

Greek and Non-Greek World in the Archaic Period

Ingomar Weiler

THE NEGATIVE JUDGEMENT which M. I. Finley forms of the collection of papers *Greco et barbaros* published by the Fondation Hardt is mainly due to his opinion that the new material “where we can now see how Greeks and barbarians lived face to face” has not been considered.¹ This criticism, though it may be true in some respects, does not, however, touch the real problem, for the subject and contributions of these papers concern mainly the literary traditions. Above all, this collection is concerned with interpreting the relationship between the Greek and the non-Greek world, going more into detail than for example the meritorious studies of J. Jüthner and U. Wilcken.² Thus H. Schwabl in his introductory treatise (not mentioned by Finley) examines the notion the Greeks had of the foreign world, basing his observations on the literary works of the archaic period. It is difficult to start from any other than literary sources when such a phenomenon of Greek history is involved.³ H. Herter’s review in *Gnomon* shows that a critical discussion of the conclusion which Schwabl drew in his paper is a better way to solve the problem than the method applied by Finley.⁴

What I shall discuss in this essay is the thesis with which Schwabl closes his paper. A translation of it would run as follows: “At that time (*sc.* the time before Herodotus) the antithesis tyranny/freedom = barbarians/Greeks does not exist yet. The notion that the barbarians have certain typical characteristics that mark them off from the

¹ M. I. Finley, *JHS* 85 (1965) 221; *Greco et barbaros* (Fondation Hardt *Entretiens* VIII, *Vandœuvres-Genève* 1962).

² U. Wilcken, “Hellenen und Barbaren,” *NJbb* 17 (1906) 457ff; J. Jüthner, *Hellenen und Barbaren* [*Das Erbe der Alten*, zw.r. VIII] (Leipzig 1923); see also H. Bengtson, “Hellenen und Barbaren,” in *Unser Geschichtsbild*, ed. K. Rüdiger, I (München 1954) 25ff.

³ H. Schwabl, “Das Bild der fremden Welt bei den Frühen Griechen,” in *Greco et barbaros*, 3ff [hereafter cited as SCHWABL].

⁴ H. Herter, *Gnomon* 38 (1966) 577ff [hereafter HERTER]; for a more positive review *cf.* K. Vretska, *AnzAlt* 18 (1965) 29.

Greeks is not prominent then. The great struggle which the Persian Wars brought about has not yet begun.”⁵

This statement means that the Persian Wars mark the beginning of the antithesis between Hellenes and barbarians.⁶ It is difficult to share Schwabl’s opinion when he speaks about the idea of liberty as a criterion of this antithesis, but it is even more difficult to follow him when he states that the early Greeks were not yet conscious of the difference between the Greek and non-Greek world.

In his review Herter begins with the difference of tongues between Greeks and non-Greeks; the word *βαρβαρόφωνοι* in Homer shows clearly that the Greeks were already aware of a difference. After pointing out some other symptoms of a “Distanzgefühl,” Herter quotes Heraclitus fr. B 107—which Schwabl mentions in his paper, too, though his interpretation differs from that of Herter—as an evidence of the negative attitude of the Greeks towards the barbarians.⁷ We shall follow this method, drawing an inference from the word itself to illuminate its intellectual background.

The word *βαρβαρόφωνοι* seems to be not only an expression denoting somebody who speaks any other than the Greek language—which is all that is usually said about this Homeric word—but it also proves, I think, that the word *βάρβαρος* did exist as well in the time of Homer.⁸ An onomatopoetic etymology (the *Κᾶρες βαρβαρόφωνοι* speak ‘bar-bar’, i.e. words whose meaning one cannot grasp⁹ or, as has also been suggested, they stammer Greek¹⁰) can hardly refute this conclusion when we think of similar word-connections like *βαρβαρόγλωσσος*, *βαρβαροήθης*, *βαρβαρόθυμος*, *βαρβαροκτόνος*, *βαρβαρότροπος*, *βαρβαροτρόφος*, *βαρβαρόφρων*, *βαρβαρόφυλος*.¹¹ Why Homer did not use the word

⁵ Schwabl 23.

⁶ Cf. also J. H. Oliver, *Demokratia, the Gods, and the Free World* (Baltimore 1960) 142: “Artists and writers of the fifth century B.C. created or magnified the antitheses Greek vs. Barbarian, *eleutheroi* vs. *douloi*, *demokratia* (in the broad or narrow sense) vs. tyranny and despotism, because they interpreted the victory over the Persians as a victory of the *theoi hellenioi* or *eleutherioi*.” We are inclined to give our preference to the word ‘magnified’, as will be shown later on.

⁷ Herter 577f; cf. as well *Il.* 3.1ff, 4.422ff; Thuc. 4.126.5; Schwabl 5.

⁸ *Il.* 2.867; cf. Schwabl 5 and the different views put forward in the discussion of his paper by A. Dihle and H. Diller, Schwabl 24; see also Diller, “Die Hellenen-Barbaren-Antithese im Zeitalter der Perserkriege,” *Grecs et barbares* 40, and Herter 578.

⁹ As it is interpreted by Diller, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.8) 40.

¹⁰ Herter 578.

¹¹ It is not necessary in my opinion to assume that the words listed here were used only after Homer; schol. Lycoph. 276; schol. *Il.* vii 89 ed. I. Bekker, I (Berlin 1825) 204; *Orac.Sibyll.* 3.332; *Thom.Mag. Ecl.* 2 ed. F. Ritschel (Halle 1832) 61; Const. Manasses, *Chron.* 3998 (PG 127.370); Theodosius Diaconus, *De Expug. Cretae Acroasis* 1.180 (PG 113.1011); *Orac.Sibyll.* 1.342, 5.96; Const.Manasses, *Chron.* 5760 (PG 127.435).

βάρβαρος we do not know, and hypotheses would be out of place here. Strabo is right when he puts the ironic question to Thucydides, who in 1.3.3. denies the existence of the word 'barbarian' in the time of Homer: "If the barbarians are not mentioned, how is it possible then that the *βαρβαρόφωνοι* are referred to nevertheless?"¹²

The further argument of Strabo is not convincing, when he points out that a name including all Hellenes, which Thucydides in 1.3.2. misses as well, does occur in the *Odyssey*.¹³ Strabo on the one hand does not think of the change of meaning the words *Ἑλλάς* and *Ἕλληνες* had undergone after Homer, though he was well aware of it;¹⁴ on the other hand he does not take into account that Homer uses *Hellas* and *Argos* simultaneously. Name and homeland of the 'Hellenes' in Homer are derived from the 'Hellas' in northern Greece,¹⁵ and therefore Homer's conception of the Hellenes is different from that signified by the traditional use of the name from the closing decades of the seventh century on, or from the term 'Panhellenes' as used by Hesiod, Archilochus and Pindar.¹⁶ The connection of the *Hellas* in northern Greece with the later common usage of *Ἕλληνες* and *Πανελλήνες* for the whole nation cannot be explained satisfactorily.¹⁷ The myths woven round Hellen do not really solve this problem. Even if, when we sum up, the earliest name used to denote the Greeks as a nation is

¹² Cf. A. W. Gomme, *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides* I (Oxford 1945) 98f. F. Hampl points out the dangers of a historical interpretation of Thuc. 1.3 in "Die Ilias ist kein Geschichtsbuch," *Serta Philologica Aenipontana* 7–8 (1962) 42.

¹³ Strabo 14.2.28 p.661 quotes *Od.* 1.344 *ἀνδρός, τοῦ κλέος εὐρὺ καθ' Ἑλλάδα καὶ μέσον Ἄργος*, and 15.80 *εἶτ' ἐθέλεις τραφῆναι ἂν Ἑλλάδα καὶ μέσον Ἄργος*.

¹⁴ Strabo 8.6.6 p.370 *περὶ δὲ τῆς Ἑλλάδος καὶ Ἑλλήνων καὶ Πανελλήνων ἀντιλέγεται*.

¹⁵ Gomme, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.12) 94: "Homer not knowing the name *Hellene* except for the inhabitants of Phthiotis." According to Oliver's theory of the religious community of the Hellenes (*supra* n.6), it is not origin and language that are the most important qualifications for belonging to the Hellenes, but belief in the *theoi Hellēnioi*, i.e. in those gods who succeeded the *theoi basileioi* after the republics had been established. Therefore Oliver (p.128) draws the conclusion that there was no antithesis 'Hellenes vs. barbarians' in the eighth and seventh centuries but Hellenes vs. non-Hellenes, who were "helots (or penestae) and slaves . . . not only these lower groups but independent Pelasgians and so forth." Besides this point of view pertaining to the situation in Greece proper—which in my opinion is no doubt correct—one should consider as well the periphery of the Greek world, where the contrast between Greeks and non-Greeks would have been prominent.

¹⁶ *Il.* 2.530; cf. Jüthner, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.2) 5; see also V. Burr, *Νεῶν κατάλογος* (*Klio Beiheft* 49, 1944) 87ff; Hes. *Op.* 528; Archil. fr. 54, which Strabo cites in 8.6.6 p.370. Pind. *Isthm.* 2.38, 4.29; see also Bengtson, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.2) 29. For an explanation of the genesis and spread of the names *Hellene-Hellenes-Hellas* cf. Oliver, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.6) 125ff, though I would rather change the word order "A Hellene . . . is a descendant of Hellen" to "Hellen is a descendant of the Hellenes."

¹⁷ About Hellen cf. Bengtson, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.2) 34f and A. Heubeck, *Das Nationalbewusstsein des Herodot* (Diss. Erlangen 1936) 45ff.

not known to us, the feeling of the Greeks that a foreign world existed besides their own is confirmed by the mere existence of the word *βάρβαρος*, because this word must have had its origin in a confrontation, just as the notion of freedom cannot be conceived apart from that of slavery.¹⁸ A confrontation of that kind is of course possible only at a time when most of the country and the Aegean world had already become Greek. The most important phase of this development covers the time from the beginning of the first millennium up to post-Homeric times.¹⁹

In the cultural field the Panhellenic games—one had to be of Hellenic origin to be able to participate²⁰—are an expression of that “Distanzgefühl,” which in its turn shows that the Greeks had become aware of the things they had in common, often referred to as *nomoi*.²¹ Some few quotations from the pre-Herodotean literature, where allusions to the barbarians are made, will attest that feeling of contrast. A fragment of Heraclitus handed down to us by Sextus Empiricus is the one most relevant: *κακοὶ μάρτυρες ἀνθρώποισιν ὀφθαλμοὶ καὶ ὦτα βαρβάρους ψυχὰς ἐχόντων*.²² In a critical analysis of this fragment Schwabl seems to become untrue to his own thesis, because if he thinks of people with barbaric souls as those who do not know how to interpret and understand the signs of the senses,²³ he characterizes the barbarians as being uneducated. I think it is not going too far to interpret the quotation of Heraclitus in an even wider sense. Is there not something in the words *ψυχὰὶ βαρβάρων* that characterizes not only the foreigner in the time following the Persian Wars, but people of all times, when referred to as “barbaric”? In Heraclitus, therefore, to be educated is a criterion of the non-barbarian. The emphasis of that particular aspect of the Heraclitean fragment is the more justified by the fact that Sextus Empiricus adds another quotation of similar con-

¹⁸ Herter 578 says that he is not quite sure if the word *βάρβαρος* was invented as a complementary term to *Ἕλληνες*. If we, on the other hand, take that for granted, we do so because of the passage in Thuc. 1.3.3: . . . ἀντίπαλον ἐς ἐν ὄνομα ἀποκεκρίσθαι.

¹⁹ F. Hampl, “Die Chronologie der Einwanderung der griechischen Stämme und das Problem der Nation der Träger der mykenischen Kultur,” *MusHelv* 17 (1960) 85.

²⁰ For example at the Olympic games: Hdt. 5.22.1f; cf. also schol. Pind. Ol. 3.21a and Dion.Hal. *Rhet.* 7.1.

²¹ On the question when the Olympic games became Panhellenic cf. Oliver, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.6) 126 and 130. On the *nomoi*, see for example V. Ehrenberg, *Der Staat der Griechen*² (Zürich/Stuttgart 1965) 123.

²² Heracl. B 107; H. Diels/W. Kranz, *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*¹¹ I (Berlin 1964) 175, interpret as follows: “Seelen, die wie Barbaren die Aussagen der Sinne nicht richtig verstehen können.” Cf. also Herter 578, and H. C. Baldry in *Grecs et barbares* (*supra* n.1) 69f.

²³ Schwabl 5.

tent: ὄπερ ἴσον ἦν τῶι 'βαρβάρων ἐστὶ ψυχῶν ταῖς ἀλόγοις αἰσθήσεσι πιστεύειν'.²⁴ H. C. Baldry and H. Herter have already pointed out that here not only is the question of a certain knowledge of language involved but also that of education.

A Delphic oracle warning Battus, the *oikistēs* of Cyrene,²⁵ of the sheepskin-wearing Libyans, the *βάρβαροι ἄνδρες . . . βαιτοφόροι*, is further evidence that the notion of barbarian implied more than just a man who spoke a tongue other than Greek. The statement of Hecataeus in which he speaks of the original inhabitants of the Peloponnese as barbarians should be mentioned here too, though it may be that the historian actually means the Pelasgians.²⁶ Finally Pindar reassures his listeners that οὐδ' ἔστιν οὕτω βάρβαρος οὔτε παλίγγλωστος πόλις, that has never heard of the heroic deeds of Peleus.²⁷ Such are the scanty fragments in which the word 'barbarian' occurs.²⁸ But nevertheless they show that the early notion of barbarian emphasizes not so much the foreign as the non-Greek aspect. From the fragments we also learn that besides difference of language other factors, such as dress and most of all education, play an important part in characterizing the barbarian of the archaic period. Therefore we are justified in assuming, in opposition to Schwabl, that even the Greeks of the archaic period were aware of the polarity of the Greek and the foreign world, and that an expression for it, as the genesis of the antithesis Hellenes vs. barbarians shows, had long been known.

From the time of the Persian Wars on, or better, from that of the invasion of Xerxes, the distinction between Hellenes and barbarians, which had existed for a long time, was magnified. It was only natural, therefore, that from that time onwards the Persians and their Asiatic allies became 'barbarians' *par excellence*.²⁹ The tragedians above all

²⁴ Sext. Emp. *Math.* 7.126; see Heracl. A 16 (Diels/Kranz p.147).

²⁵ Diod. Sic. 8.29. Pythia gives Battus the order to found a colony in Libya; cf. H. W. Parke/D. E. Wormell, *The Delphic Oracle* (Oxford 1956) I.74f and II.31f; see also Hdt. 4.155.1f.

²⁶ Hecat. Miles., *FGrHist* 1 F 119 = Strabo 7.7.1 p.321; see also F. Lochner-Hüttenbach, *Die Pelasger* (Inst.f.vergl.Sprachwiss. Graz, *Arbeiten* Hft. 6, 1960) 101ff.

²⁷ Pind. *Isthm.* 6.24ff; *Isthm.* 6 was written before the arrival of the Persians in 480 B.C.

²⁸ Because of reasons of method we have considered only those passages where the word 'barbarian' is actually used. Passages of the archaic period which refer to the non-Greek world are collected and interpreted by Schwabl.

²⁹ M. Pohlenz, *Griechische Freiheit* (Heidelberg 1955) 19f, says that, when Herodotus uses the word 'barbarian' he actually thinks of the Persians; but there are terminological differences. Cf. e.g. the description of the battle of Plataea (Hdt. 9.31.1). See also M. Pohlenz, *Herodot* (*Neue Wege zur Antike*, zw.R. 7/8, Leipzig 1937) 155ff and Diller, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.8) 45. For study of the words I have used J. E. Powell, *Lexicon to Herodotus*² (Hildesheim 1960) and Heubeck, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.17) 30ff.

were responsible for this development, when they turned to the most topical theme of their time, the Persian Wars.³⁰ With the famous dream of Atossa, mother of Xerxes, in the *Persae*, Aeschylus renders the terms 'Hellenes' and 'barbarians' with new shades of meaning. The whole comparison remains on a high symbolic level, but freedom is contrasted with slavery, simplicity with luxury.³¹ Therefore I cannot follow Miss Bacon when she puts forward the view: "He (*sc.* Aeschylus) represents not 'the barbarian' of tradition, but a Persian, a Trojan, an Egyptian, and he has clear notions about their differences in language, dress, customs, and appearance, beliefs."³² But it is the very dream of Atossa which shows the traditional notion of the barbarian.

Contrary to what one might expect, the fragments of the historiographers Charon of Lampsacus and Xanthus of Sardis, writing before Herodotus, do not give any more details of the picture the Greeks had of the foreign world. But there is the one remarkable fact that they both, unlike Herodotus, call the Persians, Lydians, Magians and other Asiatic peoples by their proper names, while nearly all the later historians speak of these peoples simply as barbarians.³³ In the well-known Herodotean antithesis³⁴—a subject often dealt with³⁵—the historian is concerned mainly with the term 'barbarian', without

³⁰ The lost work by Phrynichus ἡ Μιλήτου ἄλωσις would certainly help here. Cf. W. Kranz, *Stasimon* (Berlin 1933) 75; also Helen H. Bacon, *Barbarians in Greek Tragedy* (New Haven 1961) 15ff; G. Clifton, "The Mood of the *Persai* of Aeschylus," *G&R* 10 (1963) 111ff.

³¹ Aesch. *Pers.* 182–195. Besides the characteristic features which Hellas and Persia have in common, like stature (μέγεθος), beauty (κάλλος) and origin (κασιγνήτα γένους ταύτου), there are also some things in which they differ from each other: the Persian sister bears the humiliating yoke proudly (ἐπυργούτο) wearing a gorgeous dress (πέπλος Περσικός), while her Greek sister wearing a plain dress (Δωρικός) rejects the yoke violently (βίβ).

³² Bacon, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.30) 62; we cannot share Miss Bacon's view (p.9) that the exotic effect of the word βάρβαρος is typical of Aeschylus in opposition to Sophocles and Euripides.

³³ For example, *FGrHist* 262 F 3a, 9 (Charon) and 765 F 4, 6, 15, 16 (Xanthus); see also *FHG*, Xanthus F 19.

³⁴ It is remarkable that Herodotus, with the exception of the proem, uses the antithesis mostly in the second part of his history, but there he does so frequently: 1.4.1–4, 6.2–3, 57.2–3, 60.3; 4.12.3; 5.22.1–2, 23.2–3; 6.112.3; 7.63, 132.2, 138.1–2, 148.2, 158.5, 163.1–2, 175.1–2, 176.5, 177, 178.2, 180, 183.1–2, 189.1–2, 194.1, 196, 211.2–3, 212.1–2, 223.2, 225.2–3, 233.1; 8.4.1, 6.1–2, 9, 11.1–3, 14.1, 15.1, 16.1,3, 23.1, 29.2, 40.1–2, 46.3–4, 75.2, 80.1–2, 82.1–2, 83.2, 86, 87.1, 89.1–2, 111.1, 132.3, 142.1; 9.7, 17.4, 31.1, 32.2, 40, 45.3, 48.4, 57.3, 68, 70.3–4, 71.1, 76.1, 78.2, 90.2, 98.1,4, 99.1–2, 100.1, 101.3, 102.3–4, 103.2, 106.1. That Herodotus hardly ever speaks about Europe without mentioning Asia in some way at the same time is also very informative: 1.4.1,4, 103.3, 209.1,4; 2.16.1, 103.1; 3.96.1; 4.36.2, 42.1, 45.3,5, 143.1, 198.1; 5.12.1; 7.33.1, 174; 8.109.3.

³⁵ About that cf. Diller, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.8) 40ff.

giving much attention to its opposite. Here I want to add that the Herodotean notion is probably of Athenian origin, because in two places the historian points out that the Lacedaemonians, whenever they spoke of a non-Greek, did not call him *βάρβαρος*, as was the custom, but *ξείνος*.³⁶

Let us now examine the antithesis in respect to the other terms, *Ἕλληνες* and *Ἑλλάς*, in the traditional representation of the Persian Wars, where a new perspective for the understanding of the confrontation of the two worlds can be detected. What does Herodotus really mean by the Hellas he mentions so often?³⁷ Where is the Hellas against which Xerxes waged war (*ἐπὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα*³⁸) and what picture had Mardonius of the Hellas where he wanted to become *ὑπαρχος*?³⁹ First let us list the towns, districts and islands which Herodotus localizes *expressis verbis* in Greece so that we may have a picture of the geographical expansion of Hellas as he describes it: Ephesus (1.92.1; cf. 1.26.1), Miletus (1.92.2), Dodona (2.52.2), Thesprotia (2.56.1), Cyrene, Lindos, Samos (2.182.1; cf. also 3.131.3), Croton (3.131.3; also 8.47), Sicily, Corcyra, Crete (7.145.2; also 3.136.1ff). The story of Democedes gives some further information:⁴⁰ the Greek doctor, according to the order of Darius, is to show *πάσαν τὴν Ἑλλάδα* to fifteen Persian spies. They travel from Phoenicia *ἐς τὴν Ἑλλάδα* along the Greek coastline and finally come to Croton. Though one could suppose, reading these names, that the Greek colonies in North Africa and Asia Minor as well as in Magna Graecia⁴¹ were parts of the Herodotean Hellas, we cannot ignore the fact that the historian confines himself to the motherland Hellas in his account of the invasion of Xerxes. This observation is the more important since the contrast between Hellenes and barbarians, which is according to the proem

³⁶ Hdt. 9.11.2: *ξείνους γὰρ ἐκάλεον τοὺς βαρβάρους*; 55.2... [*ξείνους λέγων τοὺς βαρβάρους*].

³⁷ Cf. also the feminine adjective *Ἑλλάς*, which can be found in connection with *πόλις* (4.12.2 Sinope, 5.93.2 Corinth, 7.22.3 Sane, 7.115.1 Argilus, 7.115.2 Stagirus), *γῆ* (1.152.3) and *γλώσσα* (2.56.3, 137.5, 143.4, 144.2, 154.2; 4.78.1, 110.1, 155.3, 192.3; 6.98.3; 8.135.3; 9.16.2). Here one cannot yet speak of a limitation of the term, as will be shown later on in this paper.

³⁸ Hdt. 3.134.5; 7.1.1, 2, 5.1, 7.1, 8.1, 10.3, 11.1, 12.1, 13.3, 15.3, 17.2, 21.1, 25.1, 38.2, 39.1, 46.1, 47.1, 57.1, 82, 99.1, 101.1, 105, 108.1, 144.3, 148.2, 150.1, 152.3, 157.1, 177, 203.2, 209.2, 239.1; 8.100.1, 115.4, 116.1. The campaign of Mardonius on the other hand was *ἐπὶ τε Ἐρέτριαν καὶ Ἀθήνας* (6.43.4).

³⁹ Hdt. 7.6.2.

⁴⁰ Hdt. 3.134.5ff.

⁴¹ Pindar in one place also uses *Hellas* to denote *Magna Graecia* (*Pyth.* 1.75); see J. Rumpel, *Lexicon Pindaricum* (Leipzig 1883) 152.

the main concern of Herodotus' history, is of special significance for the understanding of the Persian Wars.

This modification of the term *Hellas* becomes explicit in the account of the resolution passed by the members of the congress at the Isthmus, namely that they should wait for Xerxes' army at Thermopylae and for his fleet at Artemision. The Persian king should not break through this defensive line: οἱ μὲν δὴ παρεκκελεύοντο ὄκως μὴ παρήσουσι ἐς τὴν Ἑλλάδα τοὺς βαρβάρους . . .⁴² We may conclude, therefore, that at the time of the Persian Wars Thermopylae, which significantly is also referred to as ἔσοδος ἐς τὴν Ἑλλάδα⁴³ and which separates Thessaly from Phocis, marked the northern border of *Hellas*. The words Θεσσαλίη τε καὶ ἡ σύμπασα Ἑλλάς⁴⁴ also seem to point to the fact that Thessaly was not part of *Hellas*. The name *Hellas* in the account of the Persian Wars is used only when Herodotus speaks about the southern part of the Balkan peninsula—a fact which strikingly characterizes the dreary situation of the Greeks at that time.⁴⁵ So we are justified in saying that *Hellas* still existed only where the Greeks could retain their liberty in spite of Xerxes. Clearly this idea of *Hellas* did not embody the antithesis 'Hellenes vs. barbarians.' We should note also that Herodotus thus promoted the idea of the separation of the two continents, though he sometimes speaks rather mockingly about the cleavage of the *oikoumenē* into Europe and Asia.

Let us draw a final conclusion. In spite of the scanty material in Greek literature one cannot deny the existence of a "Distanzgefühl"

⁴² Hdt. 8.15.2; cf. also 7.175.2.

⁴³ Hdt. 7.176.2f. The Greeks also decided to rebuild an old wall, originally built by the Phocians against the Thessalians, at Thermopylae to hold the barbarians back from *Hellas*.

⁴⁴ Hdt. 7.172.2; accordingly, also, Thrace (7.105), Chersonese (9.121) and Larissa in the north of Thessaly (9.1) did not belong to *Hellas* at that time. Another interpretation which would doubtless be more typical of Herodotean usage, i.e. "Thessaly and the rest of *Hellas*," is not very likely here, considering what has been said in the passages cited in nn. 42 and 43 *supra*. There the state of emergency caused by the invasion of Xerxes finds its verbal expression.

⁴⁵ Ehrenberg's view, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.21) 123, that *Hellas* is not so much a geographical but an ideal term, though he cites Herodotus as an authority (8.144), cannot be fully accepted. The numerous prepositional expressions like ἐπὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα, ἐς (πᾶσαν) τὴν Ἑλλάδα, ἀπὸ τῆς Ἑλλάδος, ἐκ τῆς Ἑλλάδος, ἀνὰ τὴν Ἑλλάδα, ἐν τῇ Ἑλλάδι show, I think, that it is a geographical term. Diller, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.8) 46, also thinks of *Hellas* as of a specific political-geographical name when he says that the name *Hellas*, after the Persian Wars, did not so much denote the country inhabited by Hellenic-speaking people as the mother country from Thessaly to the Peloponnese, which had been defended against the Persian king. The problem—often discussed in connection with Isoc. *Paneg.* 50—whether the name of Hellenes merely indicates their origin or means a certain way of thinking is also relevant to our theme; cf. for example E. Buchner, *Der Panegyrikos des Isokrates* (*Historia Einzelschr.* 2, 1958) 60ff.

from the archaic period onwards. The mere fact that the word *βάρβαρος* existed seems to be proof enough for that. This, however, does not permit us to assume that the antithesis Hellene vs. barbarian existed also, as we can take for granted from the times of Aeschylus and Herodotus, since for that assumption we miss more than just the *termini technici*. The sources do not enable us to recognize the single phases of a differentiation of the feeling of contrast in the archaic period, but only from the time of Herodotus onwards.

INSTITUT FÜR ALTE GESCHICHTE, UNIVERSITÄT INNSBRUCK
November, 1967