Université de Liège*, F. Jouan, A. Motte (eds.), Paris 1990, preface.

- ² “Within the varied field of human experience, it is politics that most frequently and authoritatively moves the spirit’s mythopoeic needs. In order to give itself an identity and legitimise its forms of life and to avoid latent struggles, each society needs to establish a distant genealogy so that it may recount its history, crowned with the glorious halo of the sacred and the divine, represent significant episodes in its past, and save it from a merely circumstantial genesis. Its origins are linked to the organisation of the cosmos or the pantheon, and are divine or else involve the deification of its founding heroes after their death, a role conferred on inspired legislators, supernatural interventions in the plot of human history, etc. Each community longs to establish names, special places and times and to exalt them, even if it has to correct the image in accordance with its evolution and the blows which befall it”.
- ³ See in particular M. Detienne, *Comment être autochtone, du pur Athénien au Français raciné*, Paris 2003 and from the same author *Les Grecs et nous*, Paris 2005, pp. 113-144 and N. Loraux, *Né de la terre*, Paris 1996.
- ⁴ The term “propaganda” (it. “propaganda”; fr. “propagande”) often appears in historical and literary bibliographies of antiquity describing the mechanism explained above. Reference to some of the more important titles serve as examples and justify the choice of terminology: M. Sordi, *Storiografia e propaganda*, Milan 1975 and *I canali della propaganda nel mondo antico*, Milano, 1976; A. Powell, *Roman poetry and propaganda in the age of Augustus*, Bristol 1994; J. Defradas, *Les thèmes de la propagande delphique*, Paris 1954.
- ⁵ The legend of Aeneas’ landings in Latium has been known since the beginning of literary production in the Latin language. The most ancient mythical attestation of the founding of Roman by the Trojan hero was also recorded in Greek production from the 5th century BC, according to Dionysius of Halicarnassus, who draws a lot of his evidence from Hellanicus of Lesbos (*Ant. Rom.*, I, 72, 1-2 and *FGrHist* 4 F 84). The original heart of the legend was gradually enriched with new episodes moulded on events in Roman history (Aeneas’ passage to Carthage is related to the Punic wars and the troubled relationship with the Phoenician colony) before being celebrated and developed by Virgil. The immortal fame of the Latin poem was certainly one of the reasons for the great fortune of the Trojan myth in various areas and times in Ancient Rome. Since the Merovingian age, it has been known that the Trojans were presented as the famous ancestors of the Frankish population due to the presumed (and fairly devious!) etymological derivation of “Francus” from “Phrygius”. During the Age of Enlightenment, the legend again fuelled the official historiography of the French Kingdom to such strong dogmatic effect that Nicolas Fréret was imprisoned in the Bastille in 1714, accused of denying the Trojan ancestry of the French population in order to exalt Frankish kinship with the Germans. On the subject of the origin and fortune of the Aeneas myth, see P. Wathelet, *Le mythe d’Enée dans l’épopée homérique. Sa survie et son exploitation poétique*, in *Mythe et Politique, Actes du Colloque de Liège, 14-16 septembre 1989, organisé par le Centre de Recherches mythologiques de l’Université de Paris X et le Centre d’Histoire des Religions de l’Université de Liège*, cit., pp. 287-296.
- ⁶ Moreover, it must be stressed that this ennobling of ancestors was not considered in relation to the Achaeans’ winning army but to their brave opponents, thus implicitly presenting the conquest of Greece by *Quirites* as the revenge of the no less brave followers of Aeneas.
- ⁷ In the *Odyssey* (III, 188 and IV, 4-9) there are allusions to the Myrmidons, Achilles’ people, without express reference to Pyrrhus Neoptolemus, even though it seems that Achilles’ son spent the last period of his life in his father’s kingdom in Phthia. The summary of Proclus’ *Chrestomathia* and of Pseudo Apollodorus’ *Epitome* suggests the version in which Neoptolemus, after Thetis’ intervention, separated from Agamemnon and the rest of the Achaean army and, returning from the war of Troy, established himself with the Molossians, together with Andromache and Helenos.
- ⁸ On the Epirote Molossians, see P. Cabanes, *Les Illyriens de Bardylis à Genthios (IVe-IIe siècles av. J.-C.)*, Paris, 1988, pp. 120-124. About the Molossian royal dynasty: Aristotle, *Politics*, V, 11, 1313a 17-28; Plutarch, *Pyrrhos*, 5,5. On the Aiakides’ myth, see S. Funke, *Aiakidenmythos und epeirotisches Königstum, Der Weg einer hellenischen Monarchie*, Stuttgart 2000.

- ⁹ G. Kinkel, *Epicorum graecorum fragmenta*, Leipzig 1877, p. 53; Eratosthenes, *FGrHist* 241 F 42= schol. *Od.*, III, 188; Apollodorus, *Library*, IV, 12; Pindar, *Nemean* IV, 51-53; VII, 51-58; Pindar, *Paeon*, VI, 102-122.
- ¹⁰ Euripides, *Andromache*, 1243-1252.
- ¹¹ Trans. A.S. Way, in *Euripides, II*, London - Cambridge (Mass.) 1958.
- ¹² L. Moscati Castelnovo, *Eleno e la tradizione troiana in Epiro*, in "Rivista di filologia e di istruzione classica", 1986, 114, pp. 411-424.
- ¹³ Justin, *Epitome of the Philippic History of Pompeius Trogus*, XVII, 3.
- ¹⁴ In the *Paeon* IV, 109 ff., Pindar recorded the tradition according to which Neoptolemus was killed by Apollo at Delphi. In Euripides' *Andromache* (1085-1165) Neoptolemus was accused of wanting to sack the Delphic sanctuary.
- ¹⁵ It should be noted that the recovery, aimed at the ethnic exaltation of heroes established by tradition more or less within the western area of the legendary peregrinations which followed the Trojan war, is widely and variously reported in literature and presents several examples used by the Greeks to justify their commercial activities and their settlements. Concerning the Adriatic, it is sufficient to mention, as an example, Diomedes, a true trans-Adriatic hero and the legendary founder of several Adriatic settlements from Daunia to Veneto. For a review of studies on Diomedes in the Adriatic, see M.C. D'Ercole, *Importuosa Italiae Litora, Paysage et échanges dans l'Adriatique Méridionale archaïque*, Naples 2002. It is true that there are no accounts of a proper recovery, for dynastic propaganda purposes, of this hero even though, as Appian (VII, 31) reports, a certain Dasius, a notable figure from Argynrippa, founded by Diomedes, did not hesitate at the time of the second Punic war to proclaim himself the direct descendent of the Argive hero. The mechanism used is the same as the one described for Aeneas and Pyrrhus.
- ¹⁶ Pausanias, I, 11,1-3.
- ¹⁷ Trans. W.H.S Jones, *Pausanias, Description of Greece, I*, Cambridge (Mass.) - London 1978.
- ¹⁸ I. Malkin, *I ritorni di Odisseo. Colonizzazione e identità etnica nella Grecia antica*, Rome 2004, p. 166 (original edition: *The Returns of Odysseus: Colonisation and Ethnicity*, Berkeley - Los Angeles - London 1998).
- ¹⁹ Appian, *Roman History*, X, I, 2.
- ²⁰ Trans. H. White, *Appian's Roman History, II*, London - Cambridge (Mass.) 1962. On this legend, see: M. Šašel Kos, *Appian and Illyricum*, Ljubljana, 2005, pp. 120 ff. and from the same author *Mythological stories concerning Illyria and its name*, in *L'Illyrie méridionale et l'Épire dans l'Antiquité, IV, Actes du IV^e colloque international de Grenoble (10-12 octobre 2002)*, P. Cabanes, J.-L. Lambolley (eds.), Paris 2004, pp. 493-504.
- ²¹ Homer, *Odyssey*, IX, 186-192; 287-295.
- ²² See D.L. Page, *Poetae melici Graeci*, Oxford 1962, fragments 815, 816, 818, 819, 822; P. Monteil, *Théocrite, Idylles*, Paris, 1968, p. 126 and R. Hunter, *Theocritus, A selection*, Cambridge, 1999, pp. 216-217: "Philoxenus' dithyramb is parodied in the *Plutus* of Aristophanes (388 BC), and it is a reasonable hypothesis that Philoxenus had performed it in Athens shortly before this date. It clearly achieved a remarkable notoriety within a brief space of time, probably both for the virtuosity of Philoxenus' musicianship and the brilliant conceit of a lovesick Cyclops".
- ²³ Theocritus, *Idylls*, 11.
- ²⁴ A. Coppola, *Mito e propaganda alla corte dionisiana*, in *La Sicilia dei due Dionisi, Atti della settimana di studio, Agrigento, 24-28 febbraio 1999*, N. Bonacasa, L. Braccisi, E. De Miro (eds.), Rome 2002, p. 373-388, in particular p. 376.
- ²⁵ Diodorus, XVI, 5,4; 9,1; XX, 78,3. see: M. Sordi, *La dynasteia in Occidente (Studi su Dionigi I)*, Padua 1992, pp. 73-79.
- ²⁶ Justin, *Epitome of the Philippic History of Pompeius Trogus*, XX, 5, 4-6; Strabo, V, 2, 3.

- ²⁷ M. Sordi, *Dionigi e il Tirreno*, in *La Sicilia dei due Dionisi, Atti della settimana di studio, Agrigento, 24-28 febbraio 1999*, N. Bonacasa, L. Braccesi, E. De Miro (eds.), Rome 2002, pp. 493-499.
- ²⁸ Diodorus, XV, 13, 1.
- ²⁹ *Ibid.*, 13, 2.
- ³⁰ N. Ceka, *I riflessi della politica di Dionisio il Grande nel territorio dell'attuale Albania*, in *La Sicilia dei due Dionisi, Atti della settimana di studio, Agrigento, 24-28 febbraio 1999*, N. Bonacasa, L. Braccesi, E. De Miro (eds.), Rome 2002, p.78.
- ³¹ Diodorus, XV, 13, 3. See: G. Woodhead, *The "Adriatic empire" of Dionysius I of Syracuse*, in "Klio", 1970, 52, pp. 503-512 and M. Sordi, *La dynasteia in Occidente (Studi su Dionigi I)*, Padua 1992.
- ³² *Ibid.*, 13, 4.
- ³³ *Ibid.*, 13 and XV, 14, 2-3; Ps. Scymnos, 413-414. According to some historians, the confusion between Lissus and Issa in Diodorus' text is also related to the first occurrence of the toponym. Lissus, nowadays the Albanian town of Lesh on the mouth of the Drin, does not show any archaeological traces of a settlement from the 4th century BC, the time of Denis' presence in the Adriatic. The excavations directed by the Albanian archaeologist F. Prendi in the 1970s emphasized that the foundation of the site and its fortifications occurred at the beginning of the 3rd century BC and no 4th century items of Sicilian origin have been found that could prove the colonization hypothesis. The lack of archaeological evidence, however, does not exclude a priori the use of the site (whose location, at the mouth of the river next to the sea, offered some important strategic advantages) as a simple Syracusan site and bridgehead to control the lower Adriatic, without necessarily entailing the foundation of a true colony. F. Prendi, K. Zheku, *La ville illyrienne de Lissus, son origine et son système de fortification*, in "Studia Albanica", 1971, 8, 2, pp. 35 ff.
- ³⁴ Cicero, *De divinatione*, I, 20, 39 = *FGrHist* 556 F 57.
- ³⁵ Stephanus of Byzantium, *Γαλεῶται ἀνδ' Ὑβλαί· ΦΓρΗιστ 556 Φ 20*.
- ³⁶ Strabo, VII, 7, 8.
- ³⁷ Trans. H.L. Jones, *The Geography of Strabo, III*, London-Cambridge (Mass) 1961.
- ³⁸ Pseudo-Scymnos, 437-438; Pausanias, IX, 5,3.
- ³⁹ Apollodorus, *Library*, III, 5, 4. See other mentions of this myth in: *scholia vaticana* to Virgil, *Aen.*, II, p. 311 Lion; Stephanus of Byzantium under Ἰλλυρία.
- ⁴⁰ Hecataeus, *FGrHist*, 1 F 99.
- ⁴¹ Plutarch, *Moralia*, 605, c; *Dion*, 11, 4.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Cabanes P., *Les Illyriens de Bardylis à Genthios (IVe-IIe siècles av. J.-C.)*, Paris 1988.
- Ceka N., *I riflessi della politica di Dionisio il Grande nel territorio dell'attuale Albania*, in *La Sicilia dei due Dionisi, Atti della settimana di studio, Agrigento, 24-28 febbraio 1999*, Bonacasa N., Braccesi L., De Miro E. (eds.), Rome 2002, pp. 77-80.
- Coppola A., *Mito e propaganda alla corte dionisiana*, in *La Sicilia dei due Dionisi, Atti della settimana di studio, Agrigento, 24-28 febbraio 1999*, Bonacasa N., Braccesi L., De Miro E. (eds.), Rome 2002, pp. 373-388.
- Defradas J., *Les thèmes de la propagande delphique*, Paris 1954.
- D'Ercole M.C., *Importuosa Italiae Litora, Paysage et échanges dans l'Adriatique Méridionale archaïque*, Naples 2002.
- Detienne M., *Comment être autochtone, du pur Athénien au Français raciné*, Paris 2003.
- Id., *Les Grecs et nous*, Paris 2005.

- Funke S., *Aiakidenmythos und epeiriotisches Königtum, Der Weg einer hellenischen Monarchie*, Stuttgart 2000.
- Jouan F., Motte A. (eds.), *Mythe et politique: actes du colloque de Liège, 14-16 septembre 1989, organisé par le Centre de Recherches mythologiques de l'Université de Paris X et le Centre d'Histoire des Religions de l'Université de Liège*, Paris 1990.
- Loraux N., *Né de la terre*, Paris 1996.
- Malkin I., *I ritorni di Odisseo. Colonizzazione e identità etnica nella Grecia antica*, Rome 2004, p. 166 (original edition: *The Returns of Odysseus: Colonisation and Ethnicity*, Berkeley - Los Angeles - London 1998).
- Moscato Castelnovo L., *Eleno e la tradizione troiana in Epiro*, in "Rivista di filologia e di istruzione classica", 1986, 114, pp. 411-424.
- Powell A., *Roman poetry and propaganda in the age of Augustus*, Bristol 1994.
- Prendi F., Zheku K., *La ville illyrienne de Lissus, son origine et son système de fortification*, in "Studia Albanica", 1971, 8, 2.
- Šašel Kos M., *Appian and Illyricum*, Ljubljana 2005.
- Id., *Mythological stories concerning Illyria and its name*, in *L'Illyrie méditerranéenne et l'Épire dans l'Antiquité, IV, Actes du IV^e colloque international de Grenoble (10-12 octobre 2002)*, Cabanes P., Lamboley J.-L. (ed.), Paris 2004, pp.493-504.
- Sordi M., *Storiografia e propaganda*, Milan 1975.
- Id., *I canali della propaganda nel mondo antico*, Milan 1976.
- Id., *La dynasteia in Occidente (Studi su Dionigi I)*, Padua 1992.
- Id., *Dionigi e il Tirreno*, in *La Sicilia dei due Dionisi, Atti della settimana di studio, Agrigento, 24-28 febbraio 1999*, Bonacasa N., Braccisi L., De Miro E. (eds.), Rome 2002, pp. 493-499.
- Wathelet P., *Le mythe d'Enée dans l'épopée homérique. Sa survie et son exploitation poétique*, in *Mythe et Politique*, in *Actes du Colloque de Liège, 14-16 septembre 1989, organisé par le Centre de Recherches mythologiques de l'Université de Paris X et le Centre d'Histoire des Religions de l'Université de Liège*, Jouan F., Motte A. (eds.), Paris 1990, pp. 287-296.
- Woodhead G., *The "Adriatic empire" of Dionysius I of Syracuse*, in "Klio", 1970, 52, pp. 503-505.

