

Mirko Obradović

Faculty of Philosophy, University of Belgrade

SPEAKING THE SAME OR DIFFERENT
LANGUAGES: *ΟΜΟΓΛΩΤΤΟΙ*, *ΕΤΕΡΟΓΛΩΤΤΟΙ*,
AND *ΔΙΓΛΩΤΤΟΙ* IN STRABO'S *GEOGRAPHY*

ABSTRACT: This paper deals with geographer Strabo's interest in languages spoken by the different peoples living within the Roman Empire. Terms *ΟΜΟΓΛΩΤΤΟΙ* (speaking the same language), *ΕΤΕΡΟΓΛΩΤΤΟΙ* (speaking the other, i.e. foreign language) and *ΔΙΓΛΩΤΤΟΙ* (speaking two languages, bilingual) have been analysed in the context in which they appear in Strabo's *Geography*, as well as author's general attitude towards these problems and the meanings of homoglossia, heteroglossia and diglossia.

KEY WORDS: Strabo (1st C. A. D.), geography, ethnography, language, Greeks, Romans, barbarians

During the centuries of Roman domination, the Mediterranean world achieved political and cultural unity as never before or later in its history. Political unity of the world, which we for many reasons call Graeco-Roman, was brought by Roman legions. They conquered gradually and systematically, and most often cruelly and extremely ruthlessly, all countries, going from the Northwest to the Southeast, from Britain to the Euphrates, as well as the regions of North Africa from Syria and Egypt to the Pillars of Hercules and the Atlantic coast. On the other hand, along with this process of violent conquest, the process of Romanization and Hellenization went on in almost all provinces of the Empire. Unlike the political process which led to military and political domination of Rome, the process of Hellenization and Romanization can be generally looked upon as a cultural phenomenon. The scope of this phenomenon extended to numerous aspects of the ancient world. By adopting La-

tin or Greek culture and language (Greek mostly in the eastern half of the Empire, but Greek was the language of choice even in Rome), conquered natives did not automatically become Latins (Romans) or Greeks (Hellenes). Quite contrary, in that way they also reinforced their local patriotism and became aware of their own distinction. Although the Roman and Hellenic way of life was too attractive and could bring benefits, they often jealously kept their language, religious beliefs, myths, and a sense of mutual kinship.¹ Since the identity of ethnic groups is, to a large extent, based on a common language and a common language tradition, conquered peoples did not forget their own language, and in new political and cultural circumstances they insisted on it and kept it for centuries. There is no need to list here all the multiplicity of languages used in the Graeco-Roman world.² Although the Romans, for instance, encouraged the Hellenization and Romanization of Asia Minor through the hellenophone urban elites, it is not surprising that an old Anatolian language, namely Paleo-Phrygian, appeared again in the weakly urbanized countryside — largely on inscriptions and written in the Greek alphabet — as Neo-Phrygian in the first centuries AD. It survived centuries of darkness and there is sufficient evidence for the use of Phrygian (and also for some other local tongues) as everyday language to the end of the Roman principate.

A witness of the period in which the process of Hellenization and Romanization was in full swing, was certainly Strabo from Amaseia in Pontus, the author of the monumental *Geography* in 17 volumes, which gives a comprehensive description of Graeco-Roman world, as well as of the rest of the known world, around the beginning of the Principate. Written in the first decades of 1st

¹ These issues were thoroughly studied by our late Professor Fanula Papazoglu in several papers published in the journal *Glas* of the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts (*SANU*): О „хеленизацији” и „романизацији” / „hellénisation” et „romanisation”, *Глас СССХХ Српске академије наука и уметности, Одељење историјских наука*, књ. 2, Београд 1980, стр. 21—36 / *Glas CCCXX de l'Académie Serbe des Sciences et des Arts, Classe des Sciences historiques*, No 2, 1980, pp. 21—36 (in Serbian); Хеленизовани варвари у Страбоновој „Географији”, *Глас СССХХХИВ Српске академије наука и уметности, Одељење историјских наука*, књ. 4, Београд 1983, стр. 1—19 / *Les barbares hellénisés dans la Géographie de Strabon, Glas CCCXXXIV de l'Académie Serbe des Sciences et des Arts, Classe des Sciences historiques*, No 4, 1983, pp. 1—19 (in Serbian with a summary in French). And in this way I seize the opportunity to thank her for inspiring my thoughts and some conclusions presented in this paper.

² See generally R. D. Woodard (ed.), *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the World's Ancient Languages*, Cambridge University Press 2004, and the particular volumes in the paperback series: *The Ancient Languages of Europe*; *The Ancient Languages of Asia Minor*; *The Ancient Languages of Mesopotamia, Egypt, and Aksum*; *The Ancient Languages of Syria-Palestine and Arabia*, all published in 2008.

century AD, during the reign of emperors Augustus and Tiberius,³ Strabo's voluminous work is a true treasury of knowledge about various peoples, their customs, religion and religious practice, culture, and language. Merging knowledge and interests of a historian, geographer, and philosopher, Strabo gave a valuable contribution to our better understanding and knowledge of many peoples that once lived within the Roman Empire, but also on its outskirts. Quite naturally, the scholar from Amaseia has also shown interest for languages which some of these peoples and tribes spoke. Educated in Greek spirit, Strabo, as well as his great literary predecessors, from Homer onward, looked on all those tribes and peoples who did not speak or used Greek language, as barbarians. Strictly speaking, that statement could also be applied to the Romans. However, as a great admirer of Augustus and his politics, Strabo was aware of the fact that Roman power and domination affected many barbarian peoples, especially those in the West, in a good way and that Romanization, like Hellenization too, represents a change for better in terms of civilization. In that respect, as a good example, Strabo mentions the Gallic people Cavari, for whom he explicitly says that "they are no longer babarians (οὐ δὲ βαρβάρους ἔτι ὄντας), but are, for the most part, transformed to the type of the Romans, both in their speech and in their mode of living, and some of them in their civic life as well" (IV 1, 12).⁴ On the other hand, using only linguistic criteria, Strabo defines barbarians as speakers of a different language or in a different manner from that of the Greeks. In this way, Strabo listed as barbarians many peoples settled in the East, although a number of them, especially in Asia Minor, had even before, in the centuries that preceded Roman conquest, accepted partly the Greek language and Greek education.⁵

³ Strabo's *Geography* traditionally used to be dated to the Augustan period. See e.g. E. Honigmann, *RE* IVA 1, 1931, col. 90, s.v. Strabon (3); W. Aly, *Strabonis Geographica, Band 4: Strabon von Amaseia. Untersuchungen über Text, Aufbau und Quellen der Geographika*, Bonn 1957, pp. 396—397. It is not, however, possible to determine when Strabo started work on his *Geography*, but the text he left behind can be best dated to the first years of the reign of Emperor Tiberius, as recently indicated by S. Pothecary, Strabo, the Tiberian Author: Past, Presence and Silence in Strabo's *Geography*, *Mnemosyne* 55, 2002, 387—438.

⁴ See e.g. G. Woolf, *Becoming Roman: the Origins of Provincial Civilization in Gaul*, Cambridge 1998, pp. 52—3. In this paper I cite the Greek text of Strabo's *Geography* from Meineke's edition (*Strabonis Geographica* I—III, *Bibliotheca Teubneriana*, Berlin 1852—1853) and English from Jones' translation of Strabo in the Loeb Classical Library series (*Strabo: Geography*, vols. I—VIII, translated by H. L. Jones, Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1917—1932).

⁵ On Strabo's use of the word "barbaros" in the sense of "non-Greek", but also in the sense of "uncivilized", see e.g. P. Thollard, *Barbarie et civilization chez*

On the other hand, Strabo in his *Geography* shows considerable interest in languages spoken by the different peoples living within the Roman Empire. He knows well that the language is an important element of ethnic and cultural definition of every community and ethnic group. For Greeks, a common language was one of the most important characteristics of ethnic consciousness. Yet Herodotus in the famous passage attributed to the Athenians as a response to the Spartan embassy in 479 BC defined four characteristics common to all Greeks: blood, common language (*homoglosson*), common rituals and sanctuaries, and the same way of life.⁶ When they formed an ethnic group, the Greeks had a common proper name (Hellenes), they had a myth of common ancestry (descent from eponymous Hellen), they shared common customs and religion, and above all, they were *ΟΜΟΓΛΩΤΤΟΙ*, i.e. they had the same language, as one of the basic values that makes Hellenes what they were. Strabo follows this pattern throughout his *Geography*, but he also emphasizes linguistic distinctions and changes even among Hellenes, which could be explained by long periods of geographical isolation as in the case of the Athenians. Their heteroglossia Strabo associates with low fertility of the soil of Attica and their lack of intercourse with others, citing Thucydides as an authority on the subject, who finds that their country was exempt from devastation for long periods and that they were considered autochthonous.⁷ This, therefore, according to Strabo (VIII 1, 2), “was precisely the cause of their becoming different both in speech and in customs, albeit they were few in number” (τοῦτο τοίνυν αὐτὸ καὶ τοῦ ἑτερογλώττου καὶ τοῦ ἑτεροεθνοῦς αἴτιον ὑπῆρξε, καίπερ ὀλίγους οὖσιν).

As in the case of the Greeks, Strabo also provides important and interesting information on *homoglossia* and *heteroglossia* among the barbarian peoples. In some cases these comparisons of language-

Strabon. Étude critique des livres III et IV de la Géographie, Paris 1987; E. Almagor, Strabo's *Barbarophoni*: a Note, *SCI* 19, 2000, 133—38; D. Dueck, *Strabo of Amasia. A Greek Man of Letters in Augustan Rome*, London 2000, pp. 75—80; E. Almagor, Who is a Barbarian? The Barbarians in the Ethnological and Cultural Taxonomies of Strabo, in D. Dueck, H. Lindsay, S. Potheary (eds.), *Strabo's Cultural Geography: the Making of a Kolossourgia*, Cambridge 2005, pp. 42—55.

⁶ Hdt. VIII 144. On Greek ethnic identity see generally J. M. Hall, *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity*, Cambridge 1997; J. M. Hall, *Hellenicity: Between Ethnicity and Culture*, Chicago 2002, but also the important critical remarks made by E. G. Mitchell, C. Tuplin, R. Osborne, A. Snodgrass, G. Shepherd, A. J. Domínguez, and J. Boardman in *Ancient West and East* 4, 2005 [2006], pp. 409—459.

⁷ Cf. Thuc. I 2; II 36.

ges used by the barbarian peoples are quite obvious and expected, like, e.g. in the case of certain Italic peoples and cities in the neighborhood of the Romans. Thus in the description of Latium, he emphasizes relationship and propinquity of the people in language, customs, sacrifices, law. For the so-called Albani, i.e. the people from the old city of Alba Longa and the region around *Albanus mons* (the Alban Mount, Italian *Monte Cavo*), he specifically mentions that they are *homoglottoi* with the Romans. According to Strabo (V 3, 4), “at the outset the Albani lived in harmony with the Romans, since they spoke the same language and were Latini” (Ἰαλβανοὶ δὲ κατ’ ἀρχὰς μὲν ὁμιονοοῦν τοῖς Ῥωμαίοις ὁμόγλωττοι τε ὄντες καὶ Λατῖνοι). Alba Longa was the ancient city of Latium which, it is said, was founded by Ascanius, the son of Aeneas. In the 7th century BC (during the reign of the Roman king Tullus Hostilius) Rome prevailed in the region around Alban Hills (Italian *Colli Albani*) where the important temple of Iuppiter Latiaris was situated, and the city of Alba Longa was destroyed, and its inhabitants were transported to Rome where they gained Roman citizenship. When speaking of close relationship between the Romans and the Albani, Strabo must have been familiar with the stories that the founders of Rome and many distinguished Roman patrician families, and the *Iulii* in particular, traced their descent from Aeneas, Ascanius and Alba Longa.⁸

As well as similarities, Strabo is also good at detecting linguistic and other distinctions between Romans and non-Romans, between Romans and other Italic peoples, but also between Italics and e.g. ethnically remote Etruscans. He also recognizes cases where one city differs in language from the others in its vicinity. For the citizens of Falerii, the centre of the Faliscans in southern Etruria and northern neighbours of Veii, he mentions (V 2, 9) that they are not Etruscans, but a separate people (ἴδιον ἔθνος) and that they speak a distinct and special language (ἰδιόγλωσσοσ). The language of the Faliscans, attested in inscriptions dating from the sixth to the third centuries BC, shows close similarities with Latin language with which it formed the so-called Latino-Faliscan family of the Italic languages of ancient Italy.⁹ Furthermore, Strabo was obviously

⁸ See generally A. Alföldi, *Das frühe Rom und die Latiner*, Darmstadt 1977, 218—256.

⁹ In 241 BC, the Romans took Falerii Veteres and its inhabitants were transported to a new site, Falerii Novi. Cf. G. Uggeri, *DNP* 4, 1998, 400—402, s.v. Falerii (1)—(2); S. Radt, *Strabons Geographika*, Band VI. *Buch V—VIII: Kommentar*, Göttingen 2007, p. 50. On Faliscan and the Latino-Faliscan subgroup of Italic languages see e.g. G. Meiser, *DNP* 4, 1998, 402—403, s.v. Faliskisch.

familiar with ethnic and linguistic picture of the southern Italy and local peoples and tribes, who unlike the Latins did not have much relationship with the Romans. So he stated (VI 3, 11) for the Apuli in southern Italy, that they “are called by the special name of Apuli, although they speak the same language as the Daunii and the Peucetii (εἰσὶ δὲ ὁμόγλωττοι μὲν τοῖς Δαυνίοις καὶ Πευκετίοις), and do not differ from them in any other respect either, at the present time at least, although it is reasonable to suppose that in early times they differed and that this is the source of the three diverse names for them that are now prevalent”. In fact, the Apuli, after whom the region Apulia (modern *Puglia*) is named, were initially a separate people and Oscan-speakers and had only cultural similarities with their Daunian neighbours of the alleged Illyrian origins, but Strabo here evidently emphasizes a gradual disappearance of local languages and also a general erosion of ethnic consciousness and old tribal boundaries in Italy in the centuries under Roman rule.¹⁰

Somewhere Strabo recognizes linguistic differences between inhabitants of certain regions and between peoples who by their physique and lifestyle could appear similar to each other. So in the description of Transalpine Gaul and its various parts (IV 1, 1) he says that the Aquitani differ in appearance from other Gauls “not only in respect to their language but also in respect to their physique — more like the Iberians than the Galatae” (οὐ τῆ γλώττῃ μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς σώμασιν ἐμφερεῖς Ἴβηρσι μᾶλλον ἢ Γαλάταις). The Aquitani are clearly described as differing from the other Gauls/Celts in speech, customs, and physique. Strabo elsewhere (IV 2, 1—2) listed many small tribes settled in ancient Aquitania bounded by the Garonne river and the Pyrenees.¹¹ Although, according to Strabo (IV 1, 1), the rest of the inhabitants of Gallia Transalpina (Transalpine Gaul) are Galatic in appearance, they “do not all speak the same language, but some make slight variations in their languages” (ὁμογλόττους δ’ οὐ πάντας, ἀλλ’ ἐνίους μικρὸν παραλλάττοντας ταῖς γλώτταις). Strabo’s account of ethnic and linguistic image of Gaul is basically in line with what it has left Caesar in his *Gallic Wars*. The opening sentences of Caesar’s Commentaries of the *Bellum Gallicum* (I 1) are, no doubt, echoed in Strabo’s notion about the threefold division of Gaul. It may be said that Caesar’s

¹⁰ Cf. E. Olshausen, *DNP* 1, 1996, 922, s.v. Apuli, Apulia; K. Lomas, *OCD*³, 1996, 132, s.v. Apulia. See also on Calabria and Apulia in Strabo’s *Geography* in R. Laurence, Territory, Ethnonyms and Geography: the Construction of Identity in Roman Italy, in R. Laurence and J. Berry (eds.), *Cultural Identity in the Roman Empire*, London and New York 1998, pp. 101—102.

¹¹ Cf. E. Frezouls, *DNP* 1, 1996, 940, s.v. Aquitani.

Commentaries on the Gallic Wars was the central Strabo's source for Book IV on Gaul, Britain, and the Alps. For his part, Strabo was obviously fully aware of a great diversity of Celtic languages that were spoken not only in Gaul, but also in large areas of central and western Europe throughout the first millennium BC.

On the other hand, Strabo provides interesting information on *homoglossia* of Getae and Dacians who lived on the lower Danube both south and north of that river on the frontiers of the Graeco-Roman world. According to Strabo (VII 3, 13), the language of the Daci [Dacians] is the same as that of the Getae (ὁμόγλωττοι δ' εἰσὶν οἱ Δακοὶ τοῖς Γέταις). Among the Greeks, however, Strabo adds, "the Getae are better known because the migrations they make to either side of the Ister [the Danube] are continuous, and because they are intermingled with the Thracians and Mysians". Greeks seem to have used the names Getae and Dacians with some confusion, though Strabo in previous chapter (VII 3, 12) conjectured that from the early times the Dacians lived in the western parts of what was later the Roman province of Dacia, and the Getae in the eastern. There is, however, an obvious inconsistency in Strabo regarding the ethnicity and language of Getae and Dacians. In another passage (VII 3, 10) Strabo states that "Aelius Catus transplanted from the country on the far side of the Ister [the Danube] into Thrace fifty thousand persons from among the Getae, a tribe with the same tongue as the Thracians (ὁμογλώττου τοῖς Θραξίν ἔθνους). And they live there in Thrace now and are called Moesi" (καὶ νῦν οἰκοῦσιν αὐτόθι Μοισοὶ καλούμενοι). So the Dacians spoke the same language as the Getae and the Getae the same as the Thracians. And they are also the Moesi. It could be concluded that all peoples from Thrace to Dacia were *ΟΜΟΓΛΩΤΤΟΙ*, i.e. speak the same language, which is, of course, completely impossible. The use of sources from different periods can at best explain certain inconsistencies in Strabo's text. He had never visited these regions and relied in his conclusions on old Greek and Hellenistic tradition with lesser use of contemporary evidence. His account on the territories and tribes to the north of the Mount Haemus is therefore not quite reliable.¹²

¹² On Strabo's sources regarding the northern parts of the Balkan peninsula, see my paper "Strabo's testimonies on the territory of present-day Serbia", read at the Conference held in Sremska Mitrovica in November 2006 and published in K. Maricki Gadjanski (ed.), *Antika i savremeni svet. Zbornik radova / Antiquity and Modern World. Collection of Papers*, Belgrade 2007, pp. 212—227 (in Serbian, but with a considerable summary in English). On historic development of Dacia and the Dacians in general see now I. A. Oltan, *Dacia: Landscape, Colonisation and Romanisation*, New York 2007.

Similar problems with sources may also lie behind Strabo's only testimony on *diglossia* in the extant part of his *Geography*. He mentions the term *ΔΙΓΛΩΤΤΟΙ* (speaking two languages, bilingual) in an unexpected place, where he speaks about similarities in dress, customs, and language of the inhabitants of the north-western parts of Greece between Upper Macedonia and the island of Corfu. He emphasizes (VII 7, 8) that "some go so far as to call the whole of the country Macedonia, as far as Corcyra, at the same time stating as their reason that in tonsure, language, short cloak, and other things of the kind, the usage of the inhabitants are similar, although, they add, some speak both languages" (ἔνιοι δὲ καὶ σύμπασαν τὴν μέγροι Κορκύρας Μακεδονίαν προσαγορεύουσιν, αἰτιολογοῦντες ἅμα ὅτι καὶ κουρᾶ καὶ διαλέκτῳ καὶ χλαμύδι καὶ ἄλλοις τοιούτοις χρῶνται παραπλησίως· ἔνιοι δὲ καὶ δίγλωττοὶ εἰσι). That would mean that the Epirotic and the Upper Macedonian tribes who inhabited the area were closely related and that they probably shared the same languages. The question remains, which languages? The Greek language and a barbarian one? The Greek language and a local idiom? When ancient Greek authors before Strabo use the expression *ΔΙΓΛΩΤΤΟΙ*, as a rule they mean the usage of Greek and one non-Greek, barbarian language. Such is the case with, for example, Thucydides (IV 109, 4) who speaks about diglossia with the inhabitants of the so-called Akte peninsula (the Mount Athos peninsula), where local cities "are inhabited by a mixed population of barbarians, speaking Greek as well as their own language" (αἱ οἰκοῦνται ξυμμεικτοῖς ἔθνεσι βαρβάρων διγλώσσων).¹³ However, a state of diglossia may also reflect the spread of the *Koine* which was used along with some local dialects of Greek preserved well until the Roman period.¹⁴

Geographical isolation, on the contrary, could lead to a state of *heteroglossia*, as in the inhospitable area between the Caspian Sea and the Black Sea where the Caucasus Mountains dominates. Once again Strabo finds (XI 2, 16) the reasons for heteroglossia in non-blending of the population in the Black Sea region above Dio-

¹³ Cf. S. Hornblower, *A Commentary on Thucydides, Volume II, Books IV—V.25*, Oxford 1996, pp. 345—48 ad Thuc. IV 109.

¹⁴ I deal with this confusing issue in detail in another paper devoted to Strabo's information on Epirus and the Epirotes: "Barbarians or not: Epirus and Epirotes in Strabo" (forthcoming). On Epirus and Epirotic peoples in general see N.G.L. Hammond, *Epirus: the Geography, the Ancient Remains, the History and the Topography of Epirus and Adjacent Areas*, Oxford 1967; P. Cabanes, *L'Épire de la mort de Pyrrhos à la conquête romaine (272—167)*, Paris 1976. Cf. D. Strauch, *DNP* 3, 1997, 1066—1070, s.v. Epeiros.

scurias (later Sebastopolis, modern Sukhumi in Georgia/Abkhazia), where at least seventy tribes “speak different languages because of the fact that, by reason of their obstinacy and ferocity, they live in scattered groups and without intercourse with one another. The greater part of them are Sarmatae, but they are all Caucasii” (πάντα δὲ ἑτερόγλωττα διὰ τὸ σποράδιον καὶ ἀμίκτως οἰκεῖν ὑπὸ ἀνθαδείας καὶ ἀγριότητος· Σαρμάται δ’ εἰσὶν πλείους, πάντες δὲ Κανκασιοί).

When speaking of the Eastern part of the Roman Empire, Strabo shows a great interest in linguistic issues. He finds a clear example of the supposed *homoglossia* in Caunus, the city located on the border between Caria and Lycia. The Caunians are usually included among the Carians, but Strabo states (XIV 2, 3) that “it is said that they speak the same language as the Carians (φασὶ δ’ αὐτοὺς ὁμογλόττους εἶναι τοῖς Καρσίνοις), but that they come from Crete and follow usages of their own” (ἀφῖχθαι δ’ ἐκ Κρήτης καὶ χρῆσθαι νόμοις ἰδίοις).¹⁵ Another example of *homoglossia* Strabo finds in the eastern parts of Asia Minor in Cappadocia. As a native of Amaseia in Pontus who had travelled widely in Asia Minor, he must have been familiar with these regions. He knew well Cappadocia and its boundaries extended from the Taurus Mountains to the vicinity of the Euxine (Black Sea). Most Cappadocians were, according to Strabo (XII 1, 1), *ΟΜΟΓΛΩΤΤΟΙ*. However, the inhabitants of Cataonia were distinguished by the ancients from the other Cappadocians, as a different people. But Strabo, who visited Cataonia also, could observe no difference in manners or in language. Furthermore, he explicitly states (XII 1, 2) that “as compared with the other Cappadocians, there is no difference to be seen either in the language or in any other usages of the Cataonians” (οὔτε δ’ ἐκ τῆς διαλέκτου διαφορᾶς τινος ἐν τούτοις πρὸς τοὺς ἄλλους Καππάδοκας ἐμφαινομένης οὔτε ἐκ τῶν ἄλλων ἔθῶν). As well as the Cappadocians, the Armenians were also, Strabo notes (XI 14, 5), *ΟΜΟΓΛΩΤΤΟΙ*, i.e. spoke the same language: “Armenia, though a small country in earlier times, was enlarged by Artaxias and Zariadris, who formerly were generals of Antiochus the Great, but later reigned as kings and jointly enlarged their kingdoms by cutting off for themselves parts of the surrounding nations... and therefore they all speak the same language” (ὥστε πάντας ὁμογλόττους εἶναι).

Further in the East, Strabo speaks of similarity and *homoglossia* with peoples inhabiting the area of the Iranian plateau when he describes the Aryans, the Persians, the Medians, as well as those tri-

¹⁵ Cf. also Hdt. I 172 that Caunians may have been of Cretan origin.

bes settled in ancient Bactria and Sogdiana. He states (XV 2, 8) that “the name of Ariana [Areia] is further extended to a part of Persia and Media, as also to the Bactrians and Sogdians to the north; for these speak approximately the same language, with but slight variations” (εἰσὶ γὰρ πῶς καὶ ὁμόγλωττοι παρὰ μικρόν).¹⁶

To sum up, it should be emphasized that Strabo provides important and interesting information on many peoples and languages spoken all over the Roman Empire around the beginning of the Principate. He defined the language as an important element of ethnic and cultural determination of every people and tribe, Greek or Barbaric. In this regard, Strabo used with a high degree of accuracy terms *ΟΜΟΓΛΩΤΤΟΙ* (speaking the same language) when referring to close relationship and linguistic affinity of two or more peoples, tribes, ethnic groups, and *ΕΤΕΡΟΓΛΩΤΤΟΙ* (speaking the different language) when he wanted to emphasize distinction and substantial linguistic differences among them. Only in one place he also uses the term *ΔΙΓΛΩΤΤΟΙ* (speaking two languages, bilingual), talking about similarities in dress, customs, and language of the inhabitants of the north-western parts of Greece between Upper Macedonia and the island of Corfu. Understandably, Strabo shows great interest in the linguistic picture of, for instance, Asia Minor, but he is also familiar with similarities and differences in various languages once spoken in Italy, Gaul and other regions in the West. On the other hand, he shows a degree of uncertainty when talking about areas on the outskirts of the Graeco-Roman world, which he did not visit himself and about which enough evidence could not be found in his sources. Thus, he believes that, for example, the Dacians and the Getae are *ΟΜΟΓΛΩΤΤΟΙ*, and that numerous peoples, 70 of them in number, who were settled in the area of the Caucasus mountain above the Black Sea and Greek Dioscurias, were all *ΕΤΕΡΟΓΛΩΤΤΟΙ*. However, Strabo’s general knowledge about various languages was considerable, even though he did not know any other language well except Greek. Even modern scholars cannot object much to his views on language issues. In that respect, it can be said that Strabo in his monumental *Geography* depicted linguistic and ethnic diversity that existed within the Roman Empire better than any of his predecessors.

¹⁶ Cf. A. Kuhrt, *The Persian Empire. A Corpus of Sources from the Achaemenid Period*, New York 2007, 841 n. 1: “Strabo means here the Iranian plateau, whose name he takes from the province Areia. Note Darius’ definition of himself on several occasions as “an Aryan, of Aryan lineage”. On Aryans in general see e.g. R. Schmitt, *EncIr* 2, 1987, 684—687, s.v. Aryans = <http://www.iranica.com/articles/aryans>.

Мирко Обрадовић

ГОВОРЕЋИ ИСТИ ИЛИ РАЗЛИЧИТЕ ЈЕЗИКЕ: *ОМОΓΛΩΤΤΟΙ*,
ΕΤΕΡΟΓΛΩΤΤΟΙ И *ΔΙΓΛΩΤΤΟΙ* У СТРАБОНОВОЈ ГЕОГРАФИЈИ

Резиме

Медитерански свет је у епоси Римског царства постигао политичко и културно јединство какво није ни пре ни после забележено у његовој историји. Под римском влашћу одвијао се и жив процес романизације и хеленизације у различитим провинцијама Царства. За разлику од политичког процеса који је довео до војне и политичке доминације Рима, процес хеленизације и романизације може се посматрати, пре свега, као културни феномен. Усвајајући латински или грчки језик и културу (грчки понајвише у провинцијама на Истоку), покорени домороци нису аутоматски постајали Римљани или Хелени, већ су, напротив, често и на тај начин јачали своје локално родољубље и постајали свесни сопствене посебности. Како је језик један од основних и најјасније уочљивих елемената посебности сваког народа, домицилно становништво није заборавило свој језик, већ га је у новонасталим околностима љубоморно чувало и истицало. Сведок времена у коме је процес хеленизације и романизације био у пуном замаху је свакако Страбон из Амасије на Понту, аутор монументалне *Географије* у 17 књига, која даје опсежан приказ како грчко-римског тако и свег осталог познатог света негде на почетку Принципата. Страбонovo волуминозно дело права је ризница знања о различитим народима, њиховим обичајима, религији, култури, језику. Спајајући знања и интересовања једног историчара, географа, али и филозофа, Страбон је дао драгоцен допринос познавању различитих народа који су живели у оквиру Римске империје, али и на њеним ободима. Питања у вези са језицима којима су се служили поједини народи и племена морали су природно заинтересовати ученог писца из Амасије. Образован у грчком духу, Страбон као и његови књижевни узор, од Хомера на даље, на све оне народе и појединце који не говоре или се добро не служе грчким језиком гледа као на варваре. Строго узевши, та би се констатација морала применити и на Римљане. Међутим, као велики поштовалац Августове политике, Страбон је свестан чињенице да је римска власт на многе народе, нарочито оне на Западу, деловала благотворно и да романизација, као и хеленизација, представља промену на боље у цивилизацијском смислу. С друге стране, Страбон је у свом делу показао завидно знање и обавештеност када је реч о језицима који су говорени широм Римског царства.

За Хелене је заједнички језик био једна од најважнијих одредница етничке свести и самосвести и темељних вредности које чине Хелене да буду то што јесу. Сасвим је онда разумљиво да су Хелени *ОМОΓΛΩΤΤΟΙ*, то јест да говоре једним истим језиком, што је једно

од њихових најважнијих обележја. То ни за Страбона није спорно. Међутим, далеко су занимљивија она места у *Географији* где Страбон друге, варварске народе доводи у везу обележавајући их да су *ΟΜΟΓΛΩΤΤΟΙ*, то јест да говоре истим језиком, у случајевима када жели да нагласи језичко сродство два или више народа, племена, етничке групе, односно као *ΕΤΕΡΟΓΛΩΤΤΟΙ*, када хоће да истакне посебности и битне језичке разлике међу њима. Само на једном месту у *Географији* Страбон користи и појам *ΔΙΓΛΩΤΤΟΙ* за оне народе и племена која међусобно комуницирају на два језика, говорећи о сличностима у одевању, обичајима и језику код становника северозападних делова Грчке насељених између горњомакедонских племена и острва Коркире (Крфа). Велико знање и самопоуздање Страбон очекивано показује када, на пример, говори о језичкој слици Мале Азије, али су му, што је нарочито интересантно, добро познате и сличности или разлике у језику код народа у Италији, Галији и другим крајевима на Западу. Извесну несигурност разумљиво показује када говори о крајевима који су се налазили на ободима грчко-римског света, а које није сам посетио и о којима није могао пронаћи довољно података у својим изворима. Тако и говори да су, на пример, Гети и Дачани на простору око реке Дунава *ΟΜΟΓΛΩΤΤΟΙ*, односно да говоре једним истим језиком, а да су, с друге стране, бројни народи, њих више од седамдесет на броју, насељени на подручју око планине Кавказа изнад Црног мора и старе грчке насеобине Диоскурије (модерна Грузија и Абхазија), сви *ΕΤΕΡΟΓΛΩΤΤΟΙ*, то јест да говоре засебним језицима. И поред оваквих примера, усудићемо се ипак да кажемо да су Страбонова знања о различитим језицима коришћеним у старини била знатна, иако он сам није добро познавао и користио ниједан други језик изузев грчког. У том погледу му чак ни модерни научници не могу ставити много приговора. Ту Страбон може у великој мери да захвали својим изворима, али и неоспорној личној научној знатижељи, испитивању и интересовању које је доследно показивао према овим питањима. На тај начин нам је, можда боље него иједан други сачувани антички писац, дочарао језичко и етничко шаренило које је постојало у оквирима Римског царства.

