

---

## Tymphaia(ns): Molossian(s) or Macedonian(s)?

by Ioannis K. Xydopoulos  
Aristotle University of Thessaloniki  
[ixydopou@hist.auth.gr](mailto:ixydopou@hist.auth.gr)

**ABSTRACT** The Tymphaians, like the Orestai, were considered as Molossian tribes by the end of the sixth century BC. One should not make the common mistake of interpreting the Macedonian expansion in these areas with the help of much later literary sources depicting the conditions in these areas under Roman rule, especially those of the Roman province of Macedonia, thus ignoring the earlier sources; therefore, one should not include Tymphaia in the “original” Macedonian regions. Tymphaia was incorporated in the Macedonian kingdom after 351 or 342 by Philip II, thus becoming thereafter an integral part of Macedonia and the theater of crucial decisions regarding the Macedonian throne. The preexisting institutions of the Tymphaians were not abolished after this incorporation. Their characterization as “Macedonians” by Arrian is related to the political use of the “national” adjective “Macedonians”, i.e., subjects of the Macedonian king. The tribal organization of the region must also have played an important role in the perception of the Tymphaians by the southern Greeks. In this context, one can only admit one’s inability to proceed to further suggestions or assumptions, as the surviving written testimonies are scarce. Perhaps, vital in this direction will be the data given to the historians through the archaeological excavations conducted in the area and the possible identification of the settlements mentioned in the scarce literary sources.

**KEYWORDS** Macedon, Archelaos I, reforms, developments

---

The area between the northeastern slopes of the Pindos range mountains, from the peaks of Mt. Grammos and Mt. Voion, is characterized by rivers rich in water (such as the Venetikos and the Grevenitis), while its geographical location (a junction between the mountainous western Greece and the eastern lowlands and between Upper Macedonia and the plain of Thessaly) made it of great importance already in antiquity<sup>1</sup>. The northern part of the Haliakmon valley crosses the areas of ancient Orestis while the southern part runs through Tymphaia and Elimeia. Therefore, one can easily explain its habitation from the Paleolithic period on<sup>2</sup>. In early historical times the area is identified with the territory (*chora*) of the Tymphaians.

The scarce information we possess about the period before the annexation of Tymphaia by the kingdom of Macedonia makes it extremely difficult to draw any definite conclusions about the people and the land. What’s more, one of the main problems related to these sources –besides their above-mentioned scarcity– is that the majority comes from later periods, that is from the fourth century, when Tymphaia had already been incorporated into the kingdom of Macedonia. However, even these

---

<sup>1</sup> KALLINI 2001-2002, 35; 2004, 52-53.

<sup>2</sup> EUSTRATIOU 2004, 43-46.

few literary sources belonging to the early fourth and the third centuries BC provide us with irrelevant information about the land. For example, we are informed from Theophrastos in the fourth century BC about the quality of the Tymphaian *gypsum* (mentioned three times), used for clothes and rated fourth in the Greek world for its quality by the author<sup>3</sup>. Nothing else is said about the region.

The inhabitants of the region, known as Tymphaioi (Tymphaians), are rarely found in the surviving literary sources<sup>4</sup>. It is very probable that they came to the highlands southwest of the turn of the Haliakmon river from their first *habitus*, the springs of the Arachthos river, on Mount Tympe (*i.e.* the area of modern Metsovo)<sup>5</sup>. The Tymphaians, like their neighboring Orestai mentioned by Hekataios as a Molossian tribe<sup>6</sup>, were probably also included by the end of the sixth century BC among these *μολοσσικά ἔθνη*. Since Strabo, whose source was Hekataios<sup>7</sup>, clearly includes the Tymphaians in the Molossian tribes, too, this probability gets higher<sup>8</sup>. In another passage, Strabo refers to the Molossian tribe of the Talares<sup>9</sup>. Since the tribes of the Orestai to the north and the Talares to the south of the region were located near the Macedonians and the Thessalians respectively<sup>10</sup>, it should be taken for granted that whoever was in between the former two was considered to be Molossian, at least by Hekataios<sup>11</sup>. Another writer, the third century BC historian of the court of Pyrrhos, Proxenos, is cited by both Aelius Herodianus and Stephanos Byzantios, when they are referring to Chaonia. Its inhabitants are called “Epeirotes”, as are the Tymphaians and the other local tribes<sup>12</sup>. This is, perhaps, the first direct reference to the Tymphaians being Molossian in origin coming from a local (Epeirote) historian. Apparently, as Tymphaia and Parauaia were given to Pyrrhos in 295<sup>13</sup>, Proxenos promoted the somehow “official” categorization of Pyrrhos’ court.

Given then their kinship with the Molossians, one can conclude that the Tymphaians spoke some form of Western Greek. This emerges also from the names of members of the royal houses preserved on inscriptions or in the literary sources (e.g., Alketas, Alexander, Simmias). Although it is well known that the names themselves do not constitute secure evidence for defining ethnic origins, they are nevertheless indicative.

The sources are clear that monarchy was their institution, as in all the neighboring tribal states of Macedonia, as well as in Macedonia itself<sup>14</sup>: Strabo, when referring to

<sup>3</sup> Theophr. *Lap.* 62.3. Also, see 64.2, 6.

<sup>4</sup> KALLINI 2001-2002, 33-38.

<sup>5</sup> Strab. 7.7.6; RUSSU 1938, 108-109; HAMMOND 1967, 478; KALLINI 2004, 52-53.

<sup>6</sup> *FGrH* 1, F 107.

<sup>7</sup> HAMMOND 1967, 447-448, 458; 1972, 439.

<sup>8</sup> Strab. 7.7.8.

<sup>9</sup> Strab. 9.5.12: Τάλαρες, μολοσσικὸν φύλον (= The Talares, a Molossian tribe ...).

<sup>10</sup> HAMMOND 1967, 462.

<sup>11</sup> According to HAMMOND 1967, 462, the Molossian tribes were also opposed both to the Illyrian ἔθνη as well as to the Macedonian ones: “It is clear that Hekataeus defined this group of tribes and named its members τα Μολοσσικά ἔθνη or τὰ τῶν Μολοσσῶν ἔθνη as contrasted with τα Ἰλλυρικά ἔθνη and τὰ τῶν Μακεδόνων ἔθνη”. However, we should stress that there are no references to Macedonian ἔθνη in the fragments of Hekataios. He also noticed in his monograph on Epeiros that the term ἡπειρωτικά ἔθνη, found in later sources (Strabo), comes from Ephoros, a historian of the fourth century BC (HAMMOND 1967, 462; 1972, 439).

<sup>12</sup> *Hdn. Pros. Cat.* 19, 4; Steph. Byz. S.v. Χαονία.

<sup>13</sup> For the context, see HAMMOND 1967, 568-569; KING 2018, 225.

<sup>14</sup> Aristotle in his *Politics* (1310b 34-40) mentions the kings of the Molossians and the Macedonians, in his effort to show how benefactors in several areas became kings. For these *ethne* being tribal states, see indicatively HAMMOND 2000, 345-352; DAVIES 2000, 251-252; LASAGNI 2018, 159-188.

the peoples of Northern Epeiros and Upper Macedonia, comments that they were all ruled by indigenous dynasties, except for the Encheli, the Molossians, and the Lynkestai<sup>15</sup>. According to Diodoros<sup>16</sup>, Polyperchon, an officer of Alexander the Great, came from the region of Tymphaia and commanded the unit (*ile*) of the (S)tymphaians in Alexander's expeditionary corps<sup>17</sup>. Polyperchon's father, Simmias, was king of the Tymphaians c. 370 BC<sup>18</sup>. Polyperchon brought Herakles, Alexander's son by Barsine, to the "ancestral kingdom", apparently Tymphaia, in the summer of 309<sup>19</sup>. "Stymphaia" mentioned in the specific passage was not in Macedonia, but the point was surely that he was planning to return him to Macedonia. Polyperchon is allegorically mentioned as a "Tymphaian dragon" by Lykophron, thus reminding us that Tymphaia was the scene of a brutal action: the assassination of young Herakles by Polyperchon, who wanted to satisfy Kassandros<sup>20</sup>. He must have been a typical mountain character: harsh, flexible and a bon viveur: he is depicted as someone who, despite his old age, was dancing every time he got drunk, wearing a saffron robe and Sikyonian sandals<sup>21</sup>.

Tymphaia may have included the tribe of the Aithikai, since Tzetzes' comments in Lykophron's *Alexandra* add that Polyperchon was a Tymphaian Epeirote, king of the Aithikai, and that the Tymphaians were an Epeirote tribe. Given this information, and the comment found in Strabo (7.7.9) that the Tymphaians and the Aithikai had territorial disputes over the sources of Peneios River<sup>22</sup>, one could perhaps assume that Aithikia was eventually absorbed by Tymphaia sometime in the late 4<sup>th</sup> century<sup>23</sup>.

Scholars have also tried to address the crucial question of when, exactly, Tymphaia became part of Macedonia. There are two main opposing suggestions in scholarship: the first one argues that Tymphaia was incorporated into Macedonia by around 480 BC, *i.e.*, when Alexander I was king. This suggestion was firstly championed by Hammond and is based on a passage from Justin (7.4.1), according to which immediately after the battle of Salamis Xerxes gave to Alexander the areas from Mt. Olympos to the mountainous range of Haimos<sup>24</sup>. Some seem to find in Thucydides'

---

HATZOPOULOS 1996, I, 101 and 220 argued that the ethne of Epeiros were (as the Macedonian ones) "original groupings of rural communities" and that in Epeiros there is not "the slightest vestige of groups united by parentage or descent".

<sup>15</sup> Strab. 7.7.8.

<sup>16</sup> D.S. 17.57.2.

<sup>17</sup> For Polyperchon, see BERVE 1926, 325-326 no. 654; RUSSU 1938, 212-113; MEEUS 2012, 5398-5399; POWNALL 2020, 432-433. GUNDERSON 1986, 231-237.

<sup>18</sup> HAMMOND 1967, 685.

<sup>19</sup> D.S. 20.28.1-5.

<sup>20</sup> Lyk. 802. See also the Scholiast in *Lykophronem*, 801, ll. 4 and 11.

<sup>21</sup> Ath. 4.42.17 (KAIBEL).

<sup>22</sup> HAMMOND 1967, 460.

<sup>23</sup> It is in this aspect perhaps, that Strabo (7.7.9) mentions Aiginion as a Tymphaian city ὄμορον to Aithikia and Trikke. Still, I believe that the latter two cities were not Tymphaian in origin, as KALLINI 2001-2002, 35-36 takes for granted.

<sup>24</sup> HAMMOND 1972, 112-113, 439; HAMMOND-GRIFFITH 1979, 63-65; HAMMOND 1989, 44 clearly accept the inclusion of the Tymphaians in the regions of Upper Macedonia with the inspiration of the Persians, after 500 BC. Already HOFFMANN 1906, 151-152 had also argued that the tribes of Upper Macedonia had come under the political influence of the Macedonian king in about the middle of the fifth century, however he stressed that they felt closer to the neighboring continental tribes, and they perceived themselves as Epeirotes. See also BILLOWS 1990, 19; KARAMITROU-MENTESIDI 1999, 62-65; 2004, 57-59, 63; KALLINI 2001-2002, 33. HATZOPOULOS-PASCHIDIS 2004, 794 take for granted that Tymphaia had been considered, from an early period, as belonging to Upper Macedonia, and so was part of the Macedonian kingdom. BOSWORTH 1971, 94, 102 and PASCHIDIS 2020, 323 place the final incorporation of these Upper Macedonian districts during the reign of Philip II.

references to the tribes of Upper Macedonia<sup>25</sup> proof that among them should have been also the Tymphaians. However, these suggestions soon came under criticism<sup>26</sup>. For example, Fanula Papazoglou, following Strabo, suggested that one should not include Tymphaia in the “primordiale” Macedonian regions (*i.e.* those included in the μακεδονίδα γῆν, mentioned only once by Herodotos (7.127.1)); instead, Papazoglou suggested that Tymphaia should be regarded as an area originally belonging to the Molossian kingdom (as initially argued by S. Dakaris)<sup>27</sup>, which was annexed by the Macedonian kingdom under Philip II after 358, thus constituting, from that point on, an integral part of his state<sup>28</sup>. Robin Lane Fox shares the same opinion, persuasively arguing for 351 as the year of the annexation, while Elizabeth Meyer tends to accept the year 343<sup>29</sup>. The passage in the *Historiae Philippicae* of Justin, as epitomized by Pompeius Trogus states the following (7.4.1):

*Post discessum a Macedonia Bubaris Amyntas rex decedit, cuius filio et successori Alexandro cognatio Bubaris non Darii tantum temporibus pacem praestitit, verum etiam Xerxen adeo conciliavit, ut, cum Graeciam veluti tempestas quaedam occupasset, inter Olympum Haemumque montes totius regionis eum imperio donaverit.*

“Soon after the departure of Boubares from Macedonia, king Amyntas died; but his relationship with Boubares not only secured to his son and successor, Alexander, peace during the reign of Dareios, but also such favor with Xerxes, that, when that monarch overspread Greece like a tempest, he conferred upon him the sovereignty of all the country between the mountains of Olympos and Haimos” (WATSON 1853, transl.).

It is more than logical that in the *Epitome* of Justin by Pompeius Trogus no details could be added. Still, there is no specific mention of tribes residing to these lands between Mt. Olympos and the Haimos Mt. range. Even if we are to accept Hammond’s argument that these territories included Upper Macedonia, it remains undefined whether the Tymphaians were incorporated to these tribes.

I would like to add two more arguments in favor of the later date. First, according to Aristotle, towards the end of the fifth century, king Archelaos (413-399 BC) married his elder daughter to an otherwise unknown king of Elimeia<sup>30</sup>. Given the perilous situation Archelaos was in, as the king of Lynkestis, Arrhabaios, and his –

<sup>25</sup> Thuc. 2.99.

<sup>26</sup> GEYER 1930, 11-12; BOSWORTH 1971, 97-98, 100; BORZA 1990, 115 n. 38; ZAHRT 1984, 364; 1992, 251; CHATZINIKOLAOU 2009, 1-20; THOMAS 2010, 75; MÜLLER 2016, 129; KING 2018, 6. Even Hammond (in HAMMOND–GRIFFITH 1979, 64-66 and map 2; HAMMOND 1989, 44), does not specifically include Tymphaia in the conceded areas of Upper Macedonia. The Orestai and the Lynkestai are mentioned by him (1995, 124) as affiliated with the Macedonians. BOSWORTH 1971, 97-98 seems to accept that “the geographers describe them (*i.e.*, the tribes of Upper Macedonia) as an entity”, and he immediately adds that all were trying to avoid their incorporation into the Macedonian kingdom.

<sup>27</sup> DAKARIS 1957, 104-105.

<sup>28</sup> PAPAZOGLU 1988, 229-234; KALLINI 2004, 54 (changing her opinion expressed in KALLINI 2001-2002, 33).

<sup>29</sup> LANE FOX 2021, 615, 619, 621. *Contra* HAMMOND 1967, 529 (*c.* 343); PAPAZOGLU 1970, 120-121 (342); CABANES 1976, 114, 121, 131; MEYER 2013, 82 n. 236 argues for 343/2, when Philip II came back to conquer the rest of Epeiros. He succeeded in capturing the coastal cities of Ambrakia and Elaia, which he gave to the new Molossian king, Alexander I, the young prince whom Philip had brought to Pella and raised.

<sup>30</sup> Arist. *Pol.* 1311b 11-15.

probably–Illyrian brother-in-law, Sirrhas, allied against him, the wedding was a means of securing his position by preventing a coalition between Elimeia and its northern neighbors<sup>31</sup>. If Upper Macedonia were a vital part of the Macedonian kingdom already in 480, then one cannot understand the struggle of its kings to look for protection from other local powers, in this case the constant enemy of Macedonia, the Illyrians. Second, when Philip II married Kleopatra in 337, a young girl (probably) from Lower Macedonia, the bride’s uncle, Attalus, spoke of the offspring of this wedding as ‘legitimate heirs’ for Philip<sup>32</sup>. I believe that this statement, besides implying Alexander’s Molossian origin from the part of his mother, could not have been made if Upper Macedonia had been part of the kingdom for almost a century and a half. It was exactly the fact that these areas had been absorbed lately by Philip that made it possible. Therefore, those who believe that Tymphaia was part of Upper Macedonia long before 351 (or 343), as it was among the areas given to Alexander I by the Persians, are in error, as they essentially interpret the earlier era based on the Roman province of Macedonia.

In this regard, a passage in Thucydides, from which the Tymphaians are absent, is perhaps revealing, as it refers to an episode in 429 BC, when the Orestai campaigned against the city of Stratos<sup>33</sup>. The list of participants in the campaign includes the Parauaians but not the Tymphaians<sup>34</sup>. The possible alternatives that could be made regarding their omission are, in my opinion, the following: a) the Tymphaians were already Macedonians in the political sense, *i.e.* subjects of the Macedonian king at the time; b) they belonged politically to the Molossians; c) they were united with the neighboring Parauaia.

The first suggestion should be rejected on the basis that, if the Tymphaians had been included in the Macedonian kingdom, this would have already occurred also for the other tribes of the region, which, however, are mentioned separately, still retaining their royal houses and their tribal organization<sup>35</sup>. The third suggestion has been initially supported by Wace and Woodward and more recently by Hatzopoulos, who considered Tymphaia to be a part of Parauaia, while both regions belonged to Upper Macedonia (although the period under examination by all three is that after the annexation of these areas by Philip II)<sup>36</sup>. I believe that it also must be rejected, as Thucydides mentions the king of the Parauaians only, Oroidos, leading his army. The

<sup>31</sup> This Sirrhas is the father of Philip’s II mother, Eurydike (Strab. 7.7.8): HAMMOND 1989, 32; BOSWORTH 1971, 100; MÜLLER 2020, 319 with references. For Sirrhas’ debatable ethnicity, see CARNEY 2019, 24.

<sup>32</sup> Plu. *Alex.* 9.7. Beth Carney, when reading my paper, remarked that, if Attalus was by his words referring not only to Olympias’ Molossian origin but also to Eurydike’s Upper Macedonian origin, he would have been insulting Philip and questioning his legitimacy too. This is a very logical question, if one takes as granted that Sirrhas was not an Illyrian (for the various suggestions on Sirrhas’ origins, see CARNEY 2019, 125 n. 48). I follow *Suda s.v.* “Karanos”, where one reads Eurydike was Illyrian. Besides, Attalus’ comment had Alexander, not Philip, as a target.

<sup>33</sup> Thuc. 2.80.5-7; XYDOPOULOS 2007, 7-9.

<sup>34</sup> HAMMOND 1972, 111 takes no position on the absence of the Tymphaians.

<sup>35</sup> HAMMOND 1972, 119.

<sup>36</sup> WACE–WOODWARD 1911-1912, 168, 181. HATZOPOULOS 1996, 77 and n. 6 argued that Parauaia and Tymphaia belonged to Upper Macedonia and were possibly a single administrative part (see also HATZOPOULOS 2015, 332; 2020, 44-45). His suggestion could be accepted mainly for the period after Pyrrhos (294 BC), if we count on Plutarch’s information (*Pyrrh.* 6.4). In his effort to strengthen his opinion, HATZOPOULOS 2020, 44-45 attributes the lack of mentions of Parauaia in the historians of Alexander the Great to its being “subsumed in Tymphaia”. One may wonder what changed from the period when Parauaia was the region mentioned (*e.g.*, in Thucydides, mentioned by Hatzopoulos a few lines above) while Tymphaia lay in the dark.

Orestai, “ranged with Epirus”<sup>37</sup> at that period, also with their king Antiochos, combined forces with the Parauaians. There is no mention of the Tymphaians by the otherwise cautious Thucydides.

Therefore, I think that the second suggestion, that Tymphaia was part of the kingdom of the Molossians at that time and had not yet been included in the ἔθνη of Upper Macedonia in the time of Thucydides, is the most probable, justifying, at the same time, the absence of any reference to the Tymphaians in the aforementioned passage. In addition, one should bear in mind that the historian is extremely careful in naming the tribes of the region. Thucydides’ treatment of all those peoples who lived in Macedonia is well-known<sup>38</sup>. Macedonia is defined as a country in which various ethnic entities lived, still in his own day. Given, in all probability, that Thucydides draws his information from Hekataios<sup>39</sup>, who in his detailed description of Epeiros names the Molossians<sup>40</sup>, the Orestai, and the Tymphaians separately (if the assumption that Strabo in 7.7.6 relied on the work of Hekataios is correct)<sup>41</sup>, it seems a paradox that the historian of the Peloponnesian War does not name them separately, too. Moreover, according to the *theorodokoi* inscription from Epidauros (dated to 356-355 BC)<sup>42</sup>, on which the name of Tharyps, king of the Molossians, is inscribed and the probable attribution to this same king of the “written rules and regulations which we find in the earliest known decrees of the Molossian state in 370-368”<sup>43</sup>, the acme of the Molossian kingdom is placed between 386 and 355. Therefore, an annexation of Tymphaia to Macedonia before Philip II seems to me improbable<sup>44</sup>.

Probably, it was after the pressures exercised later to the Molossian kingdom by the Illyrians that an alliance was concluded with the Macedonian state. As a result, a campaign of Philip II against the Illyrian king Bardylis in 358 followed, as well as the marriage of the Macedonian king to Olympias. From that point until the early third century, the destinies of the two kingdoms were united. The rivalry between Pyrrhos and Demetrios the Besieger, however, did not leave the area unaffected: Plutarch (*Pyrrh.* 6.2) states that in 295 King Pyrrhos received the areas of Parauaia and Tymphaia, which he incorporated into his Epeirote kingdom. Macedonian control was reestablished in these areas after Pyrrhos’ death and until the coming of the Romans to the East<sup>45</sup>.

The union with Macedonia probably did not overthrow the pre-existing institutions in the region: kingship was retained for the Tymphaians, as in all neighboring tribal

<sup>37</sup> Quotation from HORNBLLOWER 1991, 363.

<sup>38</sup> XYDOPOULOS 2006, 60-66.

<sup>39</sup> HAMMOND 1967, 453, 459.

<sup>40</sup> *FGrHI*, F 108.

<sup>41</sup> HAMMOND 1967, 458.

<sup>42</sup> *IG IV<sup>2</sup>* 1 95, I 31. See PERLMAN 2000, 180-184 and 261-262 for the date.

<sup>43</sup> HAMMOND 1967, 508.

<sup>44</sup> As we learn from Thucydides, Tharyps was still underage in 429; however, the fact that his family sent him to Athens for his education after the defeat of the Molossians at Stratos implies that the royal family had maintained its local power after the war, still being the overlords of the Tymphaians and some of other tribes of the region. MEYER 2015, 302. For Tharyps, see Just. 17.3.9-13; VOLKMANN 1979, 651; ZAHRT 2006; HORNBLLOWER 1991, 363. Although he disagrees with the date, LANE FOX 2021, 614 follows the proposal made by ROBERTSON 1923, 58-60 that Euripides’ *Andromache* was performed in Molossia.

<sup>45</sup> I agree with HATZOPOULOS 1996, 78 n. 3 on his proposal of the date when Tymphaia and Parauaia were part of the Macedonian kingdom again, and his argument about the importance of the inscription found in the area (see below, n. 47). See also TARN 1913, 311. *Contra* CABANES 1976, 89 and 202, who argued that Parauaia and Tymphaia were under Epeirote control until at least 230. MEYER 2013, 82 n. 237 does not conclude regarding the date.

states of Macedonia. We should assume that Philip II tried to leave the institutions in these states as intact as possible; in this way, he maintained their unity and provided them with the guise of autonomy<sup>46</sup>. Traces regarding the existence of kingship among the Tymphaians after their incorporation to the Macedonian kingdom are found, as we saw, in our literary sources.

The other institutions of the Tymphaians probably resembled those of the Molossians and the Macedonians in many respects too<sup>47</sup>. From the area of Tymphaia comes only one fragmentary inscription, dated by its editors to probably the 3<sup>rd</sup> or early second century BC<sup>48</sup>. We read on the inscription a reference to the judicial office of the *skoidos*, which according to Hesychios, was a “Macedonian officer related to the courts”<sup>49</sup>; this allows for the logical hypothesis that in the period long after its incorporation into Macedonia, Tymphaia consisted of self-governing communities, which –with the exception of Aiginion (only?)<sup>50</sup>– did not enjoy the status of a city<sup>51</sup>. Finally, as far as religion is concerned, we find evidence in Hesychios that Zeus Deipatyros was worshipped by the (S)tymphaians, an adjective of Zeus not found elsewhere<sup>52</sup>. However, the same author names the Tymphaians as a godless *ethnos*!<sup>53</sup> The question rising immediately is whether Στυμφαῖοι and Τυμφαῖον ἔθνος are two different things. According to Diodoros (17.57.2), as we saw, Polyperchon oversaw a contingent from Stymphaia. Plutarch also refers to Stymphaia (*Pyrrh.* 6.4). Obviously, the names are similar but not identical; still, despite slight differences in spelling of the same place, both refer to the same place<sup>54</sup>. There may also have been a misunderstanding by these authors, as the Scholiast in Kallimachos mentions another place in Epeiros, namely in Thesprotia, called Stymphai<sup>55</sup>.

We have mentioned above the city of Aiginion. It goes without saying that the existence of cities in Tymphaia and the process of urbanization do not imply the

<sup>46</sup> HAMMOND 1967, 531-533.

<sup>47</sup> HATZOPOULOS 1996, I, 78.

<sup>48</sup> RIZAKIS–TOURATSOGLU 1985, n° 74. HATZOPOULOS 1993, 154 n° 16; 1996, 77-78 dates it after the first quarter of the 3<sup>rd</sup> c. BC or even earlier. In an earlier version of this paper (in Greek: XYDOPOULOS 2015, 32-44), I had adopted the view of Hatzopoulos that the inscription comes from Tymphaia, while earlier researchers accept that the place where it was found preserves antiquities from Elimeia, a view to which the editors of the inscription seem to tend (although they are not certain that the inscription came from Elimeia: TOURATSOGLU–RIZAKIS 1985, 79, the inscription is placed under the sub-chapter “Elimeia-ambigua”), something also depicted on the map at the end of their volume. The debate is long: HAMMOND 1972, 117-18 suggested Elimeia; PAPAOGLOU 1988, 235, map 7 and 244-245 places the finding spot of the inscription in Orestis; KARAMITROU-MENTESIDI 1999, 63 n. 81 makes no mention to the debate, but she places it in Tymphaia. CHATZINIKOLAOU 2009, 4, in a thorough study regarding the historical geography of Upper Macedonia, argues that the northern part of modern prefecture of Grevena could belong either to ancient Tymphaia or Elimeia. Therefore, as it becomes evident from the above, regardless of whether the inscription was found in an area included in Tymphaia or in Elimeia, it does not provide us with any help whether Tymphaia had passed into the Macedonian sphere of influence earlier than Philip II.

<sup>49</sup> Hsch. Σ, 1051. For the office, see KALLÉRIS 1954, 262-264; HATZOPOULOS 1996, I, 77-78; KARAMITROU-MENTESIDI 1999, 63 n. 81; HATZOPOULOS 2015, 335.

<sup>50</sup> Strab. 7.7.9. See also below, n. 60. HAMMOND 1967, 679-81 takes Aiginion as a Tymphaian town, which he located at the so-called “Rock of a Goat”, in the modern prefecture of Trikala, thus rejecting its identification with modern Kalambaka (as suggested by WACE–WOODWARD 1911-1912, 181 n. 1).

<sup>51</sup> HATZOPOULOS 1996, I, 78.

<sup>52</sup> Hsch. Δ, 521: Δειπάτυρος· θεὸς παρὰ Στυμφαῖοις (= Deipatyros. God by the Tymphaians); mentioned by KALLINI 2001-2002, 38.

<sup>53</sup> Hsch. T, 1641: Τυμφαῖον ἔθνος· ἄθεον ἔθνος. (= Tymphaians, *ethnos*. A godless *ethnos*.)

<sup>54</sup> I agree with PAPAOGLOU 1988, 230, n. 17.

<sup>55</sup> Scholion 176, l. 1.

corresponding existence of the city-state system<sup>56</sup>. Besides, up to the fourth century, in the mountainous areas of both Epeiros and Macedonia, it is mainly *komai* that are found<sup>57</sup>. However, even for these smaller settlements, our knowledge is minimal. At this point, it is appropriate to critically examine a passage by Stephanos Byzantios, in which he speaks of the existence of a city of the same name in Tymphaia<sup>58</sup>. In the relevant entry, Stephanos mentions: “Tymphe, a Mountain in Thesprotia; (there is) also a city (called) Tymphaia. The ethnic name is Tymphaios and the feminine Tymphaia”. What is extremely interesting, I think, is that he is also referring to another variant of the city’s name, *i.e.*, Tymphais. It has long been pointed out in research that Stephanos’ reference to cities is not always accurate: Stephanos records information from earlier writers and works, definitively lost today, about *poleis* and this is the importance of his work, but he has occasionally speculated on their existence, based on references that he had not checked himself, thus without him being able to confirm the information he had provided<sup>59</sup>. Still, in this case, he may have been correct. There are two references to this city in the surviving literary evidence: Stephanos’ source may have been the work of the grammarian of the second century AD, Herodianus<sup>60</sup>. There is also another, quite late (tenth century AD) passage: an entry in the *Suda* Lexicon, in which we read Τυμφαῖς: πόλις<sup>61</sup>. Perhaps the author of the Lexicon was just copying Stephanos. Still, I find these references indicative of the existence of this town.

In 2004, Miltiades Hatzopoulos and Paschalis Paschidis mentioned only Aiginion as a pre-Hellenistic town and as the capital of the united Tymphaia-Parauaia regions, apparently based on Strabo<sup>62</sup>. I believe that one should not ignore the other references found in other sources, in which one can read about two other cities located in Tymphaia, *i.e.*, Tymphe/Tymphaia and Gyrtone. Perhaps, one of these cities mentioned is the one that became known in recent years through the excavation efforts of Stella Drougou and her partners, at the location ‘Kastri’ of Polyneri, although this late Classical-early Hellenistic settlement has also been identified with Aiginion<sup>63</sup>. Its citadel is characterized by strong fortifications and the existence of a temple of a so far unidentified deity, while the archaeological remains seem to indicate that it was an important center of political as well as religious life in the area<sup>64</sup>.

I would like to suggest that there *was* a city called Tymphaia. The passage from Arrian’s *Indica*, in which he names all officers of the Macedonian king coming from different parts of the kingdom<sup>65</sup>, comes to our aid, I believe. Among their places of origin one can find Orestis, Eordaia, Pydna, Mieza, Tymphaia, Aigai, Veria and

<sup>56</sup> DAVIES 2000, 241.

<sup>57</sup> HATZOPOULOS 2003, 55; 1996, 77; LANE FOX 2021, 615.

<sup>58</sup> Steph. Byz. *s.v.* Τύμφη (Τυμφαία πόλις).

<sup>59</sup> WHITEHEAD 1994, 101-105, 114-115.

<sup>60</sup> Hdn. *Pros. Cat.* 283, 22: Τυμφαία πόλις.

<sup>61</sup> *Suda s.v.* Τυμφαῖς. Πόλις: T 1168.1.

<sup>62</sup> HATZOPOULOS–PASCHIDIS 2004, 794-796. They include Aiginion in the pre-Hellenistic settlements, not attested as *poleis* in the sources of the period, although Aiginion is mentioned in two 2<sup>nd</sup> c. AD inscriptions as a *polis* (see the relevant references the same authors provide on p. 796. Apparently, they take as granted that a *polis* of the second century AD was not necessarily a *polis* in the fourth century BC). KARAMITROU–MENTESIDI 2004, 57 also ignores the cities of Tymphaia and Gyrtone.

<sup>63</sup> HAMMOND 1967; see also n. 50.

<sup>64</sup> KALLINI 2004, 56. See also DROUGOU–KALLINI–TRAKATELLI 2009, 75-82; 2010, 57-63. DROUGOU 2013, 223-233.

<sup>65</sup> Arr. *Ind.* 18.3-6.

Alkomenai. My suggestion is that all these toponyms refer solely to cities and not to both regions and cities. Specifically, I want to consider Eordaia, Orestis, and Tymphaia (the others named are well-known cities of Macedonia). The evidence for my suggestion is based, for Eordaia, on the *theorodokoi* list from Epidauros, dated to 360-359 BC, in which we read the name of Menelaos, son of Nikanor, from E(u)ordaia. While it has been argued that E(u)ordaia always stood for a district name, I follow Phyllis Perlman's argument that a *theoros* needed a city to make his proclamation, not simply a district<sup>66</sup>. The same goes for Orestis: Stephanos again mentions a city named Orestia in Orestis, from which Alexander's general and later founder of the Ptolemaic dynasty, Ptolemy, originated<sup>67</sup>. Of course, his statement contradicts Arrian, who has Ptolemy coming from Eordaia (and we know that Arrian's main source was Ptolemy)<sup>68</sup>. Besides, especially in the case of Macedonia, there is a similar confusion, as Stephanos also speaks of a '*Makedonon*' settlement<sup>69</sup>. Perhaps the similarity is not accidental and can be attributed to incomplete or incorrect information about the existence of the specific city in the area. In any case, it is certainly a mistake of Stephanos. Claudius Ptolemy mentions Gyrtone as the only city of Tymphaia, while he places Aiginion in the Thessalian Hestiaiotis<sup>70</sup>. The absence of a city called Tymphaia in Ptolemy's work could be an omission based on his apparently misinformed sources: as we saw, Aiginion was located at Tymphaia, while Gyrtone was a city in Thessaly.

Closely related to the above, the issue of the existence of a Tymphaian ethnic identity cannot be solved<sup>71</sup>. As far as the Classical Period is concerned, it should be emphasized from the outset that there is no evidence concerning Tymphaian self-perception. Our main sources for the period are Thucydides' *History* and the *Geography* of Strabo, the latter drawing, as noted above, from Hekataios<sup>72</sup>. Therefore, one should have in mind that we will be dealing with identities and perceptions attributed to the Tymphaians by the Greeks of the South. In addition, parameters such as the geographical designation of 'Hellas' or the different political systems (city-state vs. kingdom) also contributed to the perception of the Tymphaians as well as the other tribes of the region. Finally, given that this Molossian tribe became part of the Macedonian kingdom in a later period, the definition of their perception must have been already shaped by specific criteria, which will be presented in the following with the help of Thucydides and Strabo.

With their inclusion in the Macedonian state, one would expect that southern Greeks would have perceived Tymphaians to resemble Macedonians. The literary sources at our disposal are well known and have been commented by this author in 2006. The first one is Thucydides, whose references to the Macedonian people and

<sup>66</sup> PERLMAN 2000, 126-127 and n. 117; PAPAZOGLU 1988, 166-169 is skeptical, still she included a city called Eordaia in her catalogue; KARAMITROU-MENTESIDI 1999, 60-61 agrees with Papazoglou. *Contra* HAMMOND 1972, 109, 164 n. 5. CHATZINIKOLAOU 2009, 7 mentions the different views without reaching to any concrete suggestion.

<sup>67</sup> Steph. Byz. S.v. Ὀρεστία. PAPAZOGLU 1988, 236 and n. 10 suggested that this reference was made because of Stephanos' confusion between the name of the district and that of a polis.

<sup>68</sup> HEUCKE 1997, 28-30.

<sup>69</sup> Steph. Byz. S.v. Μακεδόνων. WHITEHEAD 1994, 111 n. 29 attributes this mention of the specific polis to an error made by Stephanos regarding the term Μακεδόνος, mentioned by Herodotos (1.56.3).

<sup>70</sup> Ptol. 3.12.40.

<sup>71</sup> PASCHIDIS 2020, 323 argues that "The rest of the Upper M. Cantons –from south to north: Tymphaia, Elimeia, Orestis, Lynkos, Derriopos– were culturally and ethnically Macedonian (despite the contacts with Epeiros and the western Greek world emphasized in the genealogical myths of the Orestans)". Still, the evidence for supporting such a suggestion is lacking.

<sup>72</sup> HAMMOND 1967, 447, 453; 1972, 432.

their country have a clearly circumstantial character, *i.e.*, the historian is referring to them only when they are involved in expeditions during the Peloponnesian War<sup>73</sup>. As for the Tymphaians and the other tribes in these regions of the Macedonian kingdom in his times, Thucydides' narrative of Brasidas' and Perdikkas' campaign in Lynkestis in 424/3 BC establishes the historian's view when he writes that “the Chalkidians and Macedonian cavalry [came to] nearly a thousand, and there was also a large mass of barbarians”. These passages have provoked considerable discussion, especially during the late twentieth century. Regarding the question of ethnicity, the question is: were the Macedonians Greeks? Or, rather, did Thucydides think of the Macedonians as Greeks or as “barbarians”? This is not the place to deal with this issue. It will suffice to say that, in my opinion, Thucydides did not intend to ascribe any negative value to the Macedonians. His view is that of an outsider and his construction of a specific Macedonian or another local identity was influenced by the presence of other non-Greek populations within the boundaries of what had become known as Thrace in the era of colonization, part of which was during his time Macedonian territory. Also, the phrase “a large mass of barbarians” clearly implies the existence of other, local tribes, *i.e.*, a multi-ethnic environment. The negative valuation of the indigenous ethnic groups was for the Greeks of Thucydides' time a criterion for determining the consolidation of the oppositional and collective connotation of “Greekness”: the relativity of the boundaries between Greece and the “barbarian” world is evident in these communities in the north of the Greek peninsula. The identity of those populations was called into question when their dialect was unintelligible or when their cultural elements (different customs and traditions) were considered. The above, combined with the geographical factor and the relativity of the definition of the term “Greece” and the common political system of all these ethnic groups (kingship) inevitably influenced their perception by the Greeks of the South.

Furthermore, Strabo uses three criteria in order to classify the “barbarians” in his work: a) ethnic origin, b) language and c) the cultural elements<sup>74</sup>. However, in the already mentioned passage (7.7.8), where he writes of the Tymphaians as being Epeirotes, he attributes to them, as well as to the other tribes of the region, some general characteristics, mentions their intermingling with the Illyrian populations of southern Illyria, and includes them in the general term “natives” (ἰθαγενεῖς)<sup>75</sup>. It is worth providing a translation of the passage here at full length:

The Amphilochians are Epeirotes; and so are the peoples who are situated above them and border on the Illyrian mountains, inhabiting a rugged country –I mean the Molossi, the Athamanes, the Aithikai, the Tymphaians, the Orestai, and also the Paroraei and the Atintanes, some of them being nearer to the Macedonians and others to the Ionian Gulf. It is said that Orestes once took possession of Orestias– when is, exile on account of the murder of his mother– and left the country bearing his name; and that he also founded a city and called it Argos Oresticon. But the Illyrian tribes which are near the southern part of the mountainous country and those which are above the Ionian Gulf are intermingled with these peoples; for above Epidamnos and Apollonia as far as the Keraunian Mountains dwell the Bylliones, the Taulantii, the Parthini, and the Brygi. Somewhere nearby are also the silver mines of Damastion, around which the Dyestai and the Encheleii (also called Sesarethii) together established their dominion; and near these people are also the Lynkestai, the territory

<sup>73</sup> XYDOPOULOS 2006, 60-67 for references.

<sup>74</sup> ALMAGOR 2005, 42-55.

<sup>75</sup> See also Thucydides' comment on bilingual communities in the Chalkidike (4.109.4).

Deuriopos, Pelagonian Tripolitis, the Eordi, Elimeia, and Eratyra. In earlier times these peoples were ruled separately, each by its own dynasty. For instance, it was the descendants of Kadmos and Harmonia who ruled over the Encheleii; and the scenes of the stories told about them are still pointed out there. These people, I say, were not ruled by men of native stock; and the Lynkestai became subject to Arrhabaios, who was of the stock of the Bakchiads (Eurydike, the mother of Philip, Amyntas' son, was Arrhabaios' daughter's daughter and Sirra was his daughter); and again, of the Epeirotes, the Molossi became subject to Pyrrhos, the son of Neoptolemos the son of Achilles, and to his descendants, who were Thessalians. But the rest were ruled by men of native stock. Then, because one tribe or another was always getting the mastery over others, they all ended in the Macedonian empire, except a few who dwelt above the Ionian Gulf. And in fact, the regions about Lynkos, Pelagonia, Orestias, and Elimeia, used to be called Upper Macedonia, though later they were by some also called Free Macedonia. But some go so far as to call the whole of the country Macedonia, as far as Korkyra, at the same time stating as their reason that in tonsure, language, short cloak, and other things of the kind, the usages of the inhabitants are similar, although, they add, some speak both languages. (trans. H. L. Jones, with minor changes)

The mixed cultural elements are limited to a reference to the dialect: the comment he makes at the end of his reference that some of these tribes were bilingual, is indicative as there was no distinction otherwise seen, as far as the perception of these tribes by the southern Greeks was concerned.

A passage, usually overlooked by scholars, reinforces the view expressed above about the perspective of historians or geographers of southern Greece. It comes from Stephanos Byzantios and concerns the Aithikai, neighbors of the Tymphaians. According to this passage, the country of the Aithikai was located between Tymphaia and Athamania, while the tribe is characterized as adventurous and “barbarian”, as well as prone to predatory raids<sup>76</sup>. Stephanos apparently drew this information from Marsyas but he does not specify whether it was Marsyas from Pella or the one from Philippi<sup>77</sup>. Regardless of whether it was the Pellaian or the one from Philippi, the presentation of the Aithikai as barbarians, however, would be a paradox for a historian coming from Macedonia. Unless, they were drawing on older sources: one cannot escape noticing that the perception of the “barbarian” character of the Aithikai, and the elements projected in this image are strongly reminiscent of those in the work of Thucydides. In fact, if Strabo's comment that some of the tribes living in Upper Macedonia are bilingual is added to the above description, then an image consistent with the treatment of these tribes as “barbarians” is completed.

Finally, Arrian, in his abovementioned description of Alexander's Indian campaign (*Ind.* 18.3-6), names all officers of the Macedonian king, who came from different parts of the kingdom. Arrian characterizes the officers from the above areas as “Macedonians” whom he even contrasts with the Greeks.

To sum up: we are still in the dark about Tymphaia, regarding our knowledge about the land and its people, especially in the period before its annexation to Macedonia. Not only are the relevant literary sources scarce, but also the information we derive from them is obscure, even contradictory. In whatever way one arranges the pieces of evidence –of which there are very few– one cannot reach conclusions with certainty. This obscurity worsens because the ethnic mix of the region is still being

<sup>76</sup> Steph. Byz. S.v. Αἰθικία, 3-8.

<sup>77</sup> This passage is included by JACOBY (*FGrH* 135-136, F 18) among those that cannot be attributed to either of them.

studied, the perception of these tribes is subject to certain parameters by the ancient authors and biases of modern scholars, and the newer epigraphic evidence does not elucidate the articulation of the political and social structures of those tribes<sup>78</sup>. I conclude that the Tymphaians were a Molossian tribe, clearly distinct from the Macedonians up to 351 BC. Their incorporation into Macedonia did not alter the character of their tribal organization, since the Tymphaians had simply changed their overlord. Their characterization as “Macedonians” by Arrian can only be explained by the political use of this ethnic name, as, with the subordination of all the tribal states that lived in the areas to the west and southwest of the Macedonian kingdom, this ethnic name was now an integral part of their perception by others, regardless of the ethnic origin of its peoples. Perhaps, also this characterization implies that the Tymphaians were not affected at all by the creation of a new Molossian identity generated by the end of the fourth and the beginning of the third centuries, after a troubled thirty-year period<sup>79</sup>.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ALMAGOR, E. (2005): “Who is a Barbarian? The Barbarians in the Ethnological and Cultural Taxonomies of Strabo”, in D. DUECK – H. LINDSAY – S. POTHECARY (eds.): *Strabo’s Cultural Geography. The Making of a Kollosourgia*, Cambridge: 42-55.
- BERVE, H. (1926): *Das Alexanderreich auf prosopographischer Grundlage*, 2 vols, Munich.
- BILLOWS, R. A. (1990): *Antigonos the One-Eyed and the Creation of the Hellenistic State*, Berkeley.
- BORZA, E. N. (1990): *In the Shadow of Olympus: The Emergence of Macedon*, Princeton.
- BOSWORTH, A. B. (1971): “Philip II and Upper Macedonia”, *CQ* 21: 93-105.
- CABANES, P. (1976): *L’Épire de la mort de Pyrrhos à la conquête romaine, 272-167 av. J. C.*, Paris.
- CARNEY, E. D. (2019): *Eurydice and the Birth of Macedonian Power*, Oxford.
- CHATZINIKOLAOU, K. (2009): “Συμβολή στη μελέτη της ιστορικής γεωγραφίας της Άνω Μακεδονίας”, *Μακεδονικά* 38: 1-20.
- DAKARIS, S. (1957): “Συμβολή εις τήν τοπογραφίαν τῆς ἀρχαίας Ἡπείρου”, *AE*: 88-113.
- DAVIES, J. K. (2000): “A Wholly Non-Aristotelian Universe: The Molossians as Ethnos, State and Monarchy”, in R. BROCK – S. HODKINSON (eds.): *Alternatives to Athens. Varieties of Political Organization and Community in Ancient Greece*, Oxford: 234-258.
- DECOURT, J. C.; NIELSEN, T. H.; HELLY, B. (2004): “Thessalia and Adjacent Regions”, in M. H. HANSEN – T. H. NIELSEN (eds.): *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis*, Oxford: 676-731.

<sup>78</sup> DAVIES 2000, 245.

<sup>79</sup> For the emergence of a new Molossian identity closely related to a *koinon*, see MEYER 2013, 124-127.

- DROUGOU, S. (2013): “Καστρί Γρεβενών. Αρχαιολογικές ενδείξεις για τον πολιτικό και θρησκευτικό χαρακτήρα της Ακρόπολης”, *Το Αρχαιολογικό Έργο στην Άνω Μακεδονία* 3: 223-233.
- DROUGOU, S.; KALLINI, C.; TRAKATELLI, L. (2009): “Η ανασκαφή της αρχαίας ακρόπολης στο Καστρί Πολυνερίου (Δήμος Θ. Ζιάκα) του νομού Γρεβενών”, *ΑΕΜΘ, Επετειακός τόμος*, Thessaloniki: 75-82.
- (2010): “Η Ακρόπολη της αρχαίας πόλης στο Καστρί Πολυνερίου του νομού Γρεβενών – Τα ίχνη των αρχαίων Τυμφαίων”, *Το Αρχαιολογικό Έργο στην Άνω Μακεδονία* 1: 57-63.
- EUSTRATIΟΥ, N. (2004): “Αναζητώντας τις παραλλαγές του κοινού ορεινού πολιτισμικού χώρου της Μεσογείου”, in M. M. PAPANIKOLAΟΥ (ed.): *Τα Γρεβενά. Ιστορία-Τέχνη-Πολιτισμός*, Thessaloniki–Grevena: 43-46.
- GEYER, F. (1930): *Makedonien bis zur Thronbesteigung Philipps II*, Munich.
- GUNDERSON, L. L. (1986): “The Tymphaeans in Curtius’ *Historiae Alexandri*”, *AM* 4: 231-237.
- HAMMOND, N. G. L. (1967): *Epirus. The Geography, The Ancient Remains, the History, and the Topography of Epirus and Adjacent Areas*, Oxford.
- (1972): *A History of Macedonia, Vol. I. Historical Geography and Prehistory*, Oxford.
- (1989): *The Macedonian State. The Origins, Institutions and History*, Oxford.
- (1995): “Connotations of ‘Macedonia’ and of ‘Macedones’ until 323 BC”, *CQ* 45: 120-128.
- (2000): “The Ethne in Epirus and Upper Macedonia”, *ABSA* 95: 345-352.
- HAMMOND, N. G. L.; GRIFFITH, G. T. (1979): *A History of Macedonia, Vol. II*, Oxford.
- HATZOPOULOS, M. B. (1993): “Epigraphie et villages en Grèce du Nord: ethnos, polis et kome en Macédoine”, in A. CALBI – A. DONATI – G. POMA (eds.): *L’epigrafia del villaggio*, Faenza: 151-171.
- (1996): *Macedonian Institutions under the Kings. A Historical and Epigraphic Study*, 2 vols, Athens.
- (2003): “Polis, Ethnos and Kingship in Northern Greece”, in K. BURASELIS – K. ZOUMBOULAKIS (eds.): *The Idea of European Community in History. Conference Proceedings II. Aspects of Connecting Poleis and Ethne in Ancient Greece*, Athens: 51-64.
- (2015): “Federal Macedonia”, in H. BECK – P. FUNKE (eds.): *Federalism in Greek Antiquity*, Cambridge: 319-340.
- (2020): *Ancient Macedonia*, Berlin.
- HATZOPOULOS, M. B.; PASCHIDIS, P. (2004): “Macedonia”, in M. H. HANSEN – T. H. NIELSEN (eds.): *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis*, Oxford: 794-809.
- HEUCKE, C. (1997): “Arrian”, *DNP* 2: 28-30.
- HOFFMANN, O. (1906): *Die Makedonen, ihre Sprache und ihr Volkstum*, Göttingen.
- JONES, H. L. (1924): *The Geography of Strabo*, Cambridge, MA.
- HORNBLOWER, S. (1991): *A Commentary on Thucydides, Vol. I*, Oxford.

- KALLERIS, J. N. (1954): *Les anciens Macédoniens. Etude linguistique et historique I-II*, Athens.
- KALLINI, C. (2001-2002): “Τυμφαία χώρα”, *Εγνατία* 6: 33-39.
- (2004): “Τυμφαία χώρα”, in M. M. PAPANIKOLAOU (ed.): *Τα Γρεβενά. Ιστορία-Τέχνη-Πολιτισμός*, Thessaloniki–Grevena: 52-56.
- KARAMITROU-MENTESIDI, G. (1999): *Βόϊον-Νότια Ορεστίς. Αρχαιολογική έρευνα και ιστορική τοπογραφία*, Thessaloniki.
- (2004): “Η Τυμφαία και ο νομός Γρεβενών”, in M. M. PAPANIKOLAOU (ed.): *Τα Γρεβενά. Ιστορία-Τέχνη-Πολιτισμός*, Thessaloniki–Grevena: 57-69.
- KING, C. (2018): *Ancient Macedonia*, London.
- LANE FOX, R. (2021): “Aspects of Epirus and Macedon, 380-230”, *AM* 8: 613-628.
- LASAGNI, C. (2018): “‘Tribal-poleis’ in Northwestern Greece”, in S. MONTIEL – A. POLLINI (eds.): *La question de l'espace au IVe siècle avant J.-C. dans les mondes grec et étrusco-italique: continuités, ruptures, reprises*, Besançon: 159-188.
- MEEUS, A. (2012): “Polyperchon”, in R. S. BAGNALL – K. BRODERSEN – C. B. CHAMPION – A. ERSKINE – S. R. HÜBNER (eds.): *The Encyclopedia of Ancient History*, Oxford: 5398-5399.
- MEYER, E. A. (2013): *The Inscriptions of Dodona and a New History of Molossia*, Stuttgart.
- (2015): “Molossia and Epeiros”, in H. BECK – P. FUNKE (eds.): *Federalism in Greek Antiquity*, Cambridge: 297-318.
- MÜLLER, S. (2016): *Die Argeaden. Geschichte Makedoniens bis zum Zeitalter Alexanders des Großen*, Paderborn.
- (2020): “Lynkestis”, in W. HECKEL *et al.* (eds.) *Lexicon of Argead Macedonia*, Berlin: 318-320.
- PAPAZOGLU, F. (1970): “Quelques problèmes de l’histoire épirote”, *Živa Antika* 20: 115-136.
- (1988): *Les villes de Macédoine à l’époque romaine. BCH Suppl.* 14, Paris.
- PASCHIDIS, P. (2020): “Makedonia”, in W. HECKEL *et al.* (eds.): *Lexicon of Argead Macedonia*, Berlin: 322-327.
- PERLMAN, P. (2000): *City and Sanctuary in Ancient Greece. The Theorodokia in the Peloponnese*, Göttingen.
- POWNALL, F. (2020): “Polyperchon”, in W. HECKEL *et al.* (eds.): *Lexicon of Argead Macedonia*, Berlin: 432-433.
- RIZAKIS, T.; TOURATSOGLU, G. (eds.) (1985): *Έπιγραφές Άνω Μακεδονίας*, Athens.
- ROBERTSON, D. S. (1923): “Euripides and Tharyps”, *CR* 37: 58-60.
- RUSSU, I. I. (1938): “Macedonica. Osservazioni sulla lingua e l’etnografia degli antichi Macedoni”, *Ephemeris Dacoromana* 8:105-232.
- TARN, W. W. (1913): *Antigonos Gonatas*, Oxford.
- THOMAS, C. G. (2010): “The Physical Kingdom”, in J. ROISMAN – I. WORTHINGTON (eds.): *A companion to Ancient Macedonia*, Oxford: 65-80.
- VOLKMANN, H. (1979): “Tharyps”, *DKP* 5: 651.

- WACE, A. J. B.; WOODWARD, A. M. (1911–1912): “Inscriptions from Upper Macedonia”, *BSA* 18: 166-188.
- WATSON, J. S. (1853): *Marcus Junianus Justinus. Epitome of the Philippic History of Pompeius Trogus*, London.
- WHITEHEAD, D. (1994): “Site-Classification and Reliability in Stephanus of Byzantium”, in D. WHITEHEAD (ed.): *From Political Architecture to Stephanus Byzantius. Sources for the Ancient Greek Polis*, Stuttgart: 99-124.
- XYDOPOULOS, I. K. (2006<sup>2</sup>): *Κοινωνικές και πολιτικές σχέσεις των Μακεδόνων και των νοτίων Ελλήνων*, Thessaloniki.
- (2007): “The Concept and Representation of Northern Communities in Ancient Greek Historiography: The Case of Thucydides”, in J. PAN-MONTOJO – F. PEDERSEN (eds.): *Communities in European History: Representations, Jurisdictions, Conflicts*, Pisa: 1-22.
- (2015): “Οι Τυμφαίοι και η χώρα τους”, in S. DROUGOU (ed.): *Καστρί Γρεβενών. Η ακρόπολη μιας αρχαίας πόλης στην Πίνδο. Η γέννηση της ανασκαφής*, Thessaloniki: 32-44.
- ZAHRNT, M. (1984): “Die Entwicklung des makedonischen Reiches bis zu den Perserkriegen”, *Chiron* 14: 325-368.
- (1992): “Der Mardonioszug des Jahres 492 v. Chr. und seine historische Einordnung”, *Chiron* 22: 237-279.
- (2006): “Tharyps”, *DNP* online ([http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1574-9347\\_dnp\\_e1206550](http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1574-9347_dnp_e1206550)).