THE LEGEND OF CADMUS – The foundation of the city of Butoa and the possible origin of the name Illyrians

**Abstract:** During one hundred years of the development of archaeology in southeast Europe, one of the dominant issues was the origin of communities that were recognized by former researchers as a homogenous component named the Illyrians. The issue of their origin was observed through different interpretations of wethnogenetic processes which numerous researchers tried to use to create different developmental phases of creating communities named after the Illyrians. By combining the most recent interpretations of concepts of myths and legends of the past communities, written data containing live memories of these myths during the past two centuries, as well as archaeological and historical data, the relationship and complexities of the oldest myths and legends, such as the one of Cadmus and Harmonia, are reimposed as they suggest the origin of the entire term of the Illyrians as a geographic and religious concept entirely dichotomous compared to, seemingly, misinterpretations of the wider ethnic context of the prehistoric Balkans.
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The matters of history, origin, and development in the territory of the Western Balkans and elsewhere have been present ever since the prehistoric times when we can also date the earliest testimonies of classical authors who, in their own distinctive way, through numerous myths, strived for understanding and yet unattainable knowledge of the development of origin and identity of communities inhabiting this territory during the scientifically established historic periods. Just like to the development of modern science, this matter experienced an exponential progression and, at a certain moment of the history of science in this territory, it occupied one of the most important matters of archaeology and historiography of the 20th century.1

Beginning from the time of the Illyrian movement and Ljudevit Gaj, when the approach to this matter was focused on the idea of providing evidence for the indigenous origin of the Western Balkan peoples, the interest of scholars has not decreased in intensity until modern times. Thus J. G. v. Hahn wrote back in 1853 on the origin of the Illyrian name and its earliest form “Иллриои, Hiluri, and Hiliricus”.2 In his book Through Bosnia and the Herzegovina on Foot During the Insurrection, August and September 1875, Arthur Evans wrote multiple overviews on the associations with the Greek world.3 The first issue of the Herald of the National Museum of Bosnia and Herzegovina (Glasnik Zemaljskog muzeja Bosne i Hercegovine) in 1889 and the paper titled О значењу имени “Босна” have not left out this matter, in which the author Lajos Thallóczy reflected on the writings of classical authors regarding the “Illyrian” peoples.4 In the same issue of the Herald, Ćiro Truhelka concluded his paper Gromile na Glasincu5 with the following words: “Nema sumnje da je ta umjetnost iz Grčke prešla ostalim balkanskim narodima, a uzme li se u obzir da se grčka kultura baš na Balkanu sporo širila, to možemo po tome suditi da glasinačke gromile nijesu davno prije našeg doba nastale”,6 alluding that the former communities in this territory are young by date and that they had established contacts with the Greek world.

The interest of the first explorers did not lose its intensity during the later period when these matters were made topics of papers of authors, citing only some of them, such as G. Novak, P. Lisičar, D. Rendić-Miočević, R. Katičića, B. Govedarica, M. Parović-Pešikan, M. Šašel Kos, and numerous others. From classical philologists to archaeologists, numerous authors reflected on the words of classical authors and prehistoric myths and legends on the arrival of Greek heroes at the coast of the Adriatic Sea by observing, or at least trying to observe, the earliest history through the eyes of the ancient Greeks. Following Nietzsche’s idea that a modern man cannot find a way out of a millennium-old
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1 This text is a result of a multi-year research and parts of it were presented on the scientific conference “Dani antičke Budve” in Budva in 2018.
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6 Ibid, 35
labyrinth, the aspiration of explorers became irreversibly focused on understanding the time of mythical events in the eyes of an ancient man and his words. Unfortunately, the enigma remains unsolved and it is difficult to assume that the absolute solution to this problem will be found in the near future even though it is almost impossible to single out a 20th-century author from the Western Balkans who has not addressed the issue of genesis and the relationship with the Aegean civilization throughout their career.

By approaching the problem through the paradigm of a cultural and historic approach, scholars have achieved a certain consensus by defining the period of the end of the Bronze Age and the earliest Iron Age as terminus post quem of forming the identity of Western Balkan communities. It seems that one of the fundamental reasons why archaeologists from the second half of the 20th century made such a chronological formula is the fact that the Iron Age produced documents containing the oldest mention of the communities in the territory of former eastern Adriatic coast, familiar to ancient Greek sailors who sailed there during the Archaic Period and Classical Greek Period, but also earlier, searching for places of future emporia and apoikia. Although anticipated by earlier authors, the moment of the first mention, or the earliest preserved mention today, in theory does not represent the moment when communities were actually formed, and we can assume that the local identities had existed much earlier dependent on geographical, communication, linguistic, and other conditions. This raises some fundamental methodological questions, particularly the problem of the relationship between mythological traditions and actual events, mechanisms for verifying them, and realistic grounds for including the usage of written words of classical authors in combination with empirically defined disciplines such as archaeology. We should note the fact that despite the so-called empiricism of archaeology, cultural and identity determinants of archaeology itself showed just as much weakness focusing exclusively on “interpretations” by artificially creating terms such as “archaeological cultures”, “individual cults”, or the so-called “princes” whose titles within a collective are exclusively from the pens of the archaeologists themselves. At the same time, it is undeniable that modern science and modern man perceive space and spatial distributions entirely differently from classical man. This is precisely where the truth lies that, unlike modern archaeologists and graphical depictions, the ancient Greeks used to define and present spatial characteristics by using written media and spoken words. Unlike graphical perception, the written and spoken words could be manifested in beliefs and myths that were comprehensible only to people living at that point of time. In the spirit of the aforementioned hypothesis, we are faced with an issue of the relationship between mythology and reality whereby one of the central problems is a continual mythological representation of heroes who were allegedly founders and conquerors, ancestors, demigods, gods. Opinions are extremely divided over the interpretation of the mythological past, and certain authors, such as

Babić 2007, 73-89.
J. G. Frazer, believe that a myth is a product of human imagination entirely disassociated from reality. On the other hand, he believes legends to be reminiscences of actual events, heroes, and occur at actual historical sites. Furthermore, by observing memories as a long-term process starting from the works represented as heroic to the materialization of memories, Kristiansen points out two types of fossilization and materialization of memories: social and religious tradition. At the same time, he believes that the process from actual characters and events to materialized memory would occur in a different developmental period from 100 to 1000 years.

![Diagram of memory processes](image)

**Ill. 1. The process of fossilization of memories through time by Kristiansen**

(Author: A. Kaljanac)

Starting from the assumption that the materialization of memories in the form that is comprehensible to younger generations is a long-term process, the question arises to what extent it is recognizable to modern researchers. Following the time range proposed by Kristiansen, the hero from Sidon – Cadmus – should have attained the status of a legend about one thousand years after his lifetime. For now, judging from the archaeological findings such as the amphora from Euboe dated to 560 – 550 BC, much earlier than Herodotus, and according to the data from the Parian Marble or the intriguing appearance of the work of Sophocles Oedipus Tyrannus (Οἰδίπους Τύραννος) Herodotus’s History appears almost simultaneously, we can conclude that there were older data that can be dated to the Iron Ages, that preceded to the origin of Herodotus’s History. Therefore, we can assume that the Bronze Age is the initial point of observation when certain events took place that materialized in writing and probably in art one millennium later. The fundamental question as the basis of this premise is whether it was possible, in the
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8 For more see: Frazer 2002.
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12 See below in text.
period of human history that preceded the modern way of recording and transferring knowledge about it, to actually maintain a realistic memory of a certain person?

First of all, we need to weigh out the amount of available knowledge as well as its comprehensibility to the wider community, more precisely whether there were adequate mechanisms of transferring the necessary information. For this reason, information transferred from local and foreign authors are deemed fascinating information and examples. The 11th issue of the journal named Bosanski Vjestnik (Bosnian Herald), established by Ignjat Sopron in 1866, published a series of interesting data regarding the life of hero Cadmus. The text notes the following:

«Од старог Дубровника води друм кроз каналску долину, која је прилично плодовита, па онда кроз турску област Суторину у Кастелново на Которском каналу. Овај друм пружа се од Дубровника неколико простора поред обале бренског залива, која је овдје ниска и има једну пећину, која се зове Ескулапова... Тако се прича, да је у њој у прастара времена Ескулап, бог ви-дарства становао... После је краљ Кадм, основатељ вароши Тебе, кад је ову због несреће своје дјеце или ко што други веле, за то оставити морао, што
нiје хтјео Бахха као Бога поштовати, овдје се доселио и код Енхелеа, који су овдје становали, прибјежиште нашао, па с помоћу ових Илире побједио.
Па је у тој пећини, прича се даље, исти краљ Кадм, у једној грдно великој шкољки бању начинио и купао се. У сусједству те пећине звало се једно брдо код старих Мона Кадеј......"\(^{13}\)

Similarly, Arthur Evans presents the information regarding the memory of the legend of Cadmus, nine years after the publication in Bosanski Vjestnik, describing the beliefs and traditions associated with the belief and veneration of serpents among the residents of Cavtat and Konavle even in 1875 when they showed "Asclepius’s" cave where Cadmus and Harmonia were turned into serpents.\(^{14}\)

Looking back at the idea of Kristiansen and the process of fossilization and materialization over a period of up to one thousand years, and judging by the aforementioned and similar examples shared by numerous travel writers from the 19th century, we can say that the citizens of the eastern Adriatic coast, including present-day Montenegro, harbored a memory of ancient myths and legends and awe at the creatures and cults from these legends. Thus, the materialization of memories does not mean the end of the overall process but an end of fossilization and the establishment of a clear structure and form of a myth that becomes part of the future tradition of usage.

On the other hand, compared to classical archaeological observation and modern disassociation of archaeological science from the problem of identity, vivid memories represent an undefined space between conditionally named and artificially construed archaeological cultures as specific determinants and the question of authentic identification of past communities. Identity or ethnos as one of the objects of archaeological pursuit ever since the 1960s within ‘western’ social scientific traditions has been viewed as a self-defining system and certain communities have been defined, in ethnic terms, as self-identified or identified by others.\(^{15}\) It is a common belief that culture is the first and fundamental factor. Culture contains numerous spiritual and material elements and, according to the definition of S. Jones, its reflection in social and psychological phenomena of collective identity is regarded as the leader of ethnic affiliation.\(^{16}\) However, in its overall form, culture does not have the ability to survive over time, and going through numerous transformations, just like archaeological artifacts themselves, it gradually fragments into parts that are passed on to modern explorers as such. In line with this assumption, as well as the fact that culture cannot survive through time, there is a statement of J. M. Hall that culture, along with language and alike, despite its apparent importance, is not the defining element of identity.\(^{17}\) According to him and previously mentioned facts,
the decisive factor can be considered elements of mythology, origin, genders, and their connection with a specific territory.\textsuperscript{18} In the spirit of this hypothesis we can observe the conclusions of L. S. Klejn who suggested that culture is \textit{kot sistem sredstev za družbeno programiranje človeškega delovanja in vedenja, ki ga vsakemu posamezniku posreduje njegova družba}, while on the contrary, archaeological culture is \textit{Sama v sebi je statična in ne organska... pogojno dinamični sistem}.\textsuperscript{19} Following these ideas, we can distinguish two forms of culture: general or vivid and fragmented. The first form of culture represents all of its elements from language to spirituality, whereas the latter one represents the fragments of vivid culture into two spheres. The first fragmentation sphere is the one that took place at the time the culture existed whereby it was divided into elements of material and non-material, non-material but materialized through records, religion and rituals, communication, identity and alike that, through itself, manifested different parts of a wider unit within daily lives of the community. The second sphere is defined by the process of entry of fragments, such as material remains, into time fragmentation whereby one segment of living culture, such as a ceramic product that materialized only one segment of living culture, is additionally fragmented through the flow of time until the moment of discovery. By making such observations, archaeological fragments of a cultural fragment of living culture represent a part of the wider unit in symbiosis with similar fragments of preserved texts of classical authors, myths, and legends that represent fragmented remains of fragments of a former living culture. Ultimately, by observing from a distance, the written materialization of the verbal sphere of living culture through fragmentation of author’s subjectivity or temporal fragmentation and poorly preserved state of ancient texts represents an equivalent of materialized fragmentation whereby the work of a ceramist has fixed individual fragments of culture that subsequently underwent additional temporal fragmentation. Thus, as already mentioned by L. Binford, unlike historical data and author manipulation, archaeological remains are silent even when discovered,\textsuperscript{20} so it seems that their interpretation is a “Sisyphean task”, as well as the interpretation of thoughts and meanings of words of the author who lived several millennia before.

Although modern archeology has made a significant turning point in examining its own ideas in the past while focusing on interdisciplinarity, we get the impression that there is a selectivity in this approach, and that earlier achievements and methods, with a potential of being used in modern observations, were considerably neglected. In the first place, by establishing the previously noted fact of S. Jones that ethnic identification makes a community identify itself as different from another community or that another community identifies it as such\textsuperscript{21}, implies determining self-perception and perception of
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\textsuperscript{20} Binford 2002, 19-23.
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former communities as opposites of their perception in the eyes of modern researchers. In this regard, as a textual materialization of a verbal and intellectual segment of a living culture, myths and legends, heroes, distant lands and oceans between them, as well as how they were understood by the author who created them and wrote them down, represent a collective identification with a territory where future cities were formed, with countries and landscapes, the past where heroic ancestors lived, where they themselves will live one day, because their longevity is the proof that they were not created or remembered for individuals nor represented, often mistakenly, only heroic individuals. Their names, the names of their ancestors and founders, conceal the lives of their communities who, even long after, were proud to express their past and mythical heroes. Could this be a historic manipulation and collective construction of the past or an actual reality of self-perception for the man of that time as much as it is a mythical non-reality for the modern man?

Reflecting on the issue of self-identification and identification, one of the fundamental imposed questions is the ability of understanding and achieving a realistic knowledge of the perception of collective identities of past communities. Elements such as history, ancestors, genealogy, ancient knowledge, and traditions were, without doubt, very important for them and their collective consciousness. In the territory of the eastern Adriatic coast, the legend about legendary heroes Cadmus and Harmonia thus played an important role in the mechanism of self-identification until the times when the memories of the inhabitants of Cavtat and Konavle were described in Bosanski Vjestnik in 1866 or until the writings of Appendini and Evans. Already in 1866, these memories reached the legendary tradition on the arrival of Cadmus, the founder of Thebes in the territory of Boeotia, as well as the founder of Butoa, sometimes named Buto or Butho, present-day Budva, and the personality that remained a part of the long-term memory in the wider territory of the southern part of the eastern Adriatic coast. The memory and conscience of mythology of the distance past certainly had a long tradition of transformation and usage during the Middle Ages and beyond, especially since the period until the development of archaeology, in the second half of the 19th century, largely depended on the written source material. In this regard we need to emphasize that the past itself, its fragments, and myths that have survived until the modern times were significantly modified depending on social, political, and social circumstances, thus implying their different interpretation, reconstruction, and usage in the period until the 19th century.
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22 Appendini 1802.
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According to a legend that was recorded in its present-day form centuries after the events of the legend, Cadmus was born as a son of Sidonian king Agenor and his wife Telephassa. He spent the first part of this life in Sidon with his brothers Phoenix, Cilix, Tasus, and sister Europa who forever changed our lives. After Zeus abducted Europa, Cadmus launched a search with his brothers and, according to the instructions of the Oracle of Delphi, ultimately found a city at a resting place of a cow with a white spot on her forehead which was never put into a yoke. Unfortunately, the place chosen by a cow to be the new settlement at the very beginning propelled several unfortunate circumstances that shaped the destiny of Cadmus and his future wife Harmonia. Cadmus was forced to confront a serpent that killed his followers and killed it not knowing that it was the serpent of the god of war – Ares. With the help of soldiers who emerged from the serpent’s tooth that Cadmus sowed, he erected the walls of Cadmeia, later known as Thebes, with seven doors. During his reign in Cadmeia, he married a woman chosen by the very gods, Harmonia, the daughter of god Ares and goddess Aphrodite, but nevertheless, Ares never forgave him for killing his sacred serpent. Although not a popular figure among the gods, the Sidonian hero was a victim of injustice many times during his lifetime, when Artemis killed his grandson Actaeon, and he lost his daughters Semele and Ino because of goddess Hera. Following these events, apart from numerous other misfortunes, together with Harmonia, Cadmus left Thebes and moved far north, to “Illyria” according to some, or among the Encheleans, according to others, where he and his wife ultimately ended their legendary travels and lives by turning into serpents that in the centuries to come continued to remind local inhabitants of the legends of Sidonian hero Cadmus and his wife Harmonia, the founders of Butoa.

It is difficult to determine the level of historical truth in this legend of the arrival of Cadmus from Sidon to Boeotia and the foundation of Cadmeia. Details referring to the question of the entire origin of the tradition of Cadmus and his deeds, especially the foundation of Butoa his role in this territory, and the influence on local communities, are just as equally fragmented in historical as well as archaeological problems. In keeping with this, following the tradition of these events, the origin of the tradition can be partially traced through fragmented data contained in the works of classical authors who wrote of Cadmus’s passage through Greece.

On several occasions, Herodotus wrote of Cadmus and his arrival in the territory of Greece much earlier than famous Ovid’s Metamorphoses. Describing the festivity in the honor of the god Dionysus, Herodotus wrote the following regarding the origin of this cult: “Nor yet will I hold that the Egyptians took either this or any other custom from the Greeks. But I believe that Melampus learnt the worship of Dionysus chiefly from Cadmus of Tyre and those who came with Cadmus from Phoenice to the land now called Boeotia”.27

---

By mentioning the information that Cadmus arrived in the Greek territory together with a group of Phoenicians as an already well-known information, while making an overview of the Gephyraean clan in another place, Herodotus gives considerably more information regarding this fact and the appearance of Cadmus, together with the Phoenicians, in the territory of Boeotia: “Now the Gephyraean clan, of which the slayers of Hipparchus were members, claim to have come at first from Eretria, but my own enquiry shows that they were among the Phoenicians who came with Cadmus to the country now called Boeotia. In that country the lands of Tanagra were allotted to them, and this is where they settled...These Phoenicians who came with Cadmus and of whom the Gephyraeans were a part brought with them to Hellas, among many other kinds of learning, the alphabet, which had been unknown before this, I think, to the Greeks.I have myself seen Cadmean writing in the temple of Ismenian Apollo at Thebes of Boeotia engraved on certain tripods and for the most part looking like Ionian letters”.28

The tradition that spoke of the Gephyraean clan from Herodotus’s description can be found in the 19th book of Strabo’s Geography. “Near Orpus is a place called Graea, and also the temple of Amphiarraus, and the monument of Narcissus the Eretrian, which is called “Sigelus’s”, because people pass it in silence. Some say that Graea is the same as Tanagra. The Poemendriak clan is the same as the Tanagraeans; and the Tanagraeans are also called Gephyraeans. The temple of Amphiarraus was transferred hither in accordance with an oracle from the Theban Cnoopia”.29 According to Herodotus, the Gephyraeans settled in Tanagra and although they were afterwards named the Tanagraeans, according to Strabo, they were known by the same name centuries after Herodotus’s description and interpretation of their origin. Pausanias also notes similar information that Cadmus came to Boeotia accompanied by a large number of Phoenicians, which is why it is possible to

28 Hdt.s 5.57-59: Οἱ δὲ Γεφυραῖοι, τῶν ἦσαν οἱ φονέες οἱ Ἱππάρχου, ὡς μὲν αὐτῷ λέγουσιν ἐγεγόνεσαν ἐξ ἕρετρις τῆς ἄρχης, ὡς δὲ ἐγὼ ἀναπυνθανόμενος εὐρύσκω, ὡς τοῖς Φοίνικες τῶν σὺν Κάδμῳ ἀπικομένων Φοινίκων ἐς τὸν τόν Βοιωτὸν καλεομένην, οἴκεον δὲ τῆς κλάσσως ταύτης ἀπολαχόντες τὰς Ταναγρικὰς μοῖρας· ἐνδευτέν δὲ, Καδμεῖων πρότερο τὸν εξαναστάντων ὡς Ἀργεῖοι, οἱ Γεφυραῖοι οὗτοι δεύτερα ὑπὸ Βοιωτών εξαναστάντες ἐτράποντο ἐπὶ Ἀβηνέων· Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ σφεας ἐπὶ τῆς ἐσόμετε σφέων αὐτῶν εἶναι πολλάκις, <εἴτε> ἄλλων τῶν ἄλλων ἀξιαπηγήτων ἐπιτάξαντες ἐργεσθαί. Οἱ δὲ Φοίνικες οὗτοι οὐκ ἦσαν Σάμων ἀπικομένοι, τῶν ὡς ἔλεγον Γεφυραῖοι, ἄλλα τὸ πολλὰ ὀλίσσαντες ταύτην τὴν κλάσσων ἐσήγαγον διδασκάλια ἐς τὸς Ἐλλήνας καὶ δὴ καὶ γράμματα, οὐκ ἐόντα πρὶν ἢ Ελλησ εἶναι ὡς ἔμοι δοκεῖν, πρῶτα μὲν τοῖνο ταύτα καὶ ἀπαντῶν χρώονται Φοίνικες· μετὰ δὲ χρόνον προβαίνοντος ἦν τὴν πολλὴν μετέβαλον καὶ τὸν ῥυθμὸν τῶν γράμματος. Περιοίκεον δὲ σφεας τὰ πολλὰ τῶν χώρων τούτων τὸν χρόνον Ἐλλήνων Ἰωνης· οἱ παραλαβόντες διδαχὴ παρὰ τῶν Φοινίκων τὰ γράμματα, μεταρρυθμίσαντες σφέων ὀλίσσαντες ἕρεμων, χρωμέοιν δὲ ἐφάτισαν, ὡσπερ καὶ τὸ δίκαιον ἐφερέ τοὺς ἐσηγαγόντων Φοινίκων ἐς τὴν Ἑλλάδα, φοινικία κεκληθή. Καὶ τὰς βυβλίους διφθέρας καλέσαν ἀπὸ τοῦ παλαιοῦ οἱ Ἰωνης, ὅτι κατ’ ἐν σπάνι βυβλίους ἐσήγαγον διφθέρας αἰγεῖσι ταύτας ἐσήγαγον καὶ κατὰ τοὺς ἔθνης ταὐτὰς. οἴκεον δὲ καὶ τοῖς Καδμείως γράμματα ἐν τῷ Κροὶ τῶν Ἀπόλλωνος τοῦ Σικνίου ἐν Θήβαις τῆς Βοιωτίας ἐπὶ τρίποσι τριάδις ἐκκαλεμμένα, τὰ πολλὰ δύναι ἐόντα τοῖς Τινωκίκοις. English translation A. D. Godley.

29 Strabo, 9.2.10: Καὶ ἢ Γραῖα δ’ ἐστὶν τῶν Ἡρωποῦ πλησίον καὶ τὸ λεύκο τοῦ Αμφιράου καὶ τὸ Ναρκίσσου τοῦ Ἐρετριώτου μνήμη δ καλεῖται Σιγηλ, ἐπείδη σηγόσα παριστάντες· τινὲς δ’ τῇ Τανάγρᾳ τὴν αὐτὴν φασι· ἢ Ποιμανδρία δ’ ἐστὶν αὐτῇ τῇ Ταναγρικῇ· καλοῦνται δὲ καὶ Γεφυραῖοι οἱ Ταναγραῖοι. Ἐκ Κνωτίας δὲ τῆς Θηβαϊκῆς μεθιδρύσαντι κατὰ χρονισμὸν διεύρυ τὸ Ἀμφιράσιον.
trace the continuation of tradition regarding these events. According to his words, a
group of newcomers was even prepared to come into conflict with local communities.
“When the Phoenician army under Cadmus invaded the land these tribes were defeated; the
Hyantes fled from the land when night came, but the Aones begged for mercy, and were allowed
by Cadmus to remain and unite with the Phoenicians”. Therefore we can conclude that
the existing tradition recorded events as occurrences of not only Cadmus as a historic
figure but of a larger group of immigrants from the coast of eastern Mediterranean
who, following initial conflicts and making contacts, settled the region of Boeotia in the
newly founded city of Cadmeia. One of these groups was allegedly the Gephyraeans,
later known as the Tanagraeans who taught the Greeks how to use the alphabet. It is an
intriguing fact that the Phoenician alphabet spread across the Mediterranean, including
Greece, but this process took place until the 8th century BC, almost three decades before
Herodotus’s “The Histories” where he had written down this tradition. On the contrary,
as already noted in the 19th century by Friedrich August Wolf, Homer and Hesiod would
have been illiterate at the moment of writing their works. As a matter of fact, Hecataeus,
Herodotus’s precursor, also corroborates the fact that the link between the Gephyraeans,
as the citizens of Tanagra, and their name the Tanagraeans was older than their mention
in Herodotus’s works in the 5th century BC. According to Stephanus of Byzantium, the
Gephyraeans were mentioned as the Tanagraeans precisely in Hecataeus’s work: “Gephyra, a town in Boeotia. Some say that they are the same as the Tanagraeans, such as Strabo
and Hecataeus. Thus, Demetra s also called the Gephyraean”.

However, if we are to believe in the accuracy of the available information, this process
could be shifted farther in the past, even until the downfall of the Mycenaean world and
the events represented in Homer’s epic poems. Dictys Cretensis who wrote “Dictys of
Crete, the chronicle of the Trojan War” in six books, as one of the works from this period,
also corroborates the fact that the Greeks did in fact learn the alphabet from the Phoeni-
cians. According to Lucius Septimius, who professes to have translated this work, Dictys
Cretensis was a contemporary and comrade of Idomeneus and Meriones, the Cretans
who fought at the walls of Troy in the army of the Achaeans. According to Lucius, more
precisely the letter he sent to Quintus Aradius Rufinus, clay plates were found after the
earthquake on Crete, allegedly in his grave and fell into the hands of a certain Praxis
or Eupraxides who translated them into Greek. Lucius translated the text from Greek
into Latin emphasizing that Dictys was fluent in the Phoenician language and alphabet
which Cadmus brought to Achaea. The first book of this piece of work describes the

30 Paus. 9.5: Κάδμου δὲ καὶ τῆς Φοινίκων στρατιᾶς ἐπελθούσης μάχη νικηθέντες οἱ μὲν Ὕαντες ἐς τὴν
νύκτα τὴν ἐπερχομένην ἐκδιδράσκουσι, τοὺς δὲ Ἄονας ὁ Κάδμος γενομένους ἱκέτας καταμεῖναι καὶ
31 Raymond 2020, 60.
32 Hecat. Ed. F. Jacoby, FGrH: Volume-Jacoby · F 1a.1; F. Fr. 118.1-5: Γέφυρα· πόλις Βοιωτίας. τινὲς δὲ τοὺς
αὐτοὺς εἶναι καὶ Ταναγραῖοι φασίν, ὡς Στράβων καὶ Ἑκαταῖος. ἀφ’ οὗ καὶ Γεφυραία ἡ Δηώ.
way of selecting Agamemnon as the leader of all Greeks in the campaign against Troy. On this occasion, Dictys wrote that, when casting ballots, the Achaeans wrote the name of the future leader on clay plates in the Phoenician alphabet: *Then they decided to appoint a commander-in-chief. Accordingly, in the temple of the Argive Juno, everyone, having received a ballot, wrote (in Phoenician letters) the name of the man he thought would make the best leader.*\(^{34}\) Given the information available from this piece of work and the description, we can assume that the Achaeans, who fought beneath the walls of Troy, had already in this period used the letter which was not directly Phoenician but, in the worst case, influenced by it. Thus, the tradition on the arrival of the Phoenicians and the famous Sidonian hero in the territory of Greece could be pinpointed to the Bronze Age, although precise chronological determinants are impossible to obtain based on this tradition.

If we consider the fact that the tradition on the origin of the Greek letter has survived for more than a millennium and that it was kept by classical authors as such, we can justifiably question the accuracy of some other asserted information. In this regard, particularly important is Herodotus’s mention of the Gephyraeans, of those Phoenicians who settled in Boeotia together with Cadmus, which implies other members of this group speaking that the Gephyraeans were in fact only a portion of Phoenicians who taught the alphabet to the Greeks. The source of Herodotus’s information that could additionally shed light on this matter remains unknown and it is impossible to prejudge how Herodotus came to this information. We can confidently claim that this information is older than his time and it probably dates back the time of oral tradition and cults, such as the cult of ancestors, as the means of identification since such a mechanism would require preservation of the past in the cult of ancestors. Additionally, the information that Herodotus speaks of was familiar, in some segments, to his predecessor Hecataeus. This is distinguishable in the previously noted work of Stephanus of Byzantium which preserves the information that proves that Hecataeus himself wrote about the Gephyraeans as the Tanagraeans. Hecataeus’s words of the city of Gephyra in Boeotia indicate a significantly older tradition than Herodotus and younger authors, as well as the fact that already during his time Gephyra got other names as well, implying an existing process during the previous period, which certainly requires time, so already much earlier than Hecataeus’s time, Gephyra could have become Tanagra from a younger tradition on the timeline. Etymological manual, "*Etymologicum magnum*", corroborates other names for Gephyra, indirectly pointing out the fact that other authors might have used a different term or that it is perhaps a long-term process of many transformations of the name: Gephyra, Tanagra, Greja, and Poimandria.\(^{35}\) Finally, Thucydides also confirms the fact that numerous presently unknown authors offered evidence regarding these events.

\(^{34}\) Dictys Cretensis, Testimonia, FGrH 49.1A, 273-275.; book I, 16.

\(^{35}\) *Etym. Magn.* 228.59-229.1-4. Πόλις Βοιωτίας, ἡ καὶ Τάναγρα καὶ Γραῖα καὶ Ποιμανδρία καλουμένη. Εἴρηται, ὅτι ἐν ἕλθος κώμῃ κατοικούντες, καὶ ἐν τῇ πέραν γῆς τοῦ Ἀσωποῦ, διὰ τοῦ χειμῶνος ἐν ταῖς πρὸς ἀλλάξεις ἐπιμελείαις γεφύραις ἐχρώντο.
According to information available to Thucydides but not to other preserved authors, the Boeotians settled in the territory of Boeotia following the Trojan War, and until then, this territory had been named the land of Cadmus, and not Boeotia. Thucydides’s date certainly makes sense when considering the linguistic side of the problem given that we’ve already pointed out the fact that the familiarization with the Phoenician letter must have been accomplished before the 8th century BC.

If we take into consideration the assumption that the background of the memory of the past and the tradition of Cadmus’s arrival in Greece is a Pre-Homeric age, and that the legendary leader brought with himself a larger and military capable group that could defeat the local population, as indicated in source data, it brings up a question of the nature of processes that took place, as well as the nature of Cadmus himself as the central figure strongly positioned in the consciousness of future generations. It seems inherent to assume that this was the matter of strengthening the colonization processes, and that, at that moment, the Phoenicians made a step towards establishing and spreading their influences across the Adriatic Sea and the Balkans. On one hand, the foundation and survival of the colony were secured through military means to certain limits, almost undoubtedly never until the complete annihilation of the indigenous element. On the other hand, as noted a long time ago by P. Lisičar, it was inconceivable that the inhabitants of any Greek colony on the Adriatic coast were pure Greeks, in reality, even in the case of the arrival of Cadmus, we can address the problem in terms of mutual influences. According to Herodotus, when speaking of the Gephyraeans who came with Cadmus, the process of colonization can be perceived through the fact that the land was allotted to them for settlement in the land of Tanagra by “tossing a coin”: “because this land was allotted to them”. First of all, this information implies the existence of other communities since the land was allotted, while elsewhere it suggests actions such as determination and distribution which were well known and attested within the Greek colonization. On the other hand, we should not forget prominent words of Pausanias who confirmed conflicts with the local population, the Aones and the Hyantes, which were the first who finally joined the immigrants and continued to coexist, so this information should be considered within the context of Lisičar’s findings and colonization processes. Finally, surrounding towns, such as Orchomenus, are another indicator of internal relations, since their position suggested the defense from Thebes until the end of the Late Helladic IIIB period, by means of a series of forts directly connected with Thebes. This city protected the route from the Corinthian Bay to Euripus Strait, that separated Euboea from

56 Th. 2.12: Βοιωτοί τε γὰρ οἱ νῦν ἑξηκοστῷ ἐλὼν ἀναστάντες ἀπὸ Θεσσαλῶν τὴν νῦν Μὲν Βοιωτίαν, πρότερον δὲ Καδμηίδα γῆν καλουμένην ᾤκισαν (ἦν δὲ αὐτῶν καὶ ἀποδασμός πρότερον ἐν θῇ γῇ ταύτῃ, ἄφ’ ὦν καὶ ἐς Ηλείον ἔστρέφεσαν).
57 Lisičar 1951, 112.
58 Hdt.s 5.57.
59 Paus. 9.5.
Boeotia. S. Symeonoglou believes that Cadmus was a Phoenician or even Canaanite who set forth to conquer Phoenician colonies in south-east Europe from the east across Crete and the Cyclades and concludes that the Phoenicians arrived in Greece together with Cretan and Cycladic Minoans. Therefore, it is probably a justifiable hypothesis that the Gephyraeans were, as Herodotus notes as well, “one of those Phoenicians who came with Cadmus” which raises a question about the remaining members of this group and their ultimate influence in this region.

According to the preserved tradition, at least in the form preserved by renowned mythographer Pseudo-Apollodorus, Cadmus left Thebes with his wife Harmonia and went to the north, to the distant Encheleans: “But Cadmus and Harmonia quitted Thebes and went to the Encheleans. As the Encheleans were being attacked by the Illyrians, the god declared by an oracle that they would get the better of the Illyrians if they had Cadmus and Harmonia as their leaders. They believed him, and made them their leaders against the Illyrians, and got the better of them. And Cadmus reigned over the Illyrians, and a son Illyrius was born to him”. Unlike Pseudo-Apollodorus, Diodorus Siculus informs us that Cadmus and his city were attacked by the Enchelean after which he retreated to the north to the Illyrians: “Be that as it may, these people then settled in the city but later the Encheleans defeated them in war and drove them out, at which time Cadmus and his followers also were driven to Illyria”. According to this information, one thing is certain, at the moment when Cadmus appears at the far north of the eastern Adriatic coast, history witnesses the appearance of the Encheleans, either as allies or opponents, traditionally believed to be one of the eldest and earliest communities of the Western Balkans with whom the old Greeks first established contacts. We learn the earliest information about them from the writings of Hecataeus and everything that Stephanus of Byzantium had transferred from his text when speaking of the Dexaroi, the people of Chaonia: “The Dexaroi, the Chaonian people,

---

40 Buck 1979, 42.
41 Symeonoglou 1985, 68.
42 Ps. – Apollod. 3.39, 1-9.
43 Diod. Sic. 19.53.4, 1-5, 5: μετὰ γὰρ τὸν ἐπὶ Δευκαλίωνος κατακλυσμὸν Κάδμου κτίσαντος τὴν ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ προαγορευθεῖσαν Καδμείαν συνῆλθεν ἐπ’ αὐτὴν λαὸς δὲ τινές μὲν Σπαρτὸν προσηγόρευσαν διὰ τὸ πανταχόθεν συναχθῆναι, τινὲς δὲ Θηβαγενῆ διὰ τὴν αρχὴν ἐκ τῆς προειρημένης πόλεως ὅταν διὰ τὸν κατακλυσμὸν ἐκπεσεῖν καὶ διασπαρῆναι. τοὺς οὖν τότε κατοικεύοντας ὡστερον Ἐγχελεῖς καταπολεμήσαντες ἐξεβαλον, διε τὴν συνέβη καὶ τοὺς περὶ Κάδμου εἰς Ἰλλυριοὺς ἐκπεσεῖν, μετὰ δὲ ταῦτ’ Ἁρμιόνος καὶ Ζήθου κρατοῦσαν τοῦ τόπου καὶ τότε πρῶτον τὸ ἄστυ κτισάντων. Translation into English by Sir James George Frazer.
the neighbors of the Encheleans, as Hecataeus writes in the description of Europe. They dwell under the mountain Amyron". The question of whether the Dexaroi are in fact the Dassaretae and whether the mountain Amyron is Tomorr in Dassaretis, as referred to by R. Katičić, has never been answered in its entirety, thus it is difficult to locate their neighbors the Encheleans. The widest interpretation of this issue includes the assumption that the Encheleans were the leaders of the Ohrid culture from Trebenište. However, a more detailed overview of other classical authors further complicates this issue given the relatively large number of data suggesting that the Encheleans settled in the area of Boeotia, and that they suddenly appeared in the north during the events describing the appearance of Cadmus in this region. On the other hand, their role in these events was evidently crucial and, at the same time, it manifested on all future traditions, so their name survived as one of the oldest known peoples to this day.

When observing the data about this community presented by Hecataeus, we observe an important fact that these Hecataeus’s Encheleans are found in the south, in the territory of the eastern Adriatic coast. However, as already mentioned on several occasions, in accordance with the hypothesis that apart from the Gephyraeans other groups that took part in the events regarding Cadmus’s conquest of the settlement Cadmeia in Boeotia, it seems that the Encheleans participated in the spread of the impacts of colonization of the Phoenicians themselves or from Boeotia from Greece. Although the news transferred by Stephanus of Byzantium from Hecataeus is the oldest preserved data about the Encheleans, numerous authors after Hecataeus used the same tradition and today unknown sources used by Hecataeus himself. One such work was created by Hellanicus of Lesbos, a logographer from the 5th century BC. When writing about the past of Boeotia (Βοιωτιακα), given that during Hecataeus’s time they were no longer there, he mentions the Encheleans as ancient inhabitants of Boeotia: “There are very large eels in lake Kopais. And Boeotia was inhabited by the peoples named the Encheleans, mentioned by Hellanicus in his book of Boeotia”. This information is identifiable and can be understood as much earlier tradition that preceded Hecataeus during the time when the Encheleans had long since become Hecataeus’s Encheleans, the neighbors of the Dexaroi. Hellanicus is not the only author who mentioned the Encheleans in Boeotia. In his work Βιβλιοτηκη ἰστορικη, Diodorus Siculus mentions the arrival of the Encheleans who attacked and conquered Cadmeia. Apart from Hellanicus and Diodorus Siculus, the
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45 Katičić 1977, 53-79.
49 Hellanic. Ed. F. Jacoby, FGrH Frg. 50, 1-5: ἐν γὰρ τῇ Κωπαίδι λίμνηι μέγισταί εἰσιν ἔγχελεις· ὤικουν τε τὴν Βοιωτίαν καὶ οἱ λεγόμενοι Ἐγχελεῖς, περὶ ὅν· καὶ Ἄλλανικος ἐν τοῖς Βοιωτιακοῖς φησίν.
50 Diod. Sic. 19.55.4, 1-5, 5: μετὰ γὰρ τὸν ἐπὶ Δευκαλίωνος κατακλυσμὸν Κάδμου κτίσαντος τὴν ἄπ'
Encheleans in Boeotia are also mentioned by other authors such as Cephalion referred to by John Malalas when speaking about how Amphion and Zethus constructed the walls of Thebes at the place of an earlier settlement Enchele.\textsuperscript{51} John of Antioch provides similar information speaking of how the sons of Calliope, Amphion, and Zethus had built the city of Euthalia (Εὐθαλειαν).\textsuperscript{52} All of this can certainly be associated with Boeotian Encheleans and we can conclude that their presence in Boeotia is a mystery even for classical authors. This produces two statements: (1) as previously stated, Cadmus, the Gephyraeans, and unnamed communities with whom the Gephyraeans used to allot the land, represented the leaders of the process of colonization of the Phoenicians, and (2) these events reveal older traditions preceding Homer and Hecataeus up until the Trojan War, according to some authors, which certainly does not exclude even the earlier period.

In the context of these presumptions, regardless of various differentiations and interpretations of classical authors, the scholars of the past century have always associated the name of the Encheleans with the meaning of their name, i.e. the "eel-people" as well as with eels themselves and the cult revered in Boeotian lake Kopais.\textsuperscript{53} However, such interpretations and associations of the cult with the Encheleans themselves further complicates the situation given that written sources have preserved the information about the reaction of the old Greeks to this cult. The cult of the eel was strongly followed at lake Kopais and among the Thebans, and the words of Eubulus from Athens adequately depict the view of this cult by other Greeks, as Eubulus ridiculed Boeotian beliefs through an overview of their cuisine and young women.\textsuperscript{54}

\textsuperscript{51} Cephalion, Hist. et Rhet., Fragmenta, Frg. 6, 98-101; Ioannes Malalas, Chronographia, 49, 7. Καὶ εὐθέως Ἀμφίων ὁ λυρικὸς κτίζει πόλιν μεγάλην πάνυ, δωδεκάπυλον, τὴν πρῶην οὖσαν κώμην λεγομένην Ἐγχέλειαν· ἣν ὠνόμασαν οἱ αὐτοὶ ἀδελφοὶ πόλιν Θήβας...

\textsuperscript{52} Ioannes Antiochenus Chronographia, (Codex Parisinus 1630) 8, 1-6: The publisher Müller corrected the name of the village and aligned it with the information set forth by Malalas from Εὐθαλειαν to Ἐγχέλειαν, Μετὰ δὲ Κάδμον ἐβασίλευσε τῆς Βοιωτίας Νυκτεὺς, οὗ θυγάτηρ Καλλιόπη ἐκ μίξεως Θεοβόϊου Ζῆθον καὶ Ἀμφίονα ἔτεκεν, οἳ ριφέντες καὶ παρ' ἀγροίκου ἀνατραφέντες κρατοῦσι τῆς Βοιωτίας, ἐπαναστάντες τῷ Νυκτεῖ, καὶ κτίζουσι πόλιν τὴν πρῶην οὖσαν κώμην καὶ καλουμένην Ἐγχέλειαν.

\textsuperscript{53} On the understanding of the name of the Encheleans and its interpretation as "eel-people" see more in: Katičić 1976; Katičić 1977; Katičić 1995; Šašel Kos 1993, 118-119.

\textsuperscript{54} On the understanding of the name of the Encheleans and its interpretation as "eel-people" see more in: Athen. 7.56, 1-14: ὅτι δ' ἤσθιον τὰς ἐγχέλεις καὶ μετὰ τεύτλων ἐντυλίξαντες πολὺ μὲν ἐστὶ καὶ παρὰ τοῖς ἄρχαις κωμικοῖς, καὶ Ἐξόνους δὲ φιςαν ἐν Ἶχνῃ νύμφα ἑπειρόγαμος τεύτλῳ περὶ σῶμα καλιπτά λευκόχρως παρέσται. Ἐγχελος, ὦ μέγα μοι μέγα σοι φῶς ... ἐναργές, καὶ ἐν Τύνωνi

μετὰ ταῦτα θύννων μεγαλόπλουτοι ἐπεισεῖπει ὑπογάστριοι ὁπτῶν αἱ τ' ἐκιδνοσώματοι Βοιώτιοι παρῆσαν ἐγχέλεις θεὶ τεύτλι ἀμπεχόμεναι. καὶ ἐν Μνείαι

parthénou Βοιώτιας Κωπᾶδος ὄνομαζεν γὰρ αἰδούμαι θεάν.
the possibility of the spiritual life of Boeotian citizens actually being foreign among the indigenous population. Intriguingly, the same cult appears on the island of Kos, 4 km from present-day Bodrum in ancient Caria, where the tradition of Krisamis of Kosand the eel was part of an established tradition.\textsuperscript{55} We encounter a similar situation on the island of Euboea, in the city of Arethusa where eels were allegedly so tame that they approached humans themselves.\textsuperscript{56} All this implies the assumption that there indeed were links between trade routes\textsuperscript{57} that in reality, by means of myths and religions, connected the places such as Crete, Kos, Boeotia, Euboea, Halkidiki, and Lefkada\textsuperscript{58}. In this regard, the interpretation of the name of the Encheleans as a connection with their religious belief, which evidently had not represented comprehensible anthropomorphic deities to the old Greeks, is essentially one of the crucial problems for understanding the overall myth and the far-reaching implications of this myth among the local communities.

The idea of trade relations and colonization can be observed in the elements present in the events from the legend on Cadmus and Harmonia, according to available fragments of the tradition. During his journey to the far north and his new reign, Cadmus bought a cow from Pelagontos,\textsuperscript{59} in which Lisičar recognized the possible reasons for moving towards the north in the context of establishing trade relations.\textsuperscript{60} During this journey, Cadmo reached Lake Ohrid where he founded the city of Lihnidos, according to an epigram of Christodorus\textsuperscript{61}. Finally, apart from Lihnidos, the tradition shows that Cadmus and Harmonia ended their journey in present-day Budva which Cadmus ultimately founded and which became known as Butoa. Memories on Cadmus’s arrival and foundation of this city were written already in the 5\textsuperscript{th} century BC by tragedian Sophocles,\textsuperscript{62} who

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{55} Hsch. A-O, Kappa, 4146, 1.
\item \textsuperscript{56} Ath. 8.3.13 -18: ἐγὼ δὲ ἐν τῇ κατὰ Χαλκίδα Ἀρεθούσῃ τεθέαμαι, ἵως δὲ καὶ ὑμῶν οἱ πλείστοι, κεστρεῖς καὶ χειρόθεις καὶ ἐγχέλεις ἐνώτια ἐχοῦσα τά τε ἀπὸ τῶν ιερείων σπλάγχνα καὶ τυροὺς χλωρούς.; Plu., 976.A, 1-6: ἡ γὰρ φύσις ὅσον ἐξικνεῖται μαθήσεως ἐπ’ αὐτὴν δεχομένη καὶ στέγουσα παρέχει πολλὰς μὲν ἐγχέλεις [ἱερὰς λεγομένας] ἀνθρώποις χειροήθεις, ὥσπερ τὰς <ἱερὰς λεγομένας> ἐν τῇ Ἀρεθούσῃ...
\item \textsuperscript{57} Parović-Pešikan 1985, 19-49.
\item \textsuperscript{58} Kaljanac 2010, 60. Kaljanac 2012, 154.
\item \textsuperscript{59} Scholia In Euripidem, Scholia in Euripidem (scholia vetera), Vita-argumentum-scholion sch Ph, section 658, 23: Κάδμος ἀφίκετο εἰς τὸ βουκόλιον τοῦ Πελάγοντος τοῦ Ἀμφιδάμαντος, παρ’ οὗ ἀγοράσας βοῦν καὶ ηγεμόνα ταύτην τῆς δόοι ποιναύμενος κτίζει τὰς θήβας ὑμώνυμους τῶν Ἀιγυπτίων Ἰηθῶν, ἐπεὶ τὸ ἀνέκαθεν Ἀιγύπτιος ἦν ὁ Κάδμος,:Paus, 9.12, 2: ἔδει δὲ ἄρα Κάδμον καὶ τὸν σὺν αὐτῷ στρατὸν ἐνταῦθα οἰκῆσαι κατὰ τὸ θεοῦ τὸν μαντείαν, ἐνθα ἐξ ἡμῶν τοῦ Ἳρακλείου Ὀγγας ἔστιν ἐναντίον τῷ λόγῳ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ταύτης τὸ ὄνομα, ὅτι ἐναντίον τῷ λόγῳ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ταύτης τὸ ὄνομα, ὅτι ἐναντίον τῷ λόγῳ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ταύτης τὸ ὄνομα, ὅτι ἐναντίον τῷ λόγῳ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ταύτης τὸ ὄνομα... ἐναντίον τῷ λόγῳ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ταύτης τὸ ὄνομα...
\item \textsuperscript{60} Lisičar 1953, 245-261.
\item \textsuperscript{61} Christodorus, Epigrammata, AG 2.7, 697: εἶχε δ’ ἀπ’ εὐσεβῶν προγόνων ἐρικυδέα πάτηρ Λυχνιδόν, ἄν Φοῖνιξ Κάδμος ἔδειμε πόλιν· ἐνθέθεν λύχνος ἐν Ἑλικώνιοι, οὔτεσκα Κάδμος στοιχεῖν Δαναοῖς πρῶτος ἔξειζε τόπον.
\item \textsuperscript{62} Etym. Geniun. beta, 202, 1-7: Βούθοια πόλις τῆς Ἰλλυρίδος· Σοφοκλῆς ὁνόμακει...
located this city at the mouth of the Drilon River. According to the words of Stephanus of Byzantium, Butoa, as a city in Illyria, named after Cadmus’s quick arrival on a bullock cart.\(^5\) Philo of Byblos also mentions the bullock cart adding that Butoa was located by the Rizous River, and Cadmus named the city after the Egyptian city of Buto.\(^6\) After conquering the local population, in alliance with the Encheleans, Cadmus allegedly took the power away from Lycotherses\(^6\), the husband of his daughter Agave, who left Cadmeia after the death of her son Pentheus.\(^6\) Since Cadmus conquered the northern communities in alliance with the Encheleans, at that moment the legend brought Cadmus and Agave together with those northern Hecataeus’s Encheleans. If we follow the course of tradition, it is possible to assume that Cadmus left Cadmeia for two reasons. The first is the possibility of establishing trade relations, whereas the second is to offer help to the Encheleans in fighting the local population.\(^7\) Regardless of how Cadmus had established contacts with the northern Encheleans, they were simultaneously located in Boeotia and the north, or they had previously left Cadmeia with Agave and left towards the north or they ultimately did this with Cadmus who set out toward the north. Either way, it seems that, at that moment, through their actions and names, one of the northern communities appeared on the stage of the old Greeks, and all our further knowledge of the northern world was a continuation of close relations. This opens the question of the consequences of the appearance of the Encheleans who were already known to the Greeks in the territory of Boeotia, as well as the problem of how the Greeks identified them or how they identified themselves.

Judging by the available information contained in the works of classical authors, as previously noted, it is possible to assume that the mythical events took place much
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\(^7\) Kaljanac 2010; Kaljanac, 2012.
sooner than the origin of the first written text which would have recorded them, probably during the Bronze Age. However, how plausible is such an observation outside the framework of legends and testimonies of written sources that are susceptible to subjectivity and different viewpoints of each author? If it were possible to determine the existence of contacts within the suggested area, it would have been possible to open the possibility of interpreting the aforementioned legend in the context of such contacts, as well as for observing the processes of colonization. During this period and somewhat earlier, around 1600 BC, along with the Minoan civilization on the island of Crete, a strong developmental impulse appears on the Greek mainland identified with the appearance of the Mycenaeans, Minoan contemporaries, and successors. Although archaeology still has no answer regarding their origin, modern scholarship believes that they inhabited these regions from 16th to 13th centuries BC, where they quickly established contacts with other peoples such as the Minoans, Hittites, and Egyptians. Rich frescos depicting people doing everyday activities and festivities showing clothes, dishes, jewelry, and even themselves, interpreted as a direct influence of Crete. The findings of wall paintings in the palace of Mycenae, dated to 1550-1450 BC, are associated with the frescos from Knossos. Frescos have also been corroborated at the site of Thebes, where we can see visible links with the island of Thera. A century of research at the site of Thebes has so far produced numerous artifacts whose interpretation has not yet led to a scholarly consensus regarding the origin of the city’s population. Almost a century ago, in 1930, A. Keramopoullos formulated a hypothesis regarding Theban rulers as governors of important craft production and overseas trade. As a result of the decipherment of Linear B, numerous plates with inscriptions from the former city of Cadmus – Cadmeia – corroborate the interest of Thebes in the areas of Thespiae, Euboea, and Aegina. Additionally, if we observe the entire region of Boeotia, Thebes is singled out as a unique unparalleled fortification system in the territory of Kopaidi, and the origin of this system can be observed as a separate and external factor within the wider fortification system of Hellas from the Bronze Age. The entire system of fortification of Thebes was focused on the protection of roads connecting the area from the Corinthian Bay to Euripus Strait, the Boeotian isthmus, and the island of Euboea, which suggests the importance of Euboea and the connection of Thebes with the Aegean Sea across Euboea. Sea lanes of commerce are also corroborated by other sites, such as the city of Kition (Cyprus), founded during the 9th century BC, as a continuation of Bronze Age settlement.
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which also belonged to a Phoenician koine connected with the old Phoenician-Euboean trade route.\textsuperscript{75} This is precisely the context for interpreting the tomb of a hero in Lefkandi which is recognized by its inventory as the tomb of a Phoenician aristocrat.\textsuperscript{76}

At the site of the so-called Second palace in Thebes, around one hundred cylindrical stamps originating from the east have been found.\textsuperscript{77} Several stamps are of the Pre-Babylonian and Babylonian origin, then Mitannian, Hittitian, Cypriot, Kassitian, and Assyrian origin, dated to 2500-1250 BC.\textsuperscript{78} According to Buck, the archaeological layer that represents the area of the First Palace of Thebes would belong to the rulers of Amphion and Zethus, and the layer of the Second Palace would belong to Cadmus and the successors from his dynasty.\textsuperscript{79} The layer that directly connects Thebes and Eastern Mediterranean\textsuperscript{80} in the Late Helladic IIIB period by means of discovered stamps, accordingly belongs to the Cadmeians. One of the discovered stamps is at the same time the only finding that corroborates the use of parchment and plausibly papyrus\textsuperscript{81} in the territory of mainland Greece with the Middle East and Egypt.\textsuperscript{82} Finally, similar stamps originating from Syria and Mesopotamia have been confirmed on Crete\textsuperscript{83} where they arrived through trade routes.\textsuperscript{84} In case such findings do not corroborate the actual conquest of the Phoenician colony in the territory of Thebes, their presence strongly affirms trade or similar contacts much earlier than the first written data or it additionally substantiates its claims. Moreover, there are other problematic matters, such as the tomb of “Amphion and Zethus”\textsuperscript{85} where T. Spyropoulos saw a step pyramid with 3 tiers, or the issue of a complex irrigation system at lake Kopaidi\textsuperscript{86} and others which suggest, but do not corroborate or dispute the arrival of colonists from the east or Egypt.\textsuperscript{87} In any case, the fact that there were contacts established among these territories is indisputable and, although the foundation of colonies has not entirely been confirmed, it is evident that the exchange of populations, artisans, and merchants on a smaller scale must be accepted. In this regard, wealthier cities, such as Thebes, were leaders and their interest in trade and production conditioned the need for natural resources, mostly metal. Land dispersion within the process of searching for metallurgical centers was noted by Lisičar

\textsuperscript{75} Niemeyer 2006, 143-168.
\textsuperscript{76} Niemeyer 2006, 149.
\textsuperscript{77} Buck 1979, 58.
\textsuperscript{78} Šašel Kos 1993, 127; Aravantinos 1995, 617.
\textsuperscript{79} Buck 1979, 58.
\textsuperscript{80} Šašel Kos 1993, 127.
\textsuperscript{81} Aravantinos 1995, 619.
\textsuperscript{82} Aravantinos 1995, 619.
\textsuperscript{83} Dow, Chadwick 1973, 582-626
\textsuperscript{84} Matz 2008, 141-164.
\textsuperscript{85} Bernal 1991.
\textsuperscript{86} Bernal 1991, 133-135.
\textsuperscript{87} Aravantinos 1995, 617.
who assumed that the legend of Cadmus and his arrival among the Encheleans hides an interest for the mining wealth from the north and the Adriatic Sea.\(^8\) The inscription of the city of Lihnidos, founded by Cadmus during his travel to the north, led Lisičar to this conclusion.\(^9\) Additionally, the corroboration of the actual city of Lihnidos realized by the discovery of an inscription with a list of citizens, encouraged Lisičar to establish a hypothesis regarding the so-called *Cadmean road* that extended along the same route as an later Roman road *Via Egnatia*.\(^9\) According to Katičić, the tradition and memory of this road, which dates back to the Neolithic, were among the natives of this territory “the most considerable mythological design of old relationships”.\(^9\) According to the well-known information, we can assume that the route of the *Cadmean road* went across Trebenište,\(^2\) and that it can easily be associated with Halkidiki, geographically very close to the *Cadmean road itself*. This is precisely the place where famous golden masks were found which are attributed to Enchelean rulers. On the contrary, V. Popović as well as V. Sokolovska believe that the masks from Trebenište must be associated with Crete and Egypt.\(^3\) V. Popović finds the connection of the masks from Trebenište with those from Mycenae only formal.\(^4\)

---

\(^8\) Lisičar 1951, 115-125.
\(^9\) Lisičar 1953, 257. Originally, it was assumed that Lihnidos was medieval Ohrid where the inscription Λύχνειδιων was found, but subsequent research has confirmed that these monuments were transferred from the surrounding areas.
\(^9\) Lisičar 1953, 260.
\(^9\) Katičić 1977, 80.
\(^2\) Lisičar 1951, 259.
\(^4\) Popović 1966, 15.
Ill. 3. Golden mask from Trebenište
(http://www.narodnimuzej.rs/antika/zbirka-grcko-helenistickog-perioda/[last checked 2021-5-28])
However, the golden masks from the graves of Trebenište are not the only indicator of a wider interaction and long-term contacts of the Adriatic and the Aegean Sea. Apart from the masks, golden bracelets\(^{95}\) were discovered in graves I and VIII which can be associated with similar findings from the Grave Circle A of Mycenae. Sandals made of gold with depictions of Gorgon\(^{96}\) were discovered in graves VIII, X, and XII, while metal sandals made of silver were known from Byblos, and thus Trebenište can also be associated with the Middle East, at least indirectly. A. Cermanović associated the golden sandals from Trebenište with vases in the shape of footwear from Greek graves,\(^{97}\) thus the idea of footwear for the final and long journey of the deceased to the afterlife should originate from the Greek region. Apart from these findings, contacts with the east are corroborated by the silver goblets that can be associated with the similar ones from Teppe Hasanlu and Amlash from Iran.\(^{98}\) However, the discovery of funeral masks from Sindos, that can be associated with those from Mycenaean graves,\(^{99}\) and dated as the masks from Trebenište to the period of the 6\(^{th}\) century BC, corroborates the frequent use of roads from the Adriatic Sea to Halkidiki\(^{100}\) whose availability to the Boeotian traders we can assume already in the earliest period through Euboea and Euboean seafarers.

---

95 Sokolovska 1997, 49.  
96 Sokolovska 1997, 49.  
97 Cermanović 1956, 307-313.  
100 Šašel Kos 1993, 129.
After observing the similarities between the depictions of Gorgon on the crater from Trebenište and a well-known crater from Vix, while having in mind the possibility of a mutual origin, we can confirm the importance of the trade route across Halkidiki to Central Europe. The depictions of Gorgon are well-known in other sites as well, especially from tombs of chiefs, such as a hydria from Novi Pazar displaying the bodiless head of Gorgon.101

If we accept the assumption that there are connections between the funeral masks from Sindos and Mycenaean masks, which are chronologically parallel to those from Sindos, the masks from Trebenište can be associated with the Mycenaean ones and the long tradition of manufacture and usage of these funeral masks, as well as with the problem of transmission of ideas and the chronological distance of these sites, more specifically the temporal distance for which transmission had occurred. Such occurrences are not sudden, and older examples are likely to be found in the future. The presence of the Mycenaean culture, or their cultural idea, can be recognized in a tholos tomb in Kiperi on the coast of Epirus, on the Late Mycenaean ceramic from Ilias102, on the ceramics from the lower layers of the settlement Kastanas103 and similar finds.

102 Palavestra 1984, 27.
which establish connections between the north and the south across Halkidiki. For the old Mycenaeans the sources of amber and tin\textsuperscript{104} and opulent mines of Damastion were located in the north. The city of Damastion, that was probably developed along these mines, was located by Ujes and Romić in the region of Kosovo and Metohija\textsuperscript{105}, testified by multiple finds of drachmas and tetradrachmas.\textsuperscript{106} Considering the tradition according to which Cadmus was the inventor of quarries, metallurgy, and bronze production\textsuperscript{107} in Thebes, the mines of Damastion were probably one of the reasons why Cadmus left and founded the city of Lihnidos that was close to this metallurgy center. Moreover, Lihnidos is found in an area rich in silver.\textsuperscript{108} The cause of Cadmus's arrival to the north was preserved in the tradition according to which Cadmus discovered gold mines and invented mining in the region of the Pangaeum, a mountain in Paeonia\textsuperscript{109}, where he was later on revered as one of the four Cabeiri\textsuperscript{110} of metallurgy\textsuperscript{111} under the name of Κόσμιλος-Καδμῖλος.\textsuperscript{112} Opulent mines, forests, and developed animal husbandry were probably very alluring to Theban rulers and we can conclude that they wanted to establish control over these precious resources.

\textsuperscript{104} Potrebica 2010, 171-175.
\textsuperscript{105} Ujes, Romić 1996, 77-98.
\textsuperscript{106} Ujes, Romić 1996, 82-85.
\textsuperscript{107} Pliny, HN 7. 195: lapicidinas Cadmus Thebis aut, ut Theophrastus, in Phoenice; Hyg. Fab., 274, 4 1-3: Cadmus Agenoris filius aes Thebis primus inuentum condidit; <AE>acus Iouis filius in Panchaia in monte Taso aurum primus inuenit.
\textsuperscript{108} Popović 1966, 15.
\textsuperscript{110} Lisičar 1951, 251.
\textsuperscript{111} Scholia in Apollonii Rhodii Argonautica (scholia vetera), 77, 22-78, ὁ ἱστορεῖ Διονυσόδωρος. Κάβειροι δὲ δοκοῦσι προσαγορεύεσθαι ἀπὸ Καβείρων τῶν κατὰ Φρυγίαν ὀρῶν, ἐπεὶ οἱ δύο εἶναι τοὺς Καβείρους φασί, [πρότερον] μὲν Δία, νεώτερον δὲ Διόνυσον.
\textsuperscript{112} Scholia in Lycophronem, scholia vetera et recentiora partim Isaac et Joannis Tzetzae, 219: σύρουσαν τὸ ἑξῆς οὕτως· βλέπω πάλαι δὲ συναγωγὴν ὁλκάδων συρομένην ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ <κἀπιροζοῦσαν> καὶ ἐπιβοῶσαν καὶ ἀπειλοῦσαν τῇ πατρίδι ἤτοι τῇ Τροίᾳ <δεινὰς ἀπειλὰς> καὶ πυρπόλησιν. <ὡς μή σε Κάδμος>· Κάδμος ὁ Ἑρμῆς ἀντὶ τοῦ Καδμῖλος κατὰ συγκοπὴν ὡς γαμφηλὰς καὶ γαμφάς. Καδμῖλος δὲ ὁ Ἐρμῆς. τούτου δὲ καὶ Ἴσσης τινὸς νύμφης, ἀφ’ ἧς καὶ Λέσβος ἐκλήθη Ἴσσα, ἐγεννήθη παῖς ὀνόματι Πρύλις. οὗτος μάντις ὢν προσενεχθέντι τῷ Ἀγαμέμνονι τῇ Λέσβῳ ἄλλως. ὡς μή σε Κάδμος· ἀπέστρεψε τὸν λόγον πρὸς τὸν Πρύλιν, ὃς ἦν μάντις ἐν Ἴσσῃ ἤτοι τῇ Λέσβῳ υἱὸς τοῦ Καδμίλου καὶ Κάδμου Ἑρμοῦ καὶ Ἴσσης τινὸς νύμφης, ἀφ’ ἡς καὶ Λέσβος ἢ καὶ Μιτυλήνη ἐκλήθη Ἴσσα, ὃς Πρύλις προσενεκθεῖς τοῖς Ἐλλησι.
For a longer period of time, the presence of the Mycenaean material at the eastern Adriatic coast was well-known at the sites of Pazhok and Vajze in Albania, Tetovo and Iglarevo in Kosovo, in the form of two swords from a tumulus at the Mata River and the place of Varibopji\(^{113}\), daggers near Niš, Pula, Crvena Stijena, Mostar, Mokrine, Belotići, Živalji, Čitluk, and others. Other well-known finds are labrys axes from Pelagonija, near Bitola, in Northern Macedonia and Niš and Babušnica in Serbia.\(^{114}\) In this context, it is possible to address a sword from Sisak, Sprockhoff IIb of Erbenheim type according to

\(^{113}\) Korkuti 1984, 111-115.  
Cowen, dated to Ha A period, given that there have already been several attempts to associate this type of swords with workshops in Central Europe and Mycenaean Greece.\textsuperscript{115} When analyzing swords found in a circle in Mycenae, we need to mention a sword from Vučevica that was initially interpreted as an import from Mycenae. Although there are similarities with the Mycenaean type F2 sword, H. Tomas concluded that differences are considerably more dominant and the inspiration for this sword could be of Aegean origin\textsuperscript{116} which, in any case, corroborates the thesis if not of a direct import, then of contacts which were used to transmit the idea. Although the origin of these finds has not been entirely defined, some of which have been bought off in the modern period, in this context we can also mention the ingots from Makarska, Ivanić-Kloštar,\textsuperscript{117} and from the island of Pag.\textsuperscript{118} Finally, the Mycenaean material has been recorded on the island of Brač\textsuperscript{119}. On the other hand, we should note the fact that, at least in the case of Mycenaean material on the eastern Adriatic coast, there is a likely possibility that the majority of these finds came directly from the Apennine Peninsula or from the south where the Mycenaean presence was much better recorded.\textsuperscript{120}

When addressing the Bronze Age and the relationship of the eastern Adriatic coast with the Aegean region through the prism of archaeological perception, we come to a question of the Cetina culture and its manifestation in this region. Blagoje Govedarica pointed out the possibility of migration of the population from western Greece to the region of the Cetina culture, i.e. the eastern Adriatic coast, that manifested in cist type graves and accompanying golden material.\textsuperscript{121} Similarities in ornaments and shapes of ceramic material indicate a possibility of connections with the cultures of Sicily and Malta\textsuperscript{122}, whereas the connections with Italy, more specifically Apulia, are much better corroborated with examples such as jugs from an aggregate in Bajagić near Obrovac.\textsuperscript{123} By observing the distribution of the Cetina culture as a style and the distribution of a recognizable style instead of a recognizable ethnic-archaeological culture, we can state that the spatial range of this ornamental manifestation was from Trieste to the Peloponnese and from Apulia to Bosnia.\textsuperscript{124}

\textsuperscript{115} Vinski-Gasparini 1973.
\textsuperscript{116} Tomas 2010, 36-39.
\textsuperscript{117} Vinski-Gasparini 1983, 647-667.
\textsuperscript{118} Parović-Pešikan 1985, 27.
\textsuperscript{119} Kirigin 2002, 363-383.
\textsuperscript{120} Tomas 2010, 36-39.
\textsuperscript{121} Govedarica 1989.
\textsuperscript{122} Govedarica 1989, 218.
\textsuperscript{123} Marović 1975, 245-246.
\textsuperscript{124} Forenbaher 2018, 128. For more information about the issue of the Cetina culture and the Cetina style see: Forenbaher Stašo, Special Place, Interesting Times. The island of Palagruža and transitional periods in Adriatic prehistory. Archaeopress Publishing Ltd, 2018.
The relationship with Greece is corroborated by finds from Montenegro, primarily tumuli with princely graves in Rubeži near Nikšić, Mala Gruda, Velika Gruda, and Gruda Boljevića. A fragment of a ceramic dish has been found at the site of Rubeži whose ornaments, decorated stripes, and zigzag lines entirely correspond to the finds of dishes in the tumulus of Mala Gruda. This type of dish is usually a standard repertoire of princely graves in Montenegro, although considerable differences between them do exist, such as semicircular carvings on the rim of a dish from Mala Gruda.\textsuperscript{125}

Moreover, it is important to note that the ornamental motif, at least its basic form made of two stripes crossed in the central section and zigzag lines along the rim, associates and most likely represents a counterpart of a punctured ornament of golden covers of axe holders from the tumuli of Mala Gruda and Gruda Boljevića. Golden covers from these two tumuli correspond to one another in their entirety,\textsuperscript{126} and this detail connects the axes from these tumuli with the ceramic material that was most probably associated

\textsuperscript{125}Parović-Pešikan, Trbuhović 1974, 129-141.
\textsuperscript{126}Baković, Govedarica 2009, 5-22.
with burial rituals. Therefore, this and the fact that the axe from Gruda Boljevića was found outside the grave and not beside the deceased\textsuperscript{127} ensure that we observe the axes from the tumuli with princely graves through the prism of practiced cults and rites or as a means of expressing the elements of identity and status.

The interpretation of the origin of the axe from the tumulus of Mala Gruda has led us to conclude that its origin is the Middle Eastern import\textsuperscript{128} that brought on further development of this type of axes.\textsuperscript{129} Moreover, axes made of electrum alloy, golden dagger, and hair rings (Noppenring) have on several occasions been associated with Asia Minor, Syria, Byblos, and the Aegean Sea.\textsuperscript{130} Kotorac-type axe has frequently been associated with Byblos, hair rings with the Aegean Sea, Troy, and Antioch, and the golden dagger with Koumas.\textsuperscript{131} Apart from this, burials of tumuli with princely graves in Montenegro also contained lesser indicators associated with Transcaucasia.\textsuperscript{132}

\textbf{III. 9. Ceramic vessel from tumulus Boljevića Gruda (Provided by P. Lutovac)}

\begin{quote}

The interpretation of the origin of the axe from the tumulus of Mala Gruda has led us to conclude that its origin is the Middle Eastern import\textsuperscript{128} that brought on further development of this type of axes.\textsuperscript{129} Moreover, axes made of electrum alloy, golden dagger, and hair rings (Noppenring) have on several occasions been associated with Asia Minor, Syria, Byblos, and the Aegean Sea.\textsuperscript{130} Kotorac-type axe has frequently been associated with Byblos, hair rings with the Aegean Sea, Troy, and Antioch, and the golden dagger with Koumas.\textsuperscript{131} Apart from this, burials of tumuli with princely graves in Montenegro also contained lesser indicators associated with Transcaucasia.\textsuperscript{132}

\textsuperscript{127} Baković, Govedarica 2009, 15.
\textsuperscript{128} Parović-Pešikan, Trbuhović 1974, 131.
\textsuperscript{129} Parović-Pešikan 1985, 21.
\textsuperscript{131} Parović-Pešikan 1985, 20.
\textsuperscript{132} Durman et al. 2006, 90.
\end{quote}
However, although all of this information, the works of classical authors and archaeological indicators, suggest the validity of the statement regarding the contacts of the Mycenaean world with the eastern Adriatic coast, especially its southern part, it seems that such statement is only partially correct. This particularly refers to the problem of chronological determination given that some of the recently published archaeological results suggest much older contacts of the southern part of the eastern Adriatic coast and the Aegean Sea. In this regard, the basic indicator could be the appearance of violin-shaped idols, traditionally associated with the Cycladic culture, as grave goods at several sites. When speaking of the area of the eastern Adriatic coast, violin-shaped idols and their analogies were recorded at the sites of Rakića kuća, Shtoj, Apollonia, Maliq, and Yunazite. During the excavations of tumuli at the site of Shtoj in the 1980s, and published in detail in 2012,133 discovered the most numerous group of violin-shaped idols, 6 in total. The initial excavations uncovered 14 graves within the tumulus VI, of which the first 13 graves were determined to be originating from the Iron Age, whereas the last grave 14 was identified to be originating from the Bronze Age with recognizable characteristics of the Cetina culture134. While the primary results attributed the discovered idols to the oldest grave 14 and the Cetina culture,135 further research uncovered an initially unknown grave, the grave 15. Given that this grave was buried in the subsoil, directly under the stone cist of the grave 14, it became clear that certain idols should be attributed as goods of this grave, and not the grave 14.136 Unlike the later period, especially the Iron Age, the initial construction of the tumulus 6 in Shtoj was for a separate individual who represented a unique burial within the construction. This layer was inherited through the subsequent burial of the Cetina culture and an increase of the construction. Violin-shaped idols at the site of Rakića kuća were discovered during the construction of a local road between Podgorica and Tuzi in 1989 when the stone from the tumulus was used as a construction material.137 In the period of 2002-2006, an excavation of the so-called tumulus 10, containing 77 graves, 49 of which are prehistoric, was conducted at the site of a large prehistoric necropolis in Apollonia.138 These included the so-called grave 74, which later on turned out to be a ritual site, not a grave.139 This unit also revealed a broken figurine, whose reconstruction determined that it corresponds to violin-shaped idols,140 making this site important in the context of contacts of the Aegean region and the western Balkans. Moreover, similar idols and the closest associations were discovered in layer IIIC at the site of Maliq in Albania, and layers of tell

133 Koka 2012.
134 Govedarica 1991, 105-112.
135 Govedarica 2016, 5-34.
136 Govedarica 2016, 7.
138 Amore 2016, 57-74.
139 Govedarica 2016, 18.
140 Govedarica 2016, 19.
in Yunazite in Bulgaria. Considering the results of the most recent research, along with stylistic characteristics, especially radiocarbon dating conducted at the sites of Rakića kuća, Gruda Boljevića, Apollonia, Velika Gruda, and Odmut, B. Govedarica concluded that the absolute calibrated dates of these sites can be the period of 3050/3000 to 2700 BC.\textsuperscript{141}

Ill. 10. Ceramic violin idols discovered in the tumulus Rakića kuća according to the numeration from the research (Provided by B. Govedarica)

Regarding the dates of the appearance of violin idols and their corresponding tumuli, evidently members of a prominent elite, we can conclude that the contacts of the Aegean region and the Adriatic had existed already at the beginning of the 3\textsuperscript{rd} millennium BC, and maintaining these contacts during the period of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} millennium BC would not be surprising, on the contrary, stronger connections would be expected. These connections and contacts could not result only in trade, and the actual establishment of trade colonies and permanent trade routes would not be surprising. Moreover, it would be thoughtless to assume that such long-term traditions until the period of classical Greek colonies at the Adriatic Sea have not left a mark on both cultures and their memories of the past and consequently on their mythological and legendary past.

According to the presented dates, it is quite clear that it would be difficult to argue the connection of tumuli with princely graves and their materials with legendary Cadmus and his Phoenicians, but the very existence of contacts between the Adriatic region in the first phases of the 3\textsuperscript{rd} millennium BC with the south opens up the possibility of considering trade colonies at the beginning and during the Bronze Age. The search for metals and the establishment of steady communications with regions deeper into the continent in the memory of the old Greeks may have reflected through the Phoenicians

\textsuperscript{141} Govedarica 2016, 24.
as a symbol of the eastern Mediterranean Basin. The words of Herodotus share the information about how the Phoenicians had founded a colony on the island of Thasos, adjacent to the island of Samothrace, just beside the aforementioned Halkidiki. According to the tumuli with princely graves from Montenegro, trade relations or mutual influences and exchange speak of contacts dating back to the early phases of the 3rd millennium BC. They also indicate the roots of the legend of Cadmus and Harmonia later, perhaps already around the 15th century BC.

According to different genealogies, such as the one presented by Herodotus, or Hecataeus and Hellanicus, as well as researchers such as S. Symeonoglou, the events described in the legend of the appearance of the Phoenicians in the territory of Greece, their leader Cadmus and his wife Harmonia, their transformation into serpents, who were revered long after, can be dated to the very early period of about 16th to 15th century BC. In this sense, an archaeological find of the Parian Marble or Chronicle suggests the arrival of Cadmus and the foundation of Thebes and dates them to 1509/8 BC: "From when Cadmus the son of Agenor came to Thebes [____and] built the Cadmeia, 1255 years, when Amphictyon was king of Athens". If we use this find as a chronological orientation, the tradition regarding these events could not have been much younger. Most certainly, the date, in this case, is no longer as crucial as the statement that the territories of present-day Herzegovina, Montenegro, Albania, and Northern Macedonia participated in a long-lasting tradition of established contacts with the Aegean region, and the fact, established in such context, that the entire myth of a legendary hero, Sidonian Cadmus, could indeed have a historical background, regardless of its form, and that “some” events actually happened.

142 Hdt.s 6, 47: Εἶδον δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς τὰ μέταλλα ταῦτα, καὶ μακρῷ ἦν αὐτῶν θωμασιώτατα τὰ οἱ Φοίνικες ἀνέφυ οἱ μετὰ Θάσου κτίσαντες τὴν νῆσον ταύτην, ἥτις νῦν ἐπὶ τοῦ Θάσου τούτου τοῦ Φοίνικος τὸ ὄνομα ἔσχηκε. Τὰ δὲ μέταλλα τὰ Φοινικικὰ ταῦτα ἐστὶ τῆς Θάσου μεταξὺ Αἰνύρων τε χώρου καλεομένου καὶ Κοινύρων, ἀντίστοιο δὲ Σαμοθρηίκης, ὄρος μέγα ἀνεστραμμένον ἐν τῇ ζητήσι.
143 Hdt.s 6, 59.
144 Symeonoglou, 1985, 68 and further.
145 Parian Marble is a chronological table found in several fragments on the island of Paros. The table itself encompasses the period from 1581 to 264 BC and it largely represents events from the “Heroic Age”.
While myths and legends, although essentially inseparable, required foundations of their origin and a period of fossilization from live memory into a myth or a legend, it is entirely reasonable to assume that every generation of the old Greeks modified inherited myths anew instead of creating new traditions. The foundations of legends most likely remained the same and it is unimaginable that Greek mythology was created as an entirely new set of traditions in order to replace the events that had taken place earlier. Referring to the aforementioned fundamental premise of Kristiansen that fossilization is a long process of up to 1000 years, possibly even longer, then it is no surprise that there are numerous finds directly and indirectly connected to serpents and a manifestation of memory recently associated by scholars with the cult of ancestors.

Apart from the very meaning of the name of the community of the Encheleans, the connection of immigrated colonists, conditionally named so, and the religious belief in eels or serpents can be established with the meaning of names of legendary personalities of Cadmus and Harmonia who embody an entire cult according to an ancient belief. The first link is the Hebrew east, Qedem, the place of origin of Cadmus, whereas the name of his wife Harmonia is connected with the mount Hermon populated by the Hivites, meaning

---

148 Finkelberg 2006.
The connections of the Hivites and Harmonia with the serpent certainly could reach goddess Ishtar who was frequently depicted together with a serpent next to her body. The serpent, as a symbol of life and death, has evidently been present ever since the Neolithic, while its dominant position in religion reached its peak in the period starting from the three-age system and further. The importance of the belief system of former inhabitants of these regions was recorded by Homer who wrote an impressive description of a Paeonian, Asteropaios, whose body was eaten by eels and thus symbolically removed from the battlefield. The territory familiar to Asteropaios as a Paeonian, near Hecataeus’s Encheleans, uncovered two plates with a depiction of soldiers leaving for battle while being watched by an upright serpent, one in Albania on the coast of Lake Ohrid, and the other at the site near Gostilj in Montenegro by Shkodra Lake.

The importance of the depicted serpent as a cult of ancestors or Cadmus himself who accompanies soldiers to battle keeping a watchful eye is not essential in this context, because we could claim that Cadmus indeed is a heroized ancestor, as different interpretation would be essentially the same. From a geographic point of view, the place where these plates were uncovered, in the land inhabited by the Encheleans, the community which was obviously hidden in an obscure past even for the Greeks themselves, is where

---

150 Calmet 1832.
151 Busuladžić 2010, 125-134.
152 Hom. II. 21.203-4:

\[τὸν \ μὲν \ ἄρ› \ ἐγχέλυες \ τε \ καὶ \ ἰχθύες \ ἀμφεπένοντο \ δημὸν \ ἐπινεφρίδιον \ κείροντες\]

Cadmus found refuge and where he died. According to Apollonius of Rhodes, the graves of Cadmus and Harmonia are located here by the black Illyrian river in the land of the Encheleans. Although maybe not for modern researchers, verbal and described geographical features could be found in this region, so in Periplus Pseudo-Skilax writes that by the coast of the Rizous river, there are graves made in some way out of stone, belonging to Cadmus and Harmonia who, even after their death, were the ancestors whom former sailors sailed to. From the Arion river to the Rizous river is half a day's sail. The stones of Cadmus and Harmonia are here, and a sanctuary not far from the Rizous river.

For these sailors, even after the metamorphosis into serpents, Cadmus and Harmonia were amply real and true.

In conclusion we can make a presumption about the origin of the Encheleans from Greek Boeotia or even from the Middle East, from where they carried the cult of serpent-eel that was spread among the inhabitants of the eastern Adriatic coast and its hinterland, who were thus named the Illyrians, serpent-people, followers of the cult of the serpent. The Encheleans could be considered the leaders of the cult of serpent-eel, an ethnonym of the Illyrians which later gradually spread toward the north and deeper into the hinterland of the Adriatic Sea to be finally encompassed by the Roman administrative unit, the province of Illyricum, entirely different from the Old Greek Illyria which to old logographers represented the only geographic-religious region inhabited by the followers of the cult of the serpent, the people associated with this cult and their name Ἰλλυριοὶ.


156 Ps. –Scylax, 24, 2: καί ἀπὸ τοῦ Νάρωνος ἐπὶ τον Ἀρίωνα ποταμόν νημέας ἐστὶ πλους· ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ Ἀρίωνος ἐπὶ τον Ὁρίοντα ποταμόν πλους νημέας ἡμισυ.; καί Κάδμοι καὶ Ἀρμονίας οἱ λίθοι εἶσιν ενταύθα, καί εἰρον ἄπωθεν τοῦ Ὁρίοντος ποταμοῦ. ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ Ὁρίοντος ποταμοῦ εἰς Βουθόν ὁ πλους καὶ τό ἐμπόριον.
Conclusion

The legend of Cadmus and his wife Harmonia is one of the oldest legends about the peoples who inhabited the region of the eastern Adriatic coast. Considering a common belief that legends are in fact historical events with historical background and actual locations, the preserved works that conveyed the information of the Sidonian hero clearly categorized Cadmus as one of the legends and legendary personalities who, during their lifetime, passed through and acted in historically established locations such as the old Cadmeia, Delphi, Lihnidos, and Butoa, present-day Budva, where he ultimately ended his legendary journey. After observing two works of the former unity, a live culture that truly experienced the legend of Cadmus, the written words and their relationships with
the material data about the potential contacts of the region of the southern part of the eastern Adriatic coast and the Aegean Sea, we can conclude that the earliest contacts of this region dated much further into the past than datable information produced by classical authors. At the same time, the fact that these memories were written down, clearly shows, as we can see in the later period, that the traditions of important events were strong and long-established. Although mysterious, logographer, poets, the first historians, classical authors wrote about communities such as the Encheleans who at a certain point of time inhabited the territory of Greece, but at another, they were at the far north, waging wars and creating what will later become known as their kingdom. There is plenty of information regarding these people, so that earlier researchers could associate them with part of their beliefs, especially eels, and correlate them with other, similar, and perhaps identical cult – the cult of the serpent.

Numerous finds of archaeological provenance, from those stylistically connected to those having elements of direct influences such as violin idols, corroborate mutual contacts of these regions. This creates the opportunity to observe the legend of Cadmus as the result of these relations, as pointed out by Marianna Koromila, being manifested through hundreds of Greek sailors. As part of these movements, there is an episode of Cadmus’s crossing to the north when the Encheleans from the north first appeared – those who had a special place in the history of the ancient Greeks. Despite the lack of data about them, this fact suggests the importance of their role – the role that remained permanently hidden and completely unknown. On the other hand, their belief and cult, as well as their name, may have been the historical reason why they have never been forgotten. If we observe the testimonies of them as eel-people at the territory of Boeotia, their appearance as such in the north, the legendary foundation of Butoa, and the fact that they are the oldest well-known community in this region to their southern neighbors, we can assume that they were also an eponymous community of the entire region in the later history. If their appearance at the north was part of trade relations or even colonization process from the south, their name and site, and new Cadmeias and Butoas became the focal point of contacts, information sources, and familiarization with the north for their contemporaries in Greece. As such, they secured their historical role in Greek ecumenism. Workshops produced items for trade towards the Encheleans as the first destination, their ports were a clear orientation and refuge, from where the trade could continue toward the north and from the north to the south. More importantly, their belief in eels and the similarity with the belief in serpents, although it is difficult to assume a clear differentiation between the two, given that they were named after their cult in Boeotia, could have played an important role in the appearance of the name of Illyrians, as well as their perception by the ancient Greeks. The similarity in meaning of the names of the Encheleans and the Illyrians implies a certain connection that could be the result of a coincidence or identical beliefs or the acceptance of beliefs of the
Encheleans themselves among local communities who were not unfamiliar with serpents and their cult and which did not aspire to the anthropomorphism of deities as the Greeks did. In this regard, the term Illyrian could determine the Encheleans themselves, and later on others who had the same beliefs in some of or in a local language. The belief in the cult of the serpent, which was associated by Cadmus himself with the cult of ancestors first by killing one serpent in Greece, then turning himself into one, could be a manifestation associated with ancestors whose origin was inevitably always in the legends, deities which were often associated with the same ancestors, and ultimately with the manifestation of spiritual beings in mundane, revered serpents, dragons, eels. If we consider that compared to numerous communities that the Greeks and even the Romans were familiar with in the later period, the most important community, named by the modern scholarship as the Illyrians, was entirely unknown without any specific mention of its geographic position but only a wider geographic setting, we can assume that for those who created the written works, the Illyrians had never existed. For them, it might have been perfectly clear and factual that this term of the language of the north implies first of all the Encheleans, then all those associated with their belief in the later period. Although perhaps an ordinary transcription, perhaps Pliny’s or Mela’s fact that they were named or called as such, or perhaps a strong dichotomy with beliefs of the ancient Greeks, it seems that this is a community which, by departing from the Greek framework, brought with itself the name and beliefs that resulted in creating different ones. Therefore, in accordance with the existence of contacts in the territory of present-day Montenegro and its proximity, it is possible to conclude that the legend of Cadmus, his foundation of the city of Butoa, as well as mutual relations corroborated by archaeology, were part of a process that had far-reaching consequences from the direct influence of Greece on this region and influence of this region on former Greece. At the same time, mutual acquaintance resulted in the fact that the Greeks were faced with an elusive and mysterious community which they had never defined, possibly because they were familiar with it within the framework of their language, whose name had spread from this region to a significantly wider region to be ultimately adopted by the Roman Empire due to a completely different administrative perception, followed by the scholarship of the 20th century.
Sažetak: Legenda o Kadmu – Osnivanje grada Butoa i moguće porijeklo imena Iliri

Legenda o sidonskom heroju Kadmu (Cadmus) i njegovoj supruzi Harmoniji (Harmonia) jedna je od najstarijih legendi povezanih sa stanovnicima prahistorijskog Balkana. Rani izvori povezuju stanovnike istočne jadranske obale sa zmijama ili jeguljama. Moderna znanost je utvrdila činjenicu da je u prehistorijskom periodu značajnu ulogu u identificiranju i samoidentificiranju zajednica imao kult predaka. Legendu o Kadmu i njegov dolazak na prostor današnje Crne Gore, osnivanje grada Butoe (Budve) i smrt pretvaranjem u zmije, moguće je prepoznati kao tragove vjerovanja u kult predaka. Prateći tradiciju ovog mita moguće je konstatirati da je cjelokupan proces reprezentirao stvaranje snažnih trgovačkih veza, potencijalno osnivanje trgovačkih kolonija, prilikom čega se kao posljedica u znanju grčkih autora pojavila eventualna transkripcija imena Enhelejaca u Ilire, bazirana na jeziku lokalnih zajednica sjevera. Na ovaj način, imena Ilira i Enhelejaca u grčkoj Beotiji nisu reprezentirali nijednu etničku zajednicu, niti danas prepoznatljivu arheološku kulturu, već vjerovanja i kult većeg broja zajednica koje su u ovim mitskim bicima pronalazili i svoje pretke poput legendarnog junaka iz Sidona.
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