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PREFACE.

Transcriptions.

The following transcription system will be used.

From Greek.

\[ \alpha \beta \gamma \delta \varepsilon \zeta \theta \iota \kappa \lambda \mu \nu \xi \omicron \pi \rho \sigma \tau \upsilon \phi \chi \psi \omega \]

\[ \alpha \beta \gamma \delta \varepsilon \zeta \theta \iota \kappa \lambda \mu \nu \xi \omicron \pi \rho \sigma \tau \upsilon \phi \chi \psi \omega \]

From Russian.

\[ \alpha \beta \delta \varepsilon \chi \delta \et \zeta \iota \kappa \lambda \mu \nu \op \rho \sigma \tau \upsilon \phi \chi \psi \]

\[ \alpha \beta \delta \varepsilon \chi \delta \et \zeta \iota \kappa \lambda \mu \nu \op \rho \sigma \tau \upsilon \phi \chi \psi \]

\[ \mathfrak{t} \mathfrak{s} \mathfrak{c} \mathfrak{h} \mathfrak{s} \]

\[ \mathfrak{t} \mathfrak{s} \mathfrak{c} \mathfrak{h} \mathfrak{s} \]

From Chinese the Wade-Giles transcription system will be use.

From Ancient Near Eastern, Indian and Central Asian languages the transcription system used will not be consistent, but mirror that used in the edition or translation of the text being used or discussed at any particular point. Some of the diacritical marks used in transliteraring Indian languages have been dropped.

Exceptions to the above guide to translations are as follows:

1. When a name or word is part of a quotation from another scholar's translation or discussion.

2. When a name is too well known in one particular form to change, e.g. Aristotle, Alexander, Scythians.
3. Near-Eastern personal names commonly used in their Latinized forms will be given in Hellenized forms.

4. When discussing the use made of a particular tribal-name in a Latin text, the Latin form of the name will be used, even if the earlier Greek form is used elsewhere in the study.

Translations.

Unless otherwise stated, translations from Russian will be my own, from Greek and Latin will be from a Loeb edition of the text, from Chinese will be from Hulsewé and Loewe, *China in Central Asia*, 1979.

Use of previous theses.

Some material presented in the author's Masters Thesis, 'Two conceptions of the tribal-geography of the Royal Scythian Empire in classical literary tradition', 1981 (parts of chapters 2-4, 6-9 &11), has been used in this Doctoral thesis (parts of chapters 3-11). The material has, however, been so thoroughly reworked and supplemented, and used for such different purposes, that the whole of the Doctoral thesis can be considered original work. Where material presented in the present author's Honours thesis, 'Scythians on and south of the Danube from Idanthyrsos to Ateas', 1979, and Masters thesis (above) is of relevance to the Doctoral thesis but does not need major reworking, it has simply been cited.
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INTRODUCTION.

The Scythians were an idea. The ancient Iranian-speaking nomads of Eurasia (from the Carpathian mountains in the west to the T’ien Shan in the east) left no written texts of their own. They left instead a trail through the records of the sedentary societies with which they came into contact. These records are numerous, but scattered. The perspectives they offer range from Urartian, Assyrian and Babylonian, to Ionian, mainland Greek, Persian, Bosporan, Alexandrian, Seleukid, Baktrian, Parthian and Chinese. The forms in which records are extant range from maritime and overland itineraries, military surveys, geographies, histories, and treatises on natural science, medicine, philosophy and politics, to poems, romances, titulary epigrams, historical inscriptions, letters and prayers. It is through these diverse records that the ethnographic history of ancient Eurasia is to be approached. As the ethnography of the Maeotis-Caucasus region and Central Asia are often closely linked by literary tradition and historical circumstances, the primary concern of the present work has been taken to be those records of most relevance to the ethnography of the nomads dwelling between the Don and Crimean Bosphoros in the west and the T’ien Shan and Pamir mountains in the east, nomads who might for convenience be called ‘Eastern Scythians’. This work will not concern itself with those sources dealing with the so called ‘Royal Scythians’ of the Ukraine, Dobrudja and Crimea (e.g. most of Herodotos’ Book IV).

Western and Soviet scholars may be characterised as adopting fundamentally different approaches to the study of these nomads’ ethnographic history. The western scholars favour philological investigation, migration theories, and a perspective from the periphery, while the Soviet scholars favour archaeological investigation, theories of indigenous ethnogenesis, and the periodisation of nomad social, economic and cultural change. Western scholars rarely stop to reflect upon either their own methodology or that of the Soviets, while Soviet scholars often reflect upon their own methodology and criticise that of the Western scholars. More significant, however, than these methodological differences are the methodological similarities. Common to nearly all modern scholars writing in the field of Scythian studies, Western and Soviet, archaeologist, philologists and historians, are two tendencies.

The first tendency is one to equate the physical and the literary tribe. The Eurasian nomads whose material remains archaeologists classify into various cultures, and the tribal-names that ancient writers used so freely, are often directly equated. Though inhabiting two very different worlds the tribe of a particular place, time and culture and the tribe of a particular text are invariably identified with each other. This is not, of course, surprising. The name in the text
was meant to conjure in the ancient reader's mind a 'real' tribe, so should it not be the modern scholars task to identify this 'real' tribe's place, time and culture?

The second tendency is one to equate a tribe named in one text with a tribe named in a text from a different pen, period and provenance. The one 'real' tribe may have a different name in different languages, so two apparently different tribal names may be equated through their individual equation with the same certain 'real' tribe.

That such tendencies undermine the usefulness of any study of Eurasian ethnography would seem self-evident, but even the crudest results of such an approach to the subject go unnoticed by modern scholars. Most modern scholars indeed seem to feel obliged to equate a tribal name used in a hundred different ways by a hundred different Greek and Roman writers over a period of hundreds of years with the ancient culture of a particular mountain valley, or the modern-day population of a particular Soviet republic, to equate a tribal-name found in a 7th century B.C. Greek poem with one found in a 2nd century Chinese history, and to build ethnographic maps of Eurasia by taking Persian, Greek, Latin and Chinese names and either arranging them as if neighbours or combining them with hyphens as if single tribes.

Modern scholarship seems obsessed with questions of identification. 'Who were tribe X?'. 'Was tribe X of this text the same as tribe Y of that text?'. Such questions tend to produce equations which are neat and resemble definitions, but which are of dubious value. The ancient nomad was caught in a network of allegiances, and clans were constantly being compelled by the needs of husbandry, migration and war to make and break alliances. The nomad's own idea of what constituted his tribe was probably in constant flux. How accurate then can we expect an outsider's idea of what constituted a tribe, confederation or people to be, and how accurate the ideas penned at the desk of the ancient Greek, Babylonian or Chinese scholar? A nomad tribe can not be meaningfully treated as a discrete, unchanging unit, whose outline can be traced and name recorded.

The question from which the most intellectual satisfaction might be derived is this: 'How are the concepts behind the tribal-names which appear in the literary record related?' . The search for the most satisfying answer involves an investigation of the many ways the ancients used various geographic and ethnographic terms. As when reading a scholar's comments on another people we usually learn far more about the attitudes of the society that produced the scholar than we do about the other people, an investigation of the ways an ancient used various
geographic and ethnographic concepts. This in turn involves an investigation of a whole range of ever changing mythological, philosophical and scientific concepts.

As working out how geographic and ethnographic concepts concerning the north evolved depends chiefly upon interpretation of literary records, and as the literary records are often fragmentary, the task often expands into one of reconstructing lost works and tracing literary traditions. As the period with which this present work is concerned, the 7th to the 2nd century B.C., was a period in which the Greek, Persian and Chinese geographic horizons expanded very rapidly, tracing literary traditions often amounts to investigating the interreaction of preconceptions with information. The task of tracing traditions through such diverse material as that outlined above, of describing the interreaction of preconception and information in a period, when such interreaction was unceasing, and of modelling the relationship between the geographic and ethnographic concepts of ancients who leave but scattered clues as to their concepts, affords few opportunities to write in terms of 'the truth'. It is felt that the constant formulation of possibilities and weighing of probabilities is a more appropriate method of pursing and presenting research on this subject. The extremely fragmentary nature of the source material demands that the research proceed cautiously and conclusions be regarded as tentative, but does not demand a retreat to an imaginary line of 'facts'.

Though the history of Eurasian material culture may be viewed with the naked eye or through a camera, the history of the Scythian tribes can only be viewed through a kaleidoscope. Our image of the history of the tribes mentioned in the literary record takes its form more from that through which we are looking than at which we are looking, new information about the tribes refracting through the tinted fragments of literary and philosophical conception and traditions.

The main thesis advanced by this work is, then, that the ethnographic history of Eurasia which we see when looking at the ancient material remains of the region's nomads and which we see when looking through the ancient literature of the peripheral societies, are not views of the same scene. The simple superimposing of the two views does not produce the most meaningful ethnographic history of Eurasia. The present author does not see the ancient literary record having primacy in any way over the archaeological record, but if we are to use the literary record in our discussion of Eurasian ethnographic history then we need to investigate the above mentioned kaleidoscopic images and interreactions.

This thesis will be advanced and the task performed at two levels. The first level is that of structure. The work as a whole will be structured more around literary figures and historiographical problems than around cultural changes or historical episodes. The second level is that of argumentation. It will be argued that many ethnographic names and concepts cannot be explained simply in terms of a literary work accurately recording the ethnographic situation of the day and responding to its every change. They are often better explained in terms of new information interreacting with existing literary traditions.
CHAPTER 1.

HERODOTOS’ STORIES OF SCYTHIAN ORIGINS.

Introduction.

It is usual to begin a work on Scythians and Sauromatians with a discussion of Herodotos’ stories of Scythian origins. In this respect the present work will be unexceptional.

Philologists, historians, and archaeologists have, for centuries, taken Herodotos’ description of the tribes beyond the ‘Scythian rectangle’ to be a description of tribes encountered by an observer travelling eastward from the lower Don, though some scholars give the observer a more northerly route (into the forest zone), others a more southerly route (down to the Iaxartes), some terminate the trip in the Urals, others in the T’ien Shan or Altai Mountains. Modern-day scholars have unanimously taken Herodotos’ source to be Aristeas of Prokonnesos. None of this need occasion surprise. Herodotos does offer a description of the tribes as they stretch away beyond the Don, and though Herodotos clearly collected much information first hand (information which may have touched on lands beyond ‘the Scythian rectangle’) he cites Aristeas when discussing the tribes furthest east. Modern-day scholars have, however, not simply taken Aristeas to be Herodotos’ source, they have taken him to be the observer who travelled Herodotos’ route (or as the relater of a real observer’s tale). They have believed that a Greek of the late 7th century B.C. had first-hand knowledge of Central Asia, that this Greek’s ethnography and history of Central Asia is faithfully preserved in Herodotos’ *Histories*, and, by implication, that Herodotos’ ethnography of the lands beyond the Don is believed to be able to be reconciled with later Greek, Persian and Chinese records of Central Asian ethnography.

The steps from the extant record to the above beliefs and from there to the above implications are, however, taken on very unsound ground. Perhaps the most unsound piece of ground is that which would seem the soundest, the link between Herodotos’ and Aristeas’ ethnography. Not one modern scholar has questioned the faithfulness with which Herodotos used Aristeas’ poem. How correct was Herodotos in taking Aristeas’ poetic ethnography and history to be a description of Central Asian ethnography and history? The question is inseparable from that of Scythian origins.
Discussions of Scythian origins are usually either confident narratives of early Eurasian history or cautious reviews of the so-called 'Scythian problem'. No scholar seems willing to complicate matters by separating out the questions of the origins of a people, a culture and a term. Yet the problem of the origins of the Scythians has at least two dimensions to it. Firstly, how to understand the changes in the material culture of the steppes west of the Don, changes which in the 7th-6th centuries are usually conceived of as the result of 'Scythian' invasions across the Don? Secondly, how are we to understand the process by which the term 'Scythian' came to be associated by ancient and modern scholars alike with these cultural changes. Our discussion will focus on this second problem, and it will be argued that although modern scholars believe that Homer, Hesiod, Aristeas and Alkman all had some knowledge of north Pontic tribes, that Aristeas recorded the migrations of tribes from as far east as Central Asia, and that Herodotos actually misused Aristeas and transferred tribal-names and histories from a seventh century B.C. Caucasian context to a north Pontic and wider Eurasian context, that Aristeas never travelled to Central Asia and that the early poets knew only the Kimmerians and the Scythians in Asia Minor.

Herodotos' Targitaos story.

Herodotos' first story of Scythian origins (IV.5-10) is one he attributed to the Scythians themselves. Zeus begot of a daughter of the river Borysthenes a man, Targitaos, who had three sons, Lipozais, Arpoxais and Kolaxais, the first of whom fathered the Auchatai, the second the Katiaroi and Traspiai, and the third and youngest, the Paralatai tribe which alone succeeded to royal power. Though numerous scholars have investigated the mythological, religious and social significance of various elements in this story, found these same elements in pre-Scythian and Scythian art and artifacts and in Avestan and Caucasian texts,
and offered etymologies for the personal and tribal-names\(^1\), few have noted the presence in these stories of 7th century Transcaucasian elements\(^2\). Three of the four personal names and three of the four tribal names can be linked with early Transcaucasia and Asia Minor.

There is a phonetic and conceptual similarity between Herodotos' \(\text{Ταργαταος} \text{βομ} \text{οις} \text{Zeus}\) born of Zeus and the daughter of the river Borysthenes, and Diodoros' (II.iv.2-4) half fish Syrian Goddess \(\Delta \epsilon \rho \pi \varepsilon \tau \omega \)\(^3\). That the Syrian godhead is female and not male need not preclude a relationship between the two\(^4\). The version of the Targitaos story which has Herakles father the Scythian kings has their mother half woman, half snake, would seem to encourage seeing a relationship\(^5\). The key to the relationship might be the 7th century Scythian presence in Asia Minor, but though El’nitskij suggests the Scythians actually took the name and concept of the Syrian Goddess back to the Ukraine (where the form was taken by a nymph and the name by the hero son) where Herodotos then heard of it\(^6\), the present writer thinks it more probable that, though Herodotos may well have picked up the story in Olbia, it was carried there by Greeks from Asia Minor who were ready to see that with which they were familiar in that which they found new.

---


\(^3\) Ibid., p.65.

\(^4\) For a fuller discussion of this point see El’nitskij, 'Скифские легенды', 1970, p.65.

\(^5\) Her.IV.9.

The name of Targitaos' second son, Αρπαχσαδ, also has links with Asia Minor, and in particular with Scythian activity there in the 7th century. The name bears a great resemblance to one of the fathers of the world's races in Genesis I.x.22, Arpachshad⁷. In Judith I.13 Arpachshad appears in a different guise, the Median who was attacked and killed by Nebuchadnezzar of Assyria. Perhaps yet another guise is as Ktesias' Median leader Arbakes, who, after many set backs, overthrew the Assyrian Empire, destroyed Nineveh and its king, Sardanapalos, and founded the Median empire⁸.

Diodoros, citing Ktesias in II.xxxii.4-6, noted that Arbakes reigned for 28 years and was succeeded by his son Maudakes, who ruled for 50 years. This conjures up still further associations with Scythians, for Herodotos names a certain Madyes king of the Scythians and gives 28 years as the duration of Scythian domination of Asia⁹. Do these names and reign period, then, rightfully belong to Medes or to Scythians?

Besides Diodoros' account of late 7th century B.C. events in Mesopotamia, there are the accounts of Herodotos, the Babylonians and the Assyrians. Most scholars agree in reconciling these three accounts as follows. The main protagonists in the mid 7th century B.C. conflicts were the Assyrians of Ashurbanipal and the Scythians of Madyes, son of Partatua, on the one hand, and a confederacy of nomads (known variously as Umman-manda and Gimmeri) and a confederacy of rebel subjects, headed by the Median chieftain (known to the Assyrians as Khshathrita and to the Greeks as Phraortes). The Assyrians repelled the attack, killing Khshathrita and routing the Umman-mandas, but the real victors were the Scythians. For the next 28 years, probably together with their one time enemy, the

---

⁹ Her.I.103-107: Kyaxares, king of the Medes, had just gained the upper hand in his war with the Assyrians when 'There came down upon him a great army of Scythians, led by their king Madyes son of Protothyes. These had invaded Asia after they had driven the Cimmerians out of Europe: pursuing them in their flight the Scythians came to the Median country'. After giving an account in I.104-106 of the Scythians' route to Media, adventures in Syria, 28 year harsh rule over Asia and final overthrow, Herodotos concluded in I.107; 'Afterwards Cyaxerxes died after a reign of forty years (among which I count the years of Scythian domination). That Herodotos means here only Upper Asia, that the Scythian activity in Palestine could only have been a raid, not the great occupation many Biblical scholars imagine, and that there is little reason to see these raids behind Jeremiah's earliest prophecies (Jeremiah I.12-14; 4:6) has been argued cogently by Vaggione, 'Over all Asia?', 1973, pp.523-530.
Kimmerians, the Scythians ravaged most of Asia Minor. In 512 the Scythians with their Median subject Kyaxares, son of Phraortes, and Babylonian ally, Nabopolassar, dealt a final blow to Assyria and destroyed Nineveh. How might Diodoros' Ktesian account fit into the above reconstruction of events?

Ktesias' Median leaders, Maudakes and his son Arbakes, might well have been Herodotos' Scythian kings, Madyes, and his unnamed successor, to whom the glory of overthrowing the Assyrians must have gone. That Ktesias takes the Scythian leader who destroyed Nineveh to have been the founder of the Median Empire, may indicate the existence of a tradition inside Persia which confounded the abortive attempt of Kyaxerxes' father, Phraortes to take Nineveh, with the successful attempt of the Scythians Arbakes, to produce a Median conqueror of Nineveh, Arbakes.

The most curious element in Diodoros' story is the reference to how Arbakes on the eve of his onslaught on Nineveh had to win allegiance of a force which had arrived from Baktria to relieve the Assyrians. Who were these so called Baktrians? Though it is possible these newcomers were Saka, either from the Caucasus or Central Asia, a still stronger case can be made in favour of seeing the newcomers in the exact same terms as Ktesias' saw them, that is as Baktrians. It is possible that there was some form of Baktrian state in existence in the 7th century B.C. Though some scholars have argued that the most organised state in Central Asia in this period was that of the Khorasmians, the evidence upon which they


11 That Ktesias may have misused the names Arbakes and Maudakes can occasion no surprise, although Rawlinson may have gone too far when he wrote in his *The five Great Monarchies*, III, 1865, pp.173-4, 'The list of Median kings in Ctesias, so far as it differs from the list in Herodotus, seems to be a pure forgery- an extension of duplication... a transparent device, clumsily cloaked by the cheap expedient of a liberal invention of names' and suggested that of Ktesias' Median kings, Artykas, Artaios and Artynes are but modifications of the root artas, 'great', and that 'In his famous story of the joint conspiracy of Arbaces and Belesis he simply took the names of the satraps of Media and Assyria during the time of his own residence in Persia'. The name Belesys appears in some editions of Xenophon's, *Anabasis*, VII.8.25.

12 Diodoros Il.xxvi; 'there came a messenger with the news that a force which had been despatched from Bactriana to the king was near at hand, advancing with all speed. Arbaces, accordingly, decided to go to meet their generals by the shortest route, taking along the best and most agile of his troops, so that, in case they should be unable to persuade the Bactrians by arguments to join in the revolt, they might resort to arms to force them to share with them the same hopes'.

argue this thesis is slight\textsuperscript{14} and though care should be taken not to overestimate, as some Soviet scholarship tends to do, the extent to which Central Asia was organised in this period, there is some archaeological\textsuperscript{15} and literary\textsuperscript{16} evidence for a pre-Akhaemenid Baktian state. With respect Diodoros II.xxvi Gnoli goes perhaps too far when he suggests that:

'This piece of information not only shows the complete autonomy of the Bactrians at the end of the 7th century B.C., but also their declared hostility towards the growing power of the Medes, whose assertion they evidently feared'\textsuperscript{17}

The name Arpoxais may also lead discussion back to the Caucasus. As Christensen argued in 1917, central to both the personal name 'Arpoxais' and the geographical name 'Показ' is the sound 'Rpa'. That this may have designated not only a mountain range (in the Caucasus) but also a people is evident from Genesis I.x.12 where Japhet's son Gomer is said to have had three sons, Achkenaz, Riphat and Topherma. As the Achkenaz are associated in Jeremiah 51.27 with the northern kingdoms of Ararat and Minni\textsuperscript{18}, as Japhet is usually regarded in Hebrew tradition as the ancestor of northern and eastern peoples\textsuperscript{19}, and as 'Gomer' is clearly from 'Gimirri', the first wave of horsemen to come down from the Caucasus, and 'Achkenaz' is clearly from 'A/Iskhenaz', the second main wave, the

\textsuperscript{14} Tolstov, Древний Хорезм, 1951, pp. 20ff. & 341 and P'jankov, 'К вопросу о сфере влияния доакхеменидского Хорезма', 1963, p.175, 'Хорасмий Гекатей Мiletского', 1972, pp.3-21 interprete the Hekataian fragment in Athenaios II.70B as alluding to ancient Chorasmian control of Merv and Harat, but this is a very free interpretation of the fragment. Gershevitch, The Avestan Hymn to Mithra, 1959, pp.14-21, 296-299 argues the existence of a pre-Akhaemenid Chorasmian state on the basis of dubious allusions in the Avesta.


\textsuperscript{16} Apart from the Ktesian fragment here being discussed, there are several other allusions to a pre-Akhaemenid Baktian state. Xenophon, Kyropaedia, I.v.2 refers to Kyaxares war with the Baktrians. Herododos I.153 refers to Kyros' fear of Baktria. Xenophon, Kyropaedia, VI.i.3 and Ktesias (Photius XXII) refer to Kyros' war with Baktria. This literary testimony has lead the following scholars to speculate upon the existence of a pre-Akhaemenid Baktian state. Geiger, Ostiranische Kultur im Altertum, 1882, pp.62ff. and Civilization of the Ancient Iranians in Ancient Times, 1885, p.45; Prasek, Geschichte der Meder und Perser, I, 1906, pp.50-54; Bartold, 'К история персидского эпоса', 1915, pp.258f; I.M.D'jakonov, 'Исцеления Мидии', 1956, p.169 and 'Восточный Иран до Кыра', 1971, pp.122-154 and Gnoli, Zoraster, 1980, pp.91-127.

\textsuperscript{17} Gnoli, ibid, p.92.

\textsuperscript{18} Noted by Szemerényi, 'Four old Iranian names', 1980, p.7.

Riphat too may be supposed to be a mounted people from the Caucasus (the 't' being the Scythian plural ending)\(^{20}\).

The name of Targitaos' third son, \(Ko\alpha \xi 0\), bears a great resemblance to the twice mentioned Kolkhic Scythian tribe \(Ko\rho\alpha \xi 0\) and a lesser resemblance to two other Caucasian ethnonyms\(^{21}\), and itself recurs in two other arguably Kolkhic contexts. In his *Parthenion*, Alkman refers to four breeds of horses, the winged dream horse, the Enetic courser, the Iberian and the Kolaxian (\(Ko\alpha \xi 0\))\(^{22}\). The provenance of these breeds has never been clear. The Enetic has been variously thought to be a Venetic or Paphlagonian, the Iberian, Celtic or Lydian\(^{23}\), and the Kolaxian, a Scythian steppe pony\(^{24}\) or a Turcoman racer from Central Asia\(^{25}\). It is clear that Alkman took pleasure in dropping exotic names\(^{26}\), and thus scholars may be justified in looking for these breeds in distant lands. How likely, however, is a Greek poet of the 7th century to have heard of a breed of horses from the north Pontic steppes and Central Asia? He is much more likely to have heard them mentioned in the context of the 7th century Scythian invasion of Asia Minor, and their occupation of the Kolchis, an area of many 7th century horse-rich barrows\(^{27}\). Even if Alkman's source was Aristeas\(^{28}\), at least in providing the term which he then

\(^{20}\) Christensen, *Les types du premier homme et du premier roi*, 1917, p.138. This possibility is overlooked even by those scholars who note that the Hebrew Achkenaz designated Scythians. e.g. Wincler, 'Kimmerier, Asguzäer, Skythen', 1897, pp.484-496 and Szemerényi, 'Four old Iranian ethnic names', 1980, p.7.

\(^{21}\) \(Ko\rho\alpha \xi 0\) Skylax 77; \(Ko\alpha \xi 0\) Skylax 78; \(Ko\rho\alpha \xi\) river Ptolemy IV.14; *Colchchos* Mela I.96; *Colchi* Mela I.108; *Colicace* Mela I.110; *Coraxici* Mela I.110, Hec. F210; Hell. F70; Aristotle, *Met.* I.13; Hipp. fr.3; Hesychius s.v. See also Devereux, 'The Kolaxaian horse of Alkman's Partheneion', 1965, p.184 and El'nitskij (unaware of Devereux's useful work) 'Скифские легенды', 1970, p.66.

\(^{22}\) Alkman, *Parthenion*, 49, 51 and 59.


\(^{24}\) Page, *ibid.* p.99.


\(^{26}\) As Devereux observes, *ibid.*, p.176. Bowra, *Greek Lyric Poetry, From Alcman to Simonides*, 1961, p.28, suggests 'Alcman introduces the adjective so naturally that it must have been familiar to his audience, and may have come from some recent and popular work'. The two need not, however, go together. Though he may have drawn the term from a recent, even popular, work, it need not have been expected that the audience be familiar with this particular detail.

\(^{27}\) Devereux, 'The Kolaxaian horse', 1965, p.185.

\(^{28}\) Bowra, *Greek Lyric Poetry*, 1961, p.27; Devereux, *ibid.*, p.183; West, 'Alcmanica', 1965, p.193- who notes Alkman's use of two other terms which may well be Aristeian, Essedones (fr.156) and Rhiphean (fr.90).
associated with horses, it cannot be assumed that this locates the breed further north or east, for Aristeas' travels may arguably have been in the Caucasus.

Valerius Flaccus, the late 1st century A.D. Roman poet, who composed an Argonautica, explicitly associated a Scythian leader Colaxes, born of Jupiter and a river, with the Colchis, this chief leading his Scythians to fight for Perses, against his brother, the Colchian King, Aeetes, and the Argonauts whose aid he had temporarily enlisted. Though Rostovtzeff believed Flaccus wove together a number of notices, some drawn from literature, others from memory, and fantasy, and though Dumézil and others believed Flaccus was merely recalling Herodotos, Grantovskij believed Flaccus to be totally independent of Herodotos, and did not treat the divergences from Herodotos as minor. It is clear that the material demands a more critical approach than that evident, for example, in the work of Petrov and Makarevich. These scholars argue that 'The existence of Scythian genealogical tradition in the 1st century B.C. is evidenced in the writing of Diodoros and in the 1st century A.D. in the writing of Valerius Flaccus', as if these writers heard the legends from Scythians they had met in their own day and did not draw upon literary sources.

29 Wight Duff, A literary history of Rome in the Silver Age, 1964 (1968), p.352 writes 'Much of the fighting against Perses and his catalogued allies in Book VI is wearisome'. This catalogue (Vi.40-90) is, however, extremely interesting from the point of view of the many Iranian and Caucasian tribal and personal names preserved in it. Thus the catalogue presents first the Alani and Heniochi, secondly 'Bisalta's legion and Colaxes its chief, himself too of the seed of gods, begotten by Jupiter in Scythian land by green Myrace and the mouths of Tibisis, enchanted, if the tale is worthy of belief, by a nymph's half human body nor afraid of her twin snakes', thirdly 'Auchus comes with thousands of like heart and displays the riches of Cimmeria', then Datis with 'the Martial Gangaridae and they whom draughts of Gems' wave make fierce and they who ring round the lake of Byce', and many other tribes, such as the men from the Hyrcanian forest, Coelalatae, and the degenerate Sindi.

30 Rostovtzeff, Skythien und der Bosporus, 1931, pp.53-57.


32 Grantovskij, Индо-иранские касты и斯基фов, 1960, pp.5ff. For example, Flaccus' Tissagetae may be the transcription of Tissagetai, an earlier form of Herodotos' Thyssagetai, and Flaccus' description of a serpent-legged goddess is closer to the archaeological image of the goddess and the motif in Diodoros' account, than Herodotos' description.

33 Petrov & Makarevich, Скифская генеалогическая легенда, 1963, p.11.
It is to Raevskij's credit that he argued that Diodoros and Flaccus evidenced no more than the existence of a pre-Herodotian literary version of the legend. Unfortunately, Raevskij does not consider himself familiar enough with early Greek historiography to attempt an investigation of Diodoros' source (noting only that 'Compared with other versions of the legend this material requires substantial reconstruction, but its informational value is beyond doubt') and of Flaccus' source, beyond recommending Aristeas as the source for Flaccus' Kolaxais reference and believing Aristeas the only possible source for the word in Alkman. The Aristean suggestion has much to recommend it, particularly as Flaccus' description of Aketes' land contains such non-Herodotian concepts as a Scythia in Rhipaiian lands, and such non-Herodotian terms as the Aukhus and Heniokhoi. Though it cannot be argued that Aristeas must have been the source of all these concepts and terms, the postulate that Aristeas' poem was set in the 7th century Caucasus, which he called the Rhipaians and that he mentioned such tribes as the Heniokhoi, Kimmeroi and Skythai and such leaders as Aukhus and Kolaxais, would seem to satisfy most of the demands of the Hekataian, Herodotian and Valerian material.

Each of Targitaos' sons is said to have fathered a tribe. Curiously, however, these tribes play no role in Herodotos' narrative. The following investigation will raise the suspicion that the reason for this was that Herodotos had taken these tribal names from a source

35 Raevskij, ibid, 1982 p.39. Raevskij's major contribution is in the use of Scythian wares to reconstruct Scythian mythology.
36 Flaccus VI.33-40, '...come tell of the wild deed thou didst see in that Riphaean land, of the mighty endeavour wherewith Perses drove Scythia to battle, and of the horses and men wherein he puts his trust.'
37 On the Heniokhoi see discussion in Chapter 2.
which was not speaking of Scythians to the north of the Euxine, as Herodotos and nearly all modern scholars believe, but in Transcaucasia.

The names of the first sons' tribe, the Αὐχαταί, and the first of the second son's two tribes, Κατόμαροι, bears a close resemblance to the names of two tribes Pliny mentions in his catalogue of 'Scythian' tribes beyond the Syr-Daria, the Euchatae and Cotieri. This resemblance was noted as early as 1855 by Neumann, who suggested the legend of Targitaos and his three sons actually originated in northern Central Asia. In 1866 Müllenhoff made one other suggestion. As the two other tribes in Pliny's catalogue, the Rumnici and Astacae/Astocae appear in Ptolemy VI.xiv.10 as 'Ρυμμοί' and Ασταταί on the Volga and in the Urals, he suggested that the Euchatae and Cotieri of this same catalogue should be located in this same region. Müllenhoff reinforces his orientation of Pliny's catalogue towards the Urals by noting that he also mentions the Palai's annihilation of the Napaei (VI.50), and by seeing in this conflict the separation of that group which Herodotos calls the detached Royal Scythians and seems to locate between the Volga and the southern Urals.

Pliny's use of such names as Euchatae/Auchatae are not however, consistent. Pliny also refers to Auchetae in the Hypanis region, the same area in which Herodotos clearly believed the Auchetae to live, and in his catalogue of tribes near to the Maeotis and Caucasus (VI.22), Pliny writes of how the Inapaei and Tanaitae were defeated by the three

---

38 See Harmatta, *Quellenstudien zu den Skythika des Herodot*, 1941; Plezia, *Hekataios über die Völker am Nordrand des skythischen Schwarze Meer Gebietes*, 1959-1960, pp.27-42, esp. p.39 where it is argued that Pliny's record of a victory (to be dealt with later) of the Auchetae and others over the Tanaitae and Napaei took place on the lower Don, and the Auchetae then moved further west to the lower Bug where Hekataios mentions them, and where they were in turn annihilated by the Neuroi. Kothe uses the names in a description of the two staged Scythian expansion into the north Pontic lands. At the end of the 7th, beginning of the 6th century, one group, calling themselves Aukhetai, penetrated as far as the Carpathian basin where they mixed with the indigenous Thracians; then late in the 6th century the Basileioi expanded into the Pontic lands, and one group, calling themselves Agathyrsai, even penetrated into the old Auchetai lands in the Carpathians. Kothe, 'Pseudokythen', 1967, pp.61-80 and 'Der Skythenbegriff bei Herodot', 1969, pp.15-88.

39 Pliny VI.50.


41 Müllenhoff, *Deutsche Altertumskunde*, 1866, III, p.23.


43 Pliny IV.88.
Scythian tribes, the Auchetae, Atherni and Asampatae. How then can Herodotos' reference to Aukhatai and Katiarai in the Ukraine (and indeed Pliny's own reference to Auchetae in the Ukraine) be reconciled with Pliny's mention of Euchatae and Cotieri in Central Asia and Auchatai near the Maeotis or Caucasus, and how can Pliny's reference to the Napae's annihilation in Central Asia be reconciled with his reference to the annihilation of this same tribe, here Inapaei, nearer the Maeotis or Caucasus?

The above question was first pondered by the Polish scholar Plezia. In 1959-63 she suggested Pliny's conflict between the Auchetae and others and the Tanaitae and Napaei took place on the lower Don, the victorious Auchetae then moving westward to the lower Bug, where Hekataatos mentioned them and where they were in turn wiped out by a new wave of tribes. Though an unsatisfactory model of events, Plezia's model was endorsed in 1977 by Skrzhinskaja, apparently unaware of the intervening work of El'nitskij and Pekkanen.

In 1961 and 1970 El'nitskij, noting that Pliny's cited source for his Central Asian catalogue was Demodamos, the Seleukid general, and believing him a reliable first-hand witness, decided the ethnonyms' original context was Central Asia, that they were carried to the Caucasus with 8th and 7th century migrations, and that they were transferred from there to the north Pontos by Herodotos.

In 1973 Pekkanen also favoured an originally Central Asian context and Demodamos as the source. He noted that the Auchetae are included among the Napaei's conquerors in Pliny VI.22, and further concluded that they 'belong to the group of the Spalaei, Palaei, Pali, who were regarded as descendants of Palus, son of Scythes. The Auchatae-Spalaei, as we may call them, represented the eastern most branch of the Royal Scythians, and the memory of their victory over the Napaei was still alive when Demodamas wrote his history.'

---

45 Skrzhinskaja, Северное Причерноморье, 1977, p.49.
Though there is clearly, as Pekkanen notes, a link between the Achatae and the Cotieri set of names and the Napae and Palae set, there remain numerous problems with both of the above solutions. Firstly, it is unlikely that Demodamos was completely ignorant of ancient geographical literature and faithfully recorded only those tribal-names he heard from the tribes themselves. Secondly, even if Demodamos had been interviewing tribes, it is extremely unlikely that he, a reporter of the 3rd century B.C., should be able to glean from locals a story about a tribe which left the region four hundred years earlier to go to the Caucasus.

A more satisfying model might be the following. The tribes and tribal conflict entered Greek literature in the context of 7th century Transcaucasion history. In Pliny’s catalogue (VI.22) the ‘Tanaitae’ were destroyed along with the Inapaei. Though this may be an allusion to a tribe on the Don or Syr-Darya, which were called Tanais from the 5th and 4th century respectively, it is also possible that it is an allusion to a tribe on the Phasis or Araxes, the combination of which in the 7th century constituted an imaginary continental boundary, to which the word Tanais may have had its original application. Jacoby, in his commentary to Hekataios fr 195, described the stages in the evolution of the conception of such an intercontinental boundary as follows: (i) it is the Kolkhian Phasis of the Argonautic legend, leading into the Ocean, (ii) it is moved north to the Hypanis and the Kimmerian Bosphorus (called by some the ‘Tanais’), and (iii) it is moved still further north to the Don, which is then called the ‘Tanais’48. In 1962, however, Bolton, pointed out that the only ancient author to call the/a Hypanis the boundary is Cornelius Gallus and his testimony carries little weight. Bolton preferred to think of ‘Phasis’ as originally being the name of the mythical strait which joined the Pontos and Ocean, subsequently being identified as the Don (‘Tanais’) and only much later being applied to the small Rhion river49. Though Bolton might with reason dismiss Jacoby’s second stage of a Hypanis boundary, there seems little sense in turning the model around, so that the designation of the Rhion as the Phasis was a late, not an early development. It is more conceivable that the small Rhion was called Phasis at an early stage, when the Greeks knew few other distant watercourses, than later and it might more easily have assumed the stature of a continental boundary earlier than later, when there would have been no reason for it to acquire a name which carried the connotation of a continental boundary. In 1975, P’jankov, came up with the most sensible explanation to date50. In his Genealogia, dealing as he was with mythology,

Hekataios used the Rhion-Phasis as the boundary, but in his *Periegesis*, a later geographical work, he used the Don-Tanais. This explanation improves upon Jacoby in dispensing with the Hypanis boundary, while maintaining Jacoby’s emphasis on an horizon expanding outwards from the Caucasus.

The only problem with finding a Trans-Caucasian context for the conflict Pliny records between the Palae and Napae, is that names very similar to the first of these names are to be found in Crimean contexts. Thus Strabo wrote of a 2nd century B.C. Crimean Scythian king called Palakes and a Crimean Scythian city called Palakikon. Names similar to Palae and Napae are also to be found in non-specified contexts. Thus Diodoros refers to a mythical Scythian ‘Palus’ and Stephanos mentions a people the Napitai. These references might be reconciled with Pliny’s reference (VI.50) to the Palai’s annihilation of the Napae in Central Asia by supposing that the Palai’s annihilation of the Napai took place in Trans-Caucasia, as argued above, but tale of the annihilation was carried by the Scythians back over the Caucasus in the 6th century, and the name Palus then became associated with the Scythians in the Ukraine and later in the Crimea, and tale of the annihilation was given, on account of the confusion geographical outlined above, a Central Asian context by one of Pliny’s sources, or source’s sources.

The name of the third son’s tribe, Paralatai, bears a great similarity to the sobriquet of the Avestan hero Khoshana, ‘Paradata’. That this is not a meaningless coincidence was first argued by El’nitskiij. Medieval Arab genealogy made the biblical Arpakshad an ancestor of the Avestan hero Khoshan. This may have been based on a very ancient association, and would suggest a close relationship between Herodotos’ Scythian genealogical tree and the Arab-Hebrew one. In the former Arpakshad’s brother fathers the Paralatai tribe (which assumed royal power). In the later Arpakshad himself fathers the hero Paradata.

The Scythian-Kimmerian War.

---

52 On the persistence of oral epic traditions among the Scythians and their occasional detection in Greek literary sources see Lelekov and Raevskij, ‘Скифский рассказ городца’ 1976, pp.68-78.
54 El’nitskiij, *ibid*. 
It is now to Herodotos' two 'historical' stories of Scythian origins that attention may turn. In IV.11 Herodotos offers a story, attributed to no particular source but favoured by him personally, in which:

'the nomad Scythians inhabiting Asia, being hard pressed in war by the Massagetae, fled across the Araxes to the Cimmerian country...'

and in IV.13 he attributes to the poet Aristeas of Prokonessos the claim that;

'the Issedones were expelled by the Arimaspians, the Scythians pushed by the Issedones, and the Cimmerians, dwelling by the southern sea, were hard pressed by the Scythians and left their country'.

It is to the dominoing in these two stories that Herodotos referred in several other sections of his history. Nearly every modern scholar has pictured this dominoing of tribes as originating somewhere in Central Asia, with the Araxes river being variously identified with the Oxos, Iaxartes and Volga, and terminating in the Kimmerian homeland, the north Pontic steppes. As a corollary they have pictured Aristeas travelling in the early 7th century from somewhere on the north Pontic coast across Eurasia to a region variously identified as Central Asia, the Urals, between the Urals and the Altai mountains, the Altai mountains and the T'ien Shan.

Though the debate over the detail of the above pictures has been scholarly, involved, and often ingenious, several very important questions have been almost entirely overlooked. How much, leaving aside interpretation of the above passages, would the Greeks seem to have known of the regions north of the Pontos and east of the Volga in the 7th century B.C.? How strong are the grounds for believing Aristeas travelled the length of Eurasia?

55 Her. I.15 & 103 and IV.1.
56 See Rawlinson, Herodotos, Essay IX in Appendix to Book I; Godley's note to the Loeb ed. of Her.I.202; Baschmakoff, Cinquante siécle d'évolution ethnique autour de la Mer Noire, 1937, p.104 (Iaxartes); Minns, Greeks and Scythians, 1913, p.44 (Volga); P'jankov, 'MaccareTti repoaoTa' 1975, pp.65-66.
How strong are the grounds for identifying 8th century B.C. north Pontic culture as Kimmerian? How are the numerous allusions in the above and associated stories to 7th century Caucasian history to be explained? What was this 'southern sea' by which the Kimmerians were said to dwell in Her.IV.13? These six questions might now be discussed in turn.

On the question of the Greek geographical horizon in the 7th century B.C. it ought be noted that in the 7th century B.C. the Greeks had no colonies on the north Pontic coast and had only just started to settle the south coast, being drawn, as the Argonauts had been, into contact with the flourishing Kolkhian kingdom. Were Aristeas' work, as interpreted by Herodotos, to be left out of the picture then it would seem that behind this Kolkhian kingdom the Greek geographical horizon fell away sharply. The Caucasus was the end of the world and the Caspian was conceived of only as part of the encircling ocean which was linked to the Pontos by a water course, sometimes conceived of as a strait called the Tanais, sometimes as the combination of two rivers, the Phasis and Araxes. Indeed, though scholars have for over a century believed the north Pontic steppes fell inside the geographical horizon of Homer and Hesiod, there is no evidence to substantiate this belief.

Homer's 'milk drinking Hippomolgoi and most just Abioi' do not demanča home on the north Pontic steppes. Poseidonios, taking his orientation from the first people mentioned in Homer's tribal catalogue, the Mysoi, interpretes Homer as referring subsequently to Thracians. A still more satisfactory identification might be the Kimmerians, to whom Homer refers by name in Odysseus XI.14-19, and with whom Strabo appears to believe Homer was familiar. There is, moreover, no need to look to the north Pontic steppes for Homer's Kimmerians when Kimmerians were probably raiding the kingdoms of eastern Anatolia throughout Homer's lifetime.

63 For an overview of the scholarly support for this notion see Lindegger, Peripheren Tibet, I, 1979, pp.78-132.
64 Homer, Iliad XIII.4-5.
65 Strabo VII.iii.3. See also Reinhardt, Poseidonios, 1921, p.77.
67 As, for example, Sulimirski did in 'Scythian Antiquities in Western Asia', 1954, p.284.
Similarly, Hesiod's *Galaktophagoi* and *Skythai hippomolgoi* do not demand a home on the north Pontic steppes, for although Hesiod linked Homer's tribes with the Skythai, it is possible that by Skythai he meant those in Asia Minor. It is indeed the Kimmerians in Phrygia, Lydia and Ionia which are subjects of the poetical works of Hesiod's near contemporary, Kallinos.

On the question of Aristeas' travels, it ought be noted that though Herodotos and all subsequent commentators have suggested Aristeas set out on his travels from the north Pontic coast, it is quite conceivable that Aristeas actually set out from the south Pontic coast. Trans Caucasia may have been the area through which Aristeas had travelled, the northern Caucasus may have been the high mountain range inhabited by a goat footed race which barred his way, and the Caspian may have been the 'ocean' down to which the country of the Hyperboreans was said to run. Indeed though Herodotos may have erred in starting Aristeas off on the north Pontic coast he does seem to have preserved something of the original orientation of Aristeas' poem when he introduces Aristeas immediately after giving an account of the Scythian entry over the Caucasus into Asia Minor in pursuit of the Kimmerians (Her.IV.12-13).

On the question of the identification of 8th century B.C. north Pontic culture as Kimmerian, it ought be noted that though most scholars have taken, and continue to take,

---

68 Strabo VII.iii.9 quotes from Hesiod's *Ges Periodos* apparently through the fourth book of Ephoros' history; 'Phineus is carried by the Storm winds to the land of the Galactopaghi, who have their dwellings in wagons'. Cf. Merkelbach & West, *Fragmenta Hesiodica* 1967, fr.151 & p.157.
69 Strabo, VII.iii.7, quotes Hesiod through Eratosthenes; 'The Ethiopians, the Ligurians, and also the Scythians, Hippemolgi'.
71 In 1935 Meuli, 'Scythica', pp.121-176, used Aristeas as evidence of the penetration of Scythian shamanism into the Greek world, and in 1962 Bolton, *Aristeas of Proconessus*, mapped out a route for Aristeas from the north Pontic coast to the Altai mountains. Bolton's work was endorsed by P'jankov, in his review of the work in 1967, pp.172-179. Though Meuli's linking of Aristeas' poem with Scythian shamanism was challenged by Dowden, 'Deux notes sur les scythes et les arimaspes', pp.486-492, the Pontos-Ural orientation of Aristeas' trip has not once been challenged.
72 Her.IV.13.
this identification for granted, there are numerous difficulties with the identification. Problems with the identification were first detected more than one hundred years ago, and in more recent years some Soviet scholars have convincingly argued that the Kimmerians who are recorded as being active in Asia Minor had nothing to do with the north Pontic coast, that the toponyms Herodotos offers as proof of a former Kimmerian presence in the Crimea are more likely to have their origin in Greek imagination than in Kimmerian occupation, that there was little difference, if any, between the Kimmerian and the Scythian culture, that the major change in north Pontic culture occurred in the 10th century, too early to correspond with the departure of the Kimmerians, that in the 8th century the north Pontic culture bore no resemblance to that of the Kimmerians in the

73 Rostovtzeff, *Iranians and Greeks*, 1922, pp.37-38 tried to reconcile Herodotos' location of Kimmerians first in the Ukraine then in Asia Minor with the awkward suggestion that the Kimmerians overextended themselves with raids into Urartu and the Scythians were then able to split their kingdom in two and destroy first the Ukrainian then the Transcaucasian wing. Harmatta, 'Le problème cimmérien', 1946-8, pp.79-132, reviewed in detail the work of such scholars as Reinecke, Parvan, Nestor, Rostovtzeff, Hančar, Sulimirski, Gallus, Harváth, Holste, Portratz, Haloun, Herrmann, De Groot and Wiesner, these scholars' various identifications of the Kimmerians (with Thracians, Celts, Caucasians, Germans and Iranians), their definitions of the Kimmerian territory (then often referred to as the 'Thraco-Cimmerian' or 'pre-scythian' sphere), and usually conceived of as stretching from the Carpathians to the Caucasus, but often further west to Hungary and further east to the T'ien Shan), and their timetables for Kimmerian movements. The belief in a north Pontic Kimmerian homeland has in fact been so strong that Haloun, 'Zur Üe-tsi-Frage', 1937, p.318, n.1, not only felt the Kimmerians could be linked on phonetic grounds with the Hsien-yün of early Chinese texts and inscriptions, but mapped out a Kimmerian migration from the north Pontic steppes eastward to the 'Tarim Basin. This thesis was soundly rejected by Karlgren, 'Some weapons and tools of the Yin dynasty', 1945, p.142n., Harmatta, 'Le problème cimmérien', 1948, p.97 and Prüsek, *Chinese statelets and the northern Barbarians*, 1971, pp.10-15. More recently Kothe, 'Die Herkunft der kimerischen Reiter', 1963, pp.5-37, presented an elaborate argument for tracing the Getai, Gimirri, Massagetai and Yüeh-chih all back to the Kimmerians of the north Pontic coast. Even the leading Soviet archaeologist Ternozhkin, *Киммериды*, 1970, pp.296-301, followed Herodotos uncritically in speaking of a north Pontic 8th century Kimmerian homeland.

74 Cuno, *Die Skythen*, 1971, pp.249ff.; Müllenhoff, *Deutsche Altertumskunde*, III B, 1893, pp.19ff.; Hennig, *Die Geographie des Homerischen Epos*, 1932, pp.77ff, and most recently by Lang, *The Peoples of the Hills*, 1971, p.167; 'The theory that the Cimmerians can be associated with the Catacomb culture of the eastern Ukraine and the Don basin, distinguished by pit graves, runs up against the difficulty that these people were expelled from their homeland in the second half of the second millenium B.C. If these were the Kimmerians, they must have had an intermediate home near the Caucasus until the late eighth century B.C.'

Caucasus and Asia Minor, and that the arrival of the Scythians on the north Pontic steppes in the 6th century was not a return, as Herodotos suggested, but a first appearance. Even if some of those who were called Kimmerians in the 7th century were descendants of emigrants from the north Pontic lands, that initial emigration must have occurred three or four centuries earlier. There are grounds, therefore, for hesitating before following Herodotos in calling the early Pontic steppe dwellers by the same name as the later century Asia Minor nomads.

On the question of allusions to 7th century Caucasian history in Herodotos' version of Aristeas' story, it ought be noted that the 7th century Caucasus was in fact a highly appropriate setting for the migrations Herodotos describes. In the second half of the 8th century the two great powers of Asia Minor were the kingdom of Urartu, with its capital at Tushpa on the shores of Lake Van and Assyria, with its capital at Nineveh. Between 745-735 Tiglath-pilser III (c.745-27) of Assyria won northern Syria back from Sarduri II (c.764-35) of Urartu. The next Urartian king, Rusa I (c.735-14) sought to reestablish his kingdom's power by expanding in the opposite direction- north into Transcaucasia and south east into the land of the Manni around lake Urmia. Sargon II (721-705), though having to deal with the rising power of Media on his eastern frontier, clearly conceived of Urartu and its several allies as the main threat to his realm. In 714 he undertook his famous and very successful eighth campaign. Much of his success may be attributed to his timing. Just before invading Urartu Sargon received intelligence through his son Sennacherib that the Urartians had suffered a massive defeat in the north of his kingdom at


the hands of 'Gimirrai'⁸¹. This is one of the first appearance in ancient literature of a name related in form to 'Kimmerians'. Rusa's successor, Argishti II (714-c.685) held the Urartian kingdom together despite further defeats at the hands of the Kimmerians, perhaps resulting in temporary tribute payments, and despite the pressure Sargon maintained on Urartian allies⁸².

By the turn of the century the nomads had clearly also become an Assyrian problem. The nomads had forced their way around the western flank of the Urartian kingdom⁸³. Though there is no record of how Sennacherib (705-681) fared on his northern frontier, his successor, Esarhaddon (668-669), felt very threatened by various confederations of Kimmerians, Manni, Medes and Urartians, and even considered marrying his daughter to Bartatua, king of the Ashkuza⁸⁴. This is the first appearance in ancient literature of a word

---


⁸² Olmstead, History of Assyria, 1923 (1960), p.364; Burney and Lang, ibid, pp.158-160; Frankel, ibid, p.15.


related in form to 'Scythians'. The Ashkuza and Gimirrai continued to be mentioned in Assyrian records of the 7th century, though often the single term Gamir or Umman-Manda seems to be used for either or both groups. Even after the fall of Nineveh in 612 to the Babylonians, Medes and Scythians, the Assyrian names survived in bilingual and trilingual texts of the Persian Empire.

No commentator has failed to note the close correspondence between the Assyrian record as outlined above and Herodotos' account (IV.12) of how the Kimmerians, fleeing from the Scythians, crossed the Caucasus;

'by the way of the coast, and the Scythians pursued with the Caucasus on their right till where they came into the Median land, turning inland on their way'

and (I.103) how, while Kyaxares was besieging the Assyrians;

'there came down upon him a great army of Scythians, led by their king Madyes, son of Protothyes'.

Soviet scholars have not, however, yet agreed upon the exact routes the Kimmerians and Scythians took to reach Transcaucasia. The Kimmerians have been variously thought to

---

85 For speculation upon the derivation of Skythai/Ašguzai/Iskuzai from an old IE work *skeud, to shoot, see Szemerényi, 'Iranica', 1951, pp.212-216. It has even been suggested that the ancient name for the Black Sea, the ΠΟΥΤΟΣ ἈΖΕΝΟΣ, 'the inhospitable sea', was a misinterpretation of the 'Sea of the Ashkenaz (the Hebrew form of Ashkuza), a form echoed in ΞΥΒΙΚΟΣ ΠΟΥΤΟΣ of Theocrit. XVI.99. Smolin 'К вопросу о названии Черного моря в древности', 1916, p.90, cited in El' nitskij, 'Северочерноморские заметки', 1950, p.195. This theory has, however, been soundly rejected by El' nitskij, ibid., p.195. The Greek ἈΖΕΝΟΣ was probably a misrepresentation of the old Persian 'akhsaena' dark'. See Vasmer, Die Iranier in Südrußland, 1923, p.20 and El' nitskij, ibid., p.176.


reach the south Pontic coast by ship\textsuperscript{89}, by a coastal road through the Kolkhis\textsuperscript{90} and the inland Darial pass\textsuperscript{91}. The Scythians have been variously thought to have taken the Darial pass and to have established a temporary kingdom in the central Caucasus, to the east of the Kolkhis and north of the upper Kyra (where most Scythian graves are to be found)\textsuperscript{92}, and to have taken the more easterly Derbent pass on the Caspian coast and to have established themselves temporarily in the south west of modern Azerbaijan on the lower Kyra (where the Sacasene of Strabo and Arrian might be located)\textsuperscript{93}, before moving further south into the lands of the Mannai (where the Ziwi\v{y}e Sakiz treasure was found)\textsuperscript{94}. The above possibilities have been combined to make numerous, often very complex, models of events\textsuperscript{95}.

By any model of events it is probable that in the early 7th century B.C. the Kimmerians and their new client Urartu were separated from the Scythians on the Kyra by the Armenian

\textsuperscript{89} Lavrov, 'О пути вторжения киммерийцев в южную Азию', 1965, pp.223-5.


\textsuperscript{91} Lehmann-Haupt, 'Киммерия', 1921, p.399; Piotrovskij, 'L'invasion des Scythes en Asie Antérieuse', 1929, p.476.

\textsuperscript{92} Pogarebova, 'Памятники斯基фской культуры в Закавказье', 1981, pp.42-58 and English summary, p.179.


\textsuperscript{95} For example, Krupnov, 'О походах斯基фов через Кавказ', 1954, pp.192-194, has the Kimmerians take the Maiotian-Kolkhian road and the Scythians four roads, the Kolkhian, Maramson, Darial and Derbent.
river, known universally to the ancients as the Araxes. It is clearly the Scythians' crossing of this river, an development of utmost significance to Kimmerians, Urartians, Assyrians and Medians, which Herodotos was recording in his account of the Scythian migration, even though he himself thought he was recording a migration into the north Pontic steppes. Herodotos simply reversed the original order of events and placed the Kimmerian and Scythian crossing into Transcaucasia after, when it should have been before, their migration across the Araxes. The suspicion that word of the nomad's crossing of the Caucasian Araxes had reached the 7th century Asia Minor Greeks is strengthened upon several considerations.

Firstly, there are strong indications that the Araxes featured prominently in pre-Herodotean geographies - possibly even, in conjunction with the Phasis, as the boundary between Europe and Asia. Thus, having scoffed at those who draw a perfectly circular world surrounded by Ocean (perhaps alluding above all to Hekataios), Herodotos goes on to describe Asia in terms of having a centre stretching north from Persia to the Kolkhians 'whose country reaches to the northern sea into which issues the river Phasis' (IV.37), of two peninsulas to the west of Persia, the first of which (Anatolia) begins at the Phasis (IV.38), and an eastern tract bound on the north 'by the Caspian Sea, and the river Araxes, that flows towards the Sun's rising' (IV.40). To have both the Phasis and Araxes serve as an effective continental boundary in a work which attempts to avoid continental divisions, suggests that they were both very well known to Herodotos, his contemporaries, and possibly such predecessors as Hekataios. Herodotos did not, however, always use 'Araxes' in the sense of a continental boundary. P'jankov defines three ways in which Herodotos used the term. The first is for a large river comparable with the Ister, with islands comparable in size to Lesbos (i.e. with a delta) and abundant in fish. The second is for the river which separated the Massagetae from the Persians. The third is for a small river with its source in the land of the Matienai, flowing east into a swamp and the Caspian, and serving, along with the Phasis, as the border between Europe and Asia. P'jankov identifies these rivers with the Volga, Amu Darya and Aras respectively, and Herodotos' sources as Olbian traders, the Persians and Hekataios respectively. He further argues that Herodotos and Diodoros were using Araxes in the first sense when writing of the Scythians crossing the Araxes.

97 Ibid., pp.65-6.
P'jankov's first and second usages are, however, both satisfied by identifying the river with the Oxos, a large deltering river which separated the Persians from the Massagetai, and it is clear that in IV.11, when speaking of the Scythians attacking the Kimmerians across the Araxes, Herodotos has confused two rivers he believed to both flow into the Caspian, the easterly flowing Armenian river the Aras and the westerly flowing central Asian river the Oxos. The three usages can, therefore, be reduced to one vague concept- a major river flowing into the Caspian, and it was across this river Herodotos knew the Scythians attacked the Kimmerians.

Secondly, the Caucasian Araxes served for a century as the Urartian Kingdom's main northern frontier. The Urartians had built a string of forts along its valley, and its overrrunning was bound to have been heard of around the ancient Near-East.

Thirdly, though most scholars seem not to have noticed, there is a discrepancy in the way 'Asia' is used in Herodotos' two 'historical' stories. In IV.11 Scythians inhabiting Asia, being pressed by Massagetai, fled into the Kimmerian territory. In the second, the Scythians, pressed by the Issedonoi, drove the Kimmerians into Asia. This could be explained with the suggestion that the Scythians came from Central Asia, crossed a Volga-Araxes, then crossed the boundary between Europe and Asia, the Don, then drove the Kimmerians from their European homeland, back across the Don into Asia, and then across the Caucasus. This is not, however, as satisfying an explanation as the following. Herodotos mixed two popular definitions of the continental boundary- the Don-Tanais and the Phasis, linked with the Kyra or Araxes. Though Herodotos did not place much importance upon continental boundaries, his predecessors did. Thus in IV.11 Herodotos may only have been referring to Scythians living in Asia so as to distinguish them from the Scythians who later came to live in the Ukraine, not because his source specifically said they crossed into Europe to attack the Kimmerians. Herodotos' source, possibly Hekataios, may have been working with a Tanais continental boundary and referred to Scythians in the north Caucasus, or may have been working with a Phasis boundary and referred to the Scythians in the north Caucasus and not said Asia. In IV.12 the source was probably working with a Phasis-Araxes boundary, and the Kimmerians' flight into Asia was across the Phasis, and the Scythian pursuit was across the Araxes.

Conclusion.
Discussion may now turn to the mechanism by which the names, description and even histories of tribes originally associated with the 8th or 7th century Transcaucasia came to be associated in later classical writings with areas near the Don, the Volga, Amu-Darya and Syr-Darya. The possible avenues by which these names may have found their way into Greek literary tradition are numerous: through early maritime contact with the Kolkhian kingdom, adventures inland from Kolkhis, 8th century commercial contact with the Assyrian kingdom, and 6th and 5th century contact with the Babylonians, Medes and Persians. The possible avenues by which a few of these names found their way into Hebrew tradition are perhaps fewer: the Babylonians, Persians and returning exiles. Herodotos himself, however, when relating his stories of Scythian origins names various sources, Scythians (IV.7 & 8), the Greeks who dwell in the Pontos (IV.8), Greeks and barbarians (IV.9) and Aristeas of Prokonnesos (IV.13). Besides these sources, he was undoubtedly also drawing heavily on the work of Hekataios of Miletos. Aristeas, it has been argued, may not have traversed Eurasia but Transcaucasia. Herodotos came to reorientate Aristeas' events as a result of the rapid expansion of the Greek geographical horizon in the intervening years. As the Greek horizon expanded so the concept of a Tanais river flowing from a giant Rhipaian mountain range and dividing Europe from Asia, fell back from the Phasis-Araxes in the Caucasus (detected in the Arimaspia of Aristeas and the Genealogika of Hekataios) to the Don without an accompanying ficticious mountain range (in Aiskhylos' plays'), to the Iaxartes and the Hindu-Kush (in the work of Aristotle and the Alexander Historians). Herodotos alone was reluctant to identify either a continent-
dividing water course or a great northern mountain range, but his geography included allusions to both. He had the Phasis behave like a continental boundary, confused the Central Asian Oxos and the Armenian Araxes and had the most distant people he knew of, the Arimaspians, dwell at the foot of a great mountain range.
CHAPTER 2

HERODOTOS' NON-SCYTHIAN TRIBES.

Introduction

From the Kimmerians and Scythians, discussion may now turn to the names of several other tribes which Herodotos located east of the Don, but which may arguably have been drawn from a 7th century Caucasian context: the Melangkhlainoi, Gelonoi, Boudinoi, Issedones, and the Sauromatai.

Melangkhlainoi

In IV.20 Herodotos located to the east of the river Gerros and to the west of the Maiotis the Basileioi Skythai, and 'Above the Royal Scythians to the north dwell the Blackcloak (ΜΕΛΑΧΛΑΙΟΙ), who are of another and not a Scythian stock; and beyond the Blackcloaks the land is all marshes and uninhabited by men, so far as we know'. This would seem to place, and has always been interpreted as placing, the tribe somewhere in the Ukraine. Yet Ps-Skylax's treatise calls the Melangkhlainoi a Caucasian tribe, and Stephanos Byzantios lists them as a Scythian tribe mentioned in Hekataios' *Europe*1. This was enough for El'nitskij to conclude in 1961 that they were originally a Caucasian Scythian people2. Yet was this Hekataios' conception? Was 'Scythians' Hekataios' or Stephanos' designation, and did Hekataios locate the tribe in Asia (as Skylax does) or in Europe (as Stephanos said Hekataios did)? It is difficult to answer these questions with any certainty. The suspicion that the tribe was originally associated with the Caucasus is, however, strengthened by the following considerations. Firstly, the male Tapyroi of Strabo XI.xi.8, a Caucasian tribe, are said to wear black clothes (ΜΕΛΑΝΕΛΟΜΟΕΣ)3. Secondly, the river Gerros, to the north east of which the Melangkhlainoi are said to dwell, has long defied identification with any Ukrainian river, but its apparent absence from the Ukrainian steppes may be explained by a transferrence from the Caucasus where Ptolemy

---

1 Ps Skylax, *Asia*, 79; Steph.Byz. s.v. ΜΕΛΑΧΛΑΙΟΙ.
3 Thus, the Georgian scholar Gaglojti, in his work АЛАНЫ И ВОПРОСЫ, 1966, pp.236-7, located Herodotos' Black-coated Scythians just to the north of the Kolkhis, in the territory of the Abkhazi.
located both the river 'Γέρρος' and the tribe 'Γέρροι'. Thirdly, the Melangkh lainoi are also associated with the Kolhhis in Pliny VI.5, Ps Arrian's *Periplous* 44, and Ptolemy V.viii.17-20. Fourthly, it can not be entirely coincidental that the Greeks knew of a southern Caucasian tribe called the 'Saudaratai', the Iranian equivalent ('sau', black, 'dar', wearer) of the Greek Melangkh lainoi. Fifthly, Herodotos says that beyond the Melangkh lainoi the land is all marshes. This has lead modern scholars to believe Herodotos conceived of the land in the northern Ukraine as marshy, even though it never was. A better explanation of Herodotos association of the tribe with marshes, was that the Greeks and Persians alike tended to conceive of the Maiotis, Caspian and Aral as one single marsh, and Herodotos' source may have conceived of the Melangkh lainoi as living south of this marsh, that is, in the Caucasus.

The Gelonoi and Boudinoi.

The Gelonoi and Boudinoi follow the Melangkh lainoi in Herodotos' catalogue (VI.102, 107-9) of the Kings of non-Scythian tribes meeting to consider the Persian threat. Yet though always mentioning the Gelonoi and Boudinoi together, treating their origin as one problem, Herodotos does not actually locate either of them. Modern commentators on Herodotos, noting the frequent association of these tribes with the Sauromatai, have invariably located them just to the east of the lower Don, and several Soviet archaeologists have even gone so far as to claim to have found the site of the wooden city Gelonos. Yet Ps Skylax, *Asia* 80 located the Gelonoi in the Caucasus, and Strabo (XI.ii.19) and Ps Arrian's *Periplous* 56 located a tribe *θειρόφαγοι* and *θειρότροφοι* in this same region. Though these terms might be translated as 'lice eaters', a better translation might be 'fir-cone eaters'. As Beljaev has argued, the eating of the fruit of fir and oak trees was very common in the Caucasus, and it is probably

5 Abaev, *Геродотовские*. 1981, p.75. Pisani's transliteration of 'Saudaratae', in his article *'Sauromatae, Saudaratae'* 1951, as 'Sau', grey + 'darata', skin/fur = 'grey-haired', referring to their horses, has little to recommend it.
6 Her.IV.102, 107-9, 119 & 136.
7 See the review of Soviet opinion in Skrzhinskaja, *Северное Причерноморье*, 1977, p.51. Shramko, *'Некоторые итоги раскопок белского городища и гелени-бугинская проблема'* 1975, pp.84-5, for example, identifies the town with a collection of fortifications in the region of Poltava near the village of Belok.
to this custom that the above terms are referring. Thus, though Herodotos may suggest his φείροντας άνθρωπος "fir cone eating" Boudinoi dwelt east of the Don (IV.109), he may have taken his notice on the Boudinoi from a source actually referring to the Caucasus.

It is, moreover, tempting to see in the wooden town of the Gelonoi settlement of the Μοσύνακοι, whose name means 'those living in wooden houses or fortifications' and whom numerous ancient writers, Herodotos included, located in the south Caucasian region. Burney and Lang have moreover noted the use of wooden stilt-houses in the present day Armenian province of Guria. The characterisation of the Gelonoi as half-Greek half-Scythian would definitely suit a people in the Kolkhian region where Greeks had conducted commerce for centuries prior to Hekataios and Herodotos, much better than it would a people on the Don, where contacts were only just beginning in the 5th century.

The Issedones.

The Ισσεδόνες are mentioned by Herodotos both in the catalogue of migrating tribes in IV.13 and in the description of the Massagetai land in I.201 as 'across the Araxes and over against the Issedones'. Believing the origin of the migrations to be Central Asia, and locating the Massagetai just south of the Iaxartes, modern scholars have for over one hundred years located the Issedonoi somewhere to the north of the Iaxartes, anywhere from the Urals to the T'ien Shan. The suspicion has already been raised that the catalogue of migrating tribes was drawn from an originally Caucasian context. The suspicion might now be raised that the description of the Massagetai land is also contaminated by an element drawn from a 7th century B.C. Caucasian context. This element is the name of the river on which they dwelt, the Araxes. Why did Herodotos mention the Issedonians here in Book I when they are only properly introduced in IV.13 & 26. The reason may be that

8 Beljaev, 'К вопросу о толковании и этнической принадлежности древнегреческого ethonima φείροντας άνθρωπος', 1964, pp.130-136.
9 See, for example, Herodotos' list of Persian subjects, III.94, Dionysios' Perigesis 761ff (both dependent on Hekataios) and Xenophon, Anabasis V.4.
10 Burney and Lang, The peoples of the hills, 1971, p.249.
11 περη του Αράξεω ποταμού, αντίον δε Ισσεδόνων ἀνδρῶν.
Herododotos' own reference to the Araxes prompted him to mention another famous tribe he knew to have been associated with this river. Unfortunately, Herodotos used 'Ἀράξης Ἐνδῖς inconsistently and confused the Armenian Araxes, by which the Issedonians dwelt, with the Central Asian Oxos, by which the Massagetai dwelt. The two tribes accordingly ended up beside each other.

That the confusion suggested above was indeed at play in Her.I.202 is suggested by the description of the Araxes in I.202, firstly forming a delta through rich country, an allusion to the Khorasian mouth of the Oxos, and then as flowing from the country of the Matieni, who feature in Herodotos' description of the old Ionian map in IV.37-40, and appear to have been associated with Hekataios' Phasis-Araxes continental boundary. The confusion was clearly aided by the fact that Herodotos had no concept of a separate Aral Sea and thought the Oxos entered the Caspian, into which the Armenian Araxes flowed. It is possible then, that Herodotos only associated the Issedones with the Massagetai out of a confusion of the Araxes and the Oxos, and that his source had in fact located the Issedones on the Transcaucasian Araxes.

The above suspicion is strengthened still further when it is noted that in Stephanos' entry on Issedonians, the 7th century poet Alkman is said to have known of the tribe, calling them 'Ἐκείνοι νασομα', and there is said to be an Issedonian city. It was probably to a city dwelling Caucasian people that Alkman was alluding.

Besides Herodotos' work, there is only one extant work which seems to clearly link the Issedones with Central Asia, and that is the geography of Ptolemy. Ptolemy VI.16.7 locates an 'Ἰσσείδον καὶ Ἐνδίς somewhere in the Tarim Basin. Though Ptolemy's work at this point might be based on the itinerary of a Central Asian traveller, such as Maes Titianus, for several reasons it is difficult to readily accept this location. If a Tarim Basin town of the 1st century B.C. or A.D. was called by locals 'Ἰσσείδον καὶ Ἐνδίς then we must believe that Alkman was referring to this very distant town in the 7th century B.C. and that the town's and people's name hardly changed in six centuries. Moreover, the Araxes by which Herodotos locates the Issedones may be the Oxos or Jaxartes, but could not possibly have been the Tarim river. It is possible that Maes had simply applied a name of the penultimate people in the early Greek catalogues for the penultimate people in his own.

13 Contrary to Bolton, Aristeas of Proconnesus, 1962, p.112.
The Urartian Inscriptions.

In arguing a case for tracing back to a 7th century Transcaucasian context many of the tribal names associated by Herodotos, many subsequent classical writers and virtually all modern scholars, with regions west of the Don, east of the Volga or north of the Iaxartes, the present author has sought to break away from the late 5th century Greek view of the world. By way of the fragmentary records of Hekataios, Aristeas, the Assyrians and Babylonians, the present author has sought to approach more closely the 7th century view of the north, and Transcaucasia in particular. These views are, however, essentially ones from the outside. The often overlooked inscriptions of the Urartian kingdom\(^{14}\), which prior to the Kimmerian invasion at the end of the 8th century extended far to the north of the Araxes river, and which had extensive dealings with Caucasian tribes\(^{15}\), may provide a view from the inside. These inscriptions offer an opportunity for speculation upon the origin of the Greek concepts of Scythian ethnography.

The 8th century opened with King Menua of Urartu (810-785) campaigning on his northwestern frontier against the Kingdom of the Diauekhi, from which he was able to extract a tribute of gold and silver\(^{16}\). Menua may not, however, have been able to subjugate the kingdom completely for his son, Argishti I (785-760) spoke of his war against the Diauekhi and the tribute he extracted\(^{17}\). The most probable location of this kingdom is the

---

\(^{14}\) Unlike the cuneiform inscriptions of Assyria, Babylonia and Persia, the Vannic inscriptions have received little scholarly attention. For editions of the relevant texts see Sayce’s series of articles ‘The cuneiform inscriptions of Van’, 1882-1906; Nikol’skij, Клинообразные надписи ванских Царей, 1893, Клинообразные надписи Закавказья, 1896, Lehmann-Haupt, Corpus inscriptionum chaldicarum, 1928 (1935); Tsertheli, Die neuen chaldischen Inschriften König Sadurs von Urartu, 1928; Matt & Orbéli, Археологическая экспедиция в Ван, and Урартские памятники Мукаея Грузии, 1939; Melikishvili, Урартские клинообразные надписи, 1960.

\(^{15}\) For the two discussions of those texts related to Transcaucasia see Ushakov, К походам урартцев в Закавказье, 1946, pp.32-33; Burney and Lang, Peoples of the Hills, 1971, pp.136-7.


\(^{17}\) Ushakov, ibid, p.33; Burney and Lang, ibid, p.137 and Barnett, ibid, p.344.
Pontic end of the southern Caucasus, where Xenophon located the Ταοξοι. Indeed, that Xenophon took his name from an early literary work is evident from his placing of the tribe between the Khalybians and the Phasians—people mentioned in all early Periploi. Xenophon, however, reorientates the old catalogue. Instead of stretching the tribes up the east Pontic coast to the Rhion, he stretched the tribes inland to the Araxes. Xenophon’s confusion of the Phasis and Araxes further suggests that he was supplementing personal experience with the use of any early literary source.

Menua’s campaigns in this region clearly meant crossing the Araxes river. It is no surprise then to discover that Argishti I founded several major fortresses in the Araxes valley and that the valley was ruled by Urartians till the Kimmerian invasion. These conquests opened up a new northern horizon, and heralded in a new series of northern campaigns. It is to these we may now turn.

Lines 33-40 of Argishti’s tomb monument might be translated as follows:

33. Argishti says: and those kings
34. who were allies of Diaukhi, I overcame,
35. I seized the country of Lusha, the country of Katarza,
36. the country of Eriakhi, the country of Gultyakhi,
37. the country of Bitserukhi
38. I extracted booty from the country of Apuuni. From the King of the country of Lush,
39. from these countries I left, but I made the king of the country Igani my vassal,
40. and settled the place (Lusha) and he (the king of the Igani) furnished Argishti with tribute...

The catalogue of Lusha, Katarza, Bitserukhi and Igani recurs in numerous inscriptions of the reign of Argishti and that of his son Sarduris. Who were these new peoples beyond the Diaukhi?

18 Xenophon, Anabasis IV.iv.18, vi.5, vii.1-2, V.v.17. According to Stophanos’ entry under Ταοξοι, this people were also mentioned in the Anabasis of a certain Sophainetos. For a similar tribal-name, see the Armenian ‘Tauk’. Melikishvili, Դասակու, 1950, pp.26-42, argues that the Diaukhi were the leaders of a confederacy which included fragments of Hurrians and Hittites and which lasted from about the 12th to the 8th century B.C.
20 Sayce 41; CICH 112, B1, Tabl.26dd (4); Melikishvili 128 B 1 (p.234-5). All translations from Urartian will be my own, but based upon the transliterations and translations offered by Sayce and Melikishvili.
At some time in the reign of Sarduris the pair 'Lusha' and 'Katarza' seem to be replaced by 'Kulka'. In 'Kulka' it is easy to see the kingdom known to the Greeks as the Kolkhis. Argishti's catalogue of tribes would accordingly appear to have a north-westerly orientation, and it is even possible that the tribes are enumerated in the order in which they were contacted on a march in a north-westerly direction. One further question might now be asked. What relationship, if any, does this catalogue bear to Greek catalogues of tribes in the Caucasus and elsewhere?

The probable correspondences of Diauekhi with the Greek ἔξις, and Kulka with the Greek Κόλκης, have already been noted. The possibility that Caucasian ethnonyms 'Katarza', 'Bitserukhi', and 'Igani' might similarly have equivalents in Greek texts has been suggested by a Soviet scholar, Ushakov, but as his arguments were present in 1946 they are immediately suspect. His arguments cannot, however, be dismissed simply because they must have proved politically convenient at the time. Though his identification of the Igani with the Greek Heniokhoi is tenuous in the extreme two of his identifications do deserve consideration.

'Bitserukhi' does resemble to some degree the Greek Βυζηρες, the name of a tribe listed by Dionysios among Caucasian tribes and referred to by Stephanos as a Pontic people. Judging from the reference to the Διζηρες in Stephanos' entry under Βυζηρες, Hekataios would seem to have mentioned this people as the neighbours of the Χοί. The city of the Χοί, Χοιράδες, Hekataios in turn associated with the Mossynoikoi, and it might be noted that Ptolemy (V.xiii.9) wrote that 'among the Moskhoi in the region of Armenia is the mountain Kotarzen'. An echo of the Vanni 'Katarza' might be detected not only in Ptolemy's (V.xiii.9) Καταρζηνη, but also in Herodotos' (IV.6) Κατιαροι and Pliny's (VI.50) Coteria. As Herodotos mentioned the Kataroi in his

---

22 Lines 2-15 of Sarduris' chronicle (Sayce 96, CICH 132A, Melishvili 155D pp.281-2) may be translated as follows; 'Sarduris says: I went against the country of Kulka, the city Ildamusha, the royal city of the king, being fortified, I took by storm; the people I enslaved, the leaders who were in the land of the Kulka I slaughtered, I built an iron tablet and erected an inscription in the city Ildamusha. The palace and city I burnt and destroyed; the country I devoured, men and women I enchained'.

23 Cf.Ushakov, 'К походам уратинцев в Закавказье', 1946, p.35.

24 Ibid., p.31-44.

25 Dionysios 765: Βυζηρες τοι πρωτα και ἄγχοθι, φύλα Θεκείρων, Μάκρωνος φίλωρες τε και οἱ μόσανος ἐξουσιο...  

26 Stephanos, Βυζηρες ξενος ἐν τῷ Ποντῷ, ἔστι καὶ Βυζηρικός λυμήν.
legend of Scythian origins and as Pliny mentioned the Cotieri in association with the Euchatae, the eighth century Vannic reference to a Caucasian tribe bearing a very similar name would tend to strengthen the arguments formulated in Chapter 1 for tracing the main elements of Herodotos' story of Scythian origins and Pliny's story of an Auchatai/Pali conquest of Tanaitae/Inapaei/Napae back to a 7th century Caucasian context.

A totally different catalogue of Transcaucasian tribes has been left by Sarduris' son Rusα I (733-714)27. The first four countries in this catalogue are located south of a lake, in all probability Lake Sevan, and the subsequent nineteen countries to the north of this lake, that is up through modern day Soviet Azarbaijan. It is not surprising then to find a very different catalogue to those found in the inscriptions of Menuas, Argishti and Sarduris. The latter were orientated towards the western Caucasus, and this one was orientated towards the eastern. Though Ushakov argued that some of the names in this catalogue, like those in the earlier catalogue, have equivalents in Greek texts28, his arguments in this case are not convincing and the proposed equivalences do not deserve serious consideration.

Herodotos' story of Sauromatai origins.

The discussion may now turn to the Sauromatai, the context in which Herodotos mentions them and the context in which they may have originally entered ancient literature. In IV.21 Herodotos located the Sauromatai as follows;

'Across the Tanais it is no longer Scythia; the first of the divisions belongs to the Sauromatae, whose country begins at the inner end of the Maeetian lake and stretches fifteen days journey to the north, and is all bare of both forest and garden trees'.

Commentators have accordingly fixed the Sauromatian territory on the east side of the Maiotis, without noting the role this tribe played in Herodotos' account of the Scythian war with Dareios29. In IV.120, after the conference of nomad kings, it was decided that;

'to one of their divisions, over which Scopasis was king, the Sauromatae should be added; this host should, if the Persian marched that way, retire before him and draw off towards the river Tanais, by the Maeetian lake, and if the Persian turned to depart they should attack and pursue him'

27 Sayce 55, Melikishvili 266, pp.328-330. See also Ushakov, 'К походам урацаев в Закавказье', 1946, pp.40-41.
28 Ushakov, 'К походам урацаев в Закавказье', 1946, pp.40-43.
29 The only exceptions are Smirnov, Сароматы, 1964, p.194 and Vinogradov, 'О斯基фских походах через Кавказ', 1964, pp.42-44.
The Gelonoi and Boudinoi were placed in Taxakis' division. In IV.128 the Scythian Kings sent:

'the division of the Scythians to which the Sauromatae were attached and which was led by Scopasis to speak with those Ionians who guarded the bridge over the Ister'

and in IV.136, upon learning of Dareios' cunning escape, they:

'gathered their power with all speed, both the two division of their host and the one division that was with the Sauromatae and Budioni and Geloni and made straight for the Ister in pursuit of the Persians'.

Inconsistencies and improbabilities abound throughout Herodotos' narrative of Dareios' Scythian expedition, yet on two points Herodotos is consistent. Firstly, it was the Sauromatai, Gelonoi and Boudinoi from east of the Tanais who responded to the Scythian call for help, and secondly, this help took the form of military activity under Scythian command across the Tanais. In 1964 Vinogradov, one of the very few scholars to notice the above passages, believed that a close relationship between Scythians and Sauromatai was born when, in the 7th century, a Sauromatai force was swept up into Madyes' Scythian army, marched over the Caucasus, and fought along side the Scythians in Asia Minor. Though Vinogradov's postulate that the Sauromatai chose to help the Scythians against Dareios out of a dislike for Persians acquired while campaigning in Asia Minor is not compelling in the extreme, the postulate that Sauromatai could be counted among the Scythians in Transcaucasia deserves further investigation.

30 Major discussions of these difficulties and inconsistencies are to be found in Macan, *Herodotus, the Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Books*, 1895 (1973) pp.43ff; How and Wells, *A Commentary on Herodotus*, I, 1964, pp.432-3; Struve, Дарий I и Скифы причерноморья', 1949, pp.15-28; Rybakov, Геродотова Скифия, 1979, pp.169-184, and the notes to the latest Russian translation of Herodotos' Scythian logos, Dovatur, Kallistov, Shishova, Народу нашей страны в истории Геродота, 1982. Whereas such scholars as Rybakov seem to underestimate the difficulties (offering facile reconstructions of Dareios' campaign on the basis of what is believed to be a consistent Herodotean account, others, such as Grundy, *The great Persian war and its preliminaries*, 1969, p.52 and Burn, *Persia and the West*, 1962, p.131, have seriously overestimated the difficulties.


32 Vinogradov, 'О скифских походах через Кавказ', 1964, p.43.
Firstly, Herodotos' account of Dareios' Scythian expedition would seem to be an amalgamation of two stories. The first is that of Dareios campaigning on the Danube and the second is that of Ariamenes, one of Dareios' generals, campaigning on the north side of the Caucasus33.

Secondly, there is rarely a mention of Sauromatai when they are not brigaded with the Gelonoi and Boudinoi, and as these two names may arguably be associated in the earliest records with the Caucasus it should cause no surprise to discover that the Sauromatai may be similarly associated.

Thirdly, Diodoros (II.43) says of the Sauromatai and Pliny says of the Sarmati, that they were drawn from Media and planted along the Tanais. Herodotos did not call the Sauromatai colonists from Media, but he did say (V.9) that the Sigynnai, who dwell on the north side of the Danube, dress in Median fashion and drive chariots pulled by little shaggy horses: 'claim to be colonists from Media, but how that can be so I cannot myself imagine—though there is room for anything in the course of time'

Strabo too (XI.xi.8) referred to the Persian customs and chariot driving of the Siginnoi, but he did not call them colonists from Media and did not locate them north of the Danube. To Strabo they were a southern Caucasian people, perhaps neighbours of the Derbikes or Makrokephaloi. As Strabo went on to associate the Derbikes, Tapyroi and Hyrkanians, whom Ktesias enumerated in the same order34, it is possible Strabo's source in XI.xi.8 was Eratosthenes, who was in turn using a source drawing heavily on Ktesias, perhaps Kleitarkhos35. In locating this tale on the Danube Herodotos may have been following Hekataios who is clearly responsible for shifting such tribes as the Sindoi from the eastern side of the Euxine to the western36. The description of Sauromatai as colonists from Media accordingly links them with the Sigynnoi and the Caucasus. The practising of Median customs is indeed more probable in the Caucasus than on the Don or Danube.

Fourthly, in Hippokrates' *Airs, waters and places*, ch.13-17, Europe and Asia is divided by Lake Maiotis, on the European side of which was the Scythian tribe called the

---

34 See Chapter 6.
35 Markwart, 'Die Sigynnen', 1932, p.5
36 Cf. Stephanos s.v. Εὐρυκυμία Νιφάδας, ος Ἐκαταίς, ἐν ρωμῆ.
Sauromatai, and on the Asian side of which were the Makrokephaloi and Phasis dwellers\textsuperscript{37}. In this model the Sauromatai and Makrokephaloi would be neighbours. Similarly, Strabo (XI.xi.8), after discussing the Sigynnoi, referred to other Caucasian people who:

'are said to practise making their heads appear as long as possible and making their foreheads project beyond their chins'

References to Makrokephaloi in the Caucasus are in fact frequent and can be dated as early as Hesiod\textsuperscript{38}.

Fifthly, an allusion to the Sauromatai may be found in the ancient Zoroastrian/Mazdeian text, the Avesta, Yasht 13 (the Farvardin), verses 143 and 144, where the prayer:

'We worship the ēvavishi [sacred spirits] of the holymen in the Aryan countries; we worship the ēvavishi of the holy women in the Aryan countries'

is repeated with successive references to the Turanian, Sairiman, Saini, and Dahi counties.

No modern scholar has failed to link the name Sairima with the name of the third son of the Iranian national hero Thraētaona Salm/Selm and with the Greek tribal-name Σαυρομάτης\textsuperscript{39}. Modern scholars have, however, failed to agree on a localisation of the people designated by the name 'Sairima'. The question of this peoples' localisation might been linked to two other questions.

The first question is the river 'Ranghi' 's identification. In 1938 Marquart suggested that the 'Ranghi' was the Volga, the 'Po of Ptolemy\textsuperscript{40}', thereby suggesting that the Volga did fall within the geographical horizon of the Avestan compilers and that the Sairima were

\textsuperscript{37} See Chapter 4.

\textsuperscript{38} For Hesiod's reference to such a people see Strabo I.ii.35 and VI.iii.6. For other references see the Scholion on Apollonios Rhodos I.1024 and II.1017; Palaiophatos fragment in Hapkratation Μακροκέφαλος; the Suidas, Μακροκέφαλος; Stephanos s.v. Μακροκέφαλος; Xenophon, Anabasis, IV.vii.27-28 and viii.8-24; Anonym. Periplous Pont. Euxine 37. See Marquart, 'Die Sigynnen', 1932, pp.15-16.


identical with the Sauromatai dwelling on the Volga. There are, however, little grounds for identifying the Ranghi with the Volga. As Darmsteter points out 'Rangi' is usually used to designate the Tigris, and even if this were not the original definition of the term 'Rangi', a more probable early use was as the Central Asian Iaxartes, as Boyce has suggested. The Volga was probably beyond the geographical horizon of the Avestan compilers, and the name 'Ranghi' was probably used in a wide variety of different contexts over the centuries. Indeed, it is possible that the most useful comment on the problem to date has been that by Gnoli. Gnoli has been sceptical about both the Volga and Iaxartes identification and seen 'Ranghi' being used to express a purely mythological concept, pointing out that such a use of 'Ranghi' would be closely paralleled by the use made of the term 'Rasa' in the Rigveda. Thus 'Ranghi' can not help to localise the 'Sairima', let alone on the Volga.

The second question to which the localisation of the Sairima might be linked is that of Zoroaster's homeland, for Zoroaster's homeland has been argued by Abaev to have been among the Scythians. Were Zoroaster to have been a Central Asian Scythian, then it is possible that by 'Sairima' the original compilers of the Avesta did mean 'Sauromatai' from the Volga or Central Asia. Unfortunately, however, more plausible links have been forged between Zoroaster and a Khorasmian state in the region of Marv or Harat, with

---

41 Smirnov, Проблема происхождении..., 1958, p.18, is not entirely happy with Marquart's localisation of the tribe as the Avesta 'does not give any indication of their abode. It is probable that here the concern is with the Sauromatai of Herodotos. Mention of this race in one of the Avesta Hymns testifies to the somewhat close ancient ties of the Sauromatai with the cradle of Iranian peoples. However, the basic archaeological and anthropological indications of the Sauromatai do not give us the right to directly draw them from the Massagetai-Dahi world of the Aral region'. Smirnov does, however, see language as a link between the Sarmatai and the Massagetai world, and in Сарматы, 1964, reaffirms his commitment to Marquart's identification of the Avestan 'Rangha' with the Volga and to the belief that the Avestan geographical horizon embraced the Sauromatai homeland on the Volga. Smirnov even goes so far as to suggest that the name of the Sairima 'rang loudly in the arena of political events of the ancient world'.

43 Gnoli, Zoroaster's Time and Homeland, 1980, p.56.
44 Though Chattopadhyay, The Achaemenids and India, 1974, p.2 identified the Rasa of the Rigveda with the Central Asian Iaxartes.
46 Henning, Zoroaster, 1951, pp.24-29.
the Akhaemenids\textsuperscript{47}, and most plausibly and recently of all, with south east Iran (Sistan)\textsuperscript{48}. Thus, deliberation upon the question of Zoroaster's homeland can throw no more light upon the question of the Sairima's localisation, than can deliberation upon the identification of the river Ranghi.

As the Sairima are unlikely to have entered the Avestan corpus as a distant call from the Volga, it is possible that they entered it either as Central Asian nomad people or as a looming power in the Transcaucasian region\textsuperscript{49}. The former is a possibility, granted the close links between Central Asia and the eastern Iranians. The latter is a still stronger possibility, granted the suspicion that Sauromatai were fighting along side Scythians and Medes in Transcaucasia and Mesopotamia in the 7th century B.C. and the close links between the Medes and the early stages of the Avesta's composition.

The final blow by which the term Sauromatai may be linked with the 7th century Caucasus is by far the strongest, and is virtually delivered by Herodotos himself when he offered the following account of Sauromatai origins:

'When the Greeks warred with the Amazons (...) the story runs that after their victory on the Thermodon they sailed away carrying in three ships as many Amazons as they had been able to take alive; and out at sea the Amazons set upon the crew and slew them... they were borne at the mercy of the waves and winds, till they came to the cliffs by the Maeetian lake; this place is in the country of the free Scythians'.

The Amazons began mounted raids on the Scythians, who, on hearing that their foes were women resolved to send their youngest men to encamp by them and beget children by them (IV.111). This the youths managed, but soon the women had mastered the Scythians speech and made it clear that they had no desire to return with these men to live among the Scythian women, whose customs were so different. It was agreed the Scythian men would go back, collect their possessions, and return to their new wives. They did so and the Amazons then suggested they leave and dwell across the river Tanais (IV.114-5):

\textsuperscript{49} Though the Sauromatai/Sarmatai were probably Iranian speaking, that his group was of homogenous 'ethnic stock' is questionable. Attention was long ago drawn to the possibility that the Sauromatai confederacy was in part made up of locals from the Caucasus. Dzhavakhishvili, \textit{Основные историко-этнографические проблемы истории Грузии, Кавказа и Ближнего Востока древнейшей эпохи}, 1939, p.40. See also Aliev, \textit{История Мидии}, 1960, pp.101-2.
To this too the youths consented; and crossing the Tanais they went a three days' journey from the river eastward, and a three days' journey from the Maeotian lake northward; and when they came to the region in which they now dwell, they made their abode there.

The language of the Sauromatai, Herodotos added, 'is Scythian, but not spoken in its ancient purity, seeing that the Amazons never rightly learnt it' (IV.117).

Most commentators on Herodotos and even authors of studies on the Amazons in ancient literature have only paused over the above story long enough to note the many other forms in which Amazon legends come. The only scholars to the present writers knowledge to investigate in depth the significance of this particular story are El'nitskij and Vinogradov.

In 1961, after tracing the concept of Amazons from ancient fertility goddess cults to the legendary women warriors of Kappodocia, El'nitskij went on to note how the 8th-7th century invasion of Asia Minor by Scythians seems to have been understood by contemporary Asia Minor Greeks in terms of Amazon movements. Two excellent examples of this are Diodoros II.43-46 and Justin II.4, where accounts of the Scythian conquest of Asia Minor blur with accounts of Amazon expansion.

The legend linking the Amazons of the Thermodon with the Sauromatai of the Maiotis, El'nitskij believes to be the result of a linking between 'knowledge' of Amazons on the Thermodon and increasing Greek colonisation of the north Pontic coast, particularly the Crimean Bosporos. Colonisation brought Greeks into contact with peoples whose 'female cults' not only made them easily identifiable as Amazon descendants, but helped reinforce the Amazon legend. In the concepts of Enari, Arimaspians, and Ενα κοππατούμενα this same interaction of local culture and Greek preconception may be detected.

---

51 El'nitskij, Знания древних, 1961, p.27-30 and 35-6, where he says, 'The Asia Minor Greeks easily identified the Caucasian tribes which under the names of Kimmerians (Gimirrai) and Skythians (Ishkuza) invaded Asia Minor in the middle of the 7th century B.C., with the Amazons'.
52 See Chapter 6.
53 El'nitskij, Знания древних, 1961, p.31-32.
In 1964 Smirnov noted Aiskhylos' linking of the Amazons with a great mountain range, Ephoros' linking of the Amazons with the Sauromatai, the men folk of whom were all killed in a campaign in Europe, and Herodotos' linking of the Sauromatai's origins with the Maiotian coast. The Herodotean story he believed, moreover, reflected a Sauromatai matriarchal marriage custom, where women take men from their father's home. The same practice may be detected in Hippokrates' description of the tribe and in Polyainos' Tirgatao and Amage stories.

El'nitski and Smirnov were prepared, after noting the links in ancient literature between Amazons and the Sauromatai, to still follow Herodotos in locating the early Sauromatai on the Maiotian coast but how then did the Amazons and Sauromatai come to be linked? In 1974 Schmeja suggested that the Scythians knew the Sauromatai as 'Men killer' and for the Greeks nothing was closer to this notion than the Amazons. Unfortunately, however, the name Sauromatai, from which Schmeja derives the above meaning was probably not the earliest form of the name in literature. Schmeja completely overlooks the Avestan form 'Sairima' and the possibility that the final 'ta' is an Iranian plural. A more probable link than the etymological one between the Sauromatai and the Amazons was the geographical. The Sauromatai being known to dwell near the lands traditionally believed to be occupied by the Amazons, were easily associated with Amazons. In this vein, in 1972 Vinogradov was prepared to interpret the ancient accounts as echoing events not on the Maiotian coast, but much nearer the Thermodon- in the Caucasus. Herodotos is indeed the only ancient writer who specifically linked the origins of the Sauromatai with the Maiotis, and his link, a

---

55 Stephanos, Αμαζόνες: 'Amazones, race of women on the Thermodon, as Ephoros writes, which are now called Sauromatidai. 'It is said of them, that in physical strength they are superior to men, and explained on account of the local climate, which usually produces women stronger and taller than men. But I think that the commonest of all sufferings, as ...the reason. More convincing is what their neighbours say. The Sauromatai men raiding from their country into Europe, were all killed and their women remained alone...the youths grew up and revolted against the women, but when the women won out, the men fled into the forest and died. Fearing the revenge of the youths, the women decided to break their limbs and so they are for all time". They are also called Sauromatidai because they stamp on lizards (σαύρας) and eat them, or because they live in Sauromatia Skythia'.
56 Smirnov, ibid., p.201. See Chapters 4, 5 & 11.
57 Schmeja, 'Griechen und Iranier', 1974, pp.185-89. Schmeja even suggests the name 'Sauromatai' was derived from the Iranian 'Sura-ma(t)ta', 'hero killers', and that the Amazons' epithet οὐρματα is similarly derived form *ουρματα, 'Man killer'.
58 See the criticisms of Gnoli, Zoroaster's Time and Homeland, 1980, p.60 n.8.
59 Vinogradov, Центральный и северо-восточный Кавказ, 1972, p.20-25.
boat filled with Amazon women (abducted from the Thermodon) drifting by chance upon the Maiotian coast, is slender in the extreme. To remove this link, we are left in Transcausia, and the search for the origins of the Sauromatai might properly end there.

Ephoros, as cited by Stephanos, spoke only of Sauromatai raids into Europe and of Sauromatai dwelling in Scythia. Yet though Europe and Scythia were, for Ephoros, probably west of the Don-Sea of Azov, for a source of the 7th century B.C., Europe was probably delineated by the Caucasian Phasis in combination with the Kyros or Araxes, and Scythia was a Caucasian Kingdom. The Sauromatai might then have been originally associated with the Amazons much nearer the Amazons' homeland.

Strabo reported on two localisations of the Amazons. The first (XI.v.1-2) was the mountains above the Albanoi, for as the Theophanes who marched into this region with Pompey wrote:

'the Gelae and the Legae, Scythian people, live between the Amazons and the Albanians, and that the Mermadalis River flows there, midway between these people and the Amazons'

The second was the northerly foot hills of the Keraunian branch of the Caucasus on the other side of which such scholars as Metrodoros of Skepsis and Hypsicates say the Gargarians live. The Amazons are said to spend most of their time by themselves, but:

'they have two special months in the spring in which they go up into the neighbouring mountains which separates them and the Gargarians. The Gargarians also, in accordance with an ancient custom, go up thither to offer sacrifice with the Amazons and also to have intercourse with them for the sake of begetting children...'

Following his account of child rearing customs, Strabo offers the following geographical note (XI.v.2):

'The Mermodas dashes down from the mountains through the country of the Amazons and through Siracen and the intervening desert and then empties into Lake Maeotis. It is said that the Gargarians went up from Themiscyra into this region with the Amazons, then revolted from them and in the company with some Thracians and Euboeans who had wandered thus far carried on war against them, and that they later ended the war against them and made a compact in the conditions above-mentioned, that is, that they should have dealings with one another only in the matter of children and that each people should live independent of the other'

Having already noted the ancients' readiness to describe Sauromatai in terms of Amazons, Vinogradov interprets the above stories of liaison between Amazon invaders and Gargarians in the north east Caucasus as echoing a liaison between invading Sauromatai
and local Caucasian tribes. The story that the Gargarians went up from Themiscyra into the region with the Amazons and then revolted from them, places some pressure on the thesis that they were locals. Perhaps they had been conquered by the Sauromatai elsewhere in the Caucasus and moved with them to their Albanian habitat. The reference to a revolt in the company of Thracians and Euboeans, could in part be explained, were Thracians here a miswriting of the well known tribe Εἰράδας, whose territory (Ἐκοχήν) was in fact mentioned in the same passage. Kleitarkhos' story (Strabo XI.v.4) of the Amazon queen visiting Alexander in Hyrkania from the Thermodon and the Caspian gates (ἀνὰ Καππαδοκίαν πυλῶν καὶ Θερμοδόντος), Vinograd interprets as alluding to a twopronged (Terek and Derbent passes) Sauromatai invasion of Transcaucasia. The presence of a matriarchal Sauromatai in the Caucasus may also explain one of the most curious features of the Georgian language- the unexpected association of masculine gender with concepts normally regarded as female.

Conclusion.

It might then be concluded that though Herodotos discussed such tribes as Melangkhlainoi, Gelonoi and Boudinoi in the context of north Pontic ethnography, and the Sauromatai in the context of Maiotian ethnography, the context in which all these tribal-names were first used was in all probability a 7th century Caucasian one. It was concluded in Chapter 1 that Aristeas' poem had dealt with peoples not on a Pontic-Altai trade route but on a Transcaucasian migration route, and that a shifting geographical horizon had led Herodotos to reorientate Aristeas' ethnography. The same may be the case with respect to Hekataios. But even if Aristeas and Hekataios were reporting on Caucasian peoples, why should Herodotos, with north Pontic informants at his disposal, use names from Aristeas' work, Hekataios' work, or a Caucasian context to describe tribes in the north Pontic region? There are several possible explanations as to why he might.

60 Vinogradov, Центральный и северо-восточный Кавказ, 1972, pp.24-25.
61 See Chapter 11.
63 Allen, A History of the Georgian People, 1932 (1971), p.37. For example, the word for Father is 'Mamaa' and for Mother is 'Deda'. The sun has feminine gender, the moon ('м'tvare, or 'ruler') has masculine. The Georgian language is, however, such an enigma that explanations for any feature of it can only be extremely tentative.
The first possible explanation is that some tribes migrated from the Caucasus to the Ukraine. When the Scythians withdrew from Asia Minor, crossed the Caucasus and took possession of the lands west of the Don at the beginning of the 6th century B.C., they may have carried with them some of the numerous Caucasian tribes who had been their allies for the past century. The significance of the role played by Caucasian tribes in the Scythian invasion of Asia Minor has been seriously underestimated by modern scholars. Though modern scholars trace the origins of the 'Sauromatian' culture of the lower Don back to the Volga region, the name 'Sauromatai' can be traced back to a 7th century Caucasian context, and the people who bore this name would seem to be a good example of a people who joined with the southward-moving Scythians in descending upon Mesopotamia from the Caucasus and followed the Scythians back over the Caucasus to the Don. A migration theory can not, however, account for all the different occurrences of tribal-names suspected of belonging originally to the Caucasian region (e.g. Eukhatai, Cotieri and Issedoni in Central Asia).

A second possible explanation is that Herodotos' informants had themselves reorientated the old ethnographies and used the names of tribes encountered in the 8th and 7th century in the south-east of the Pontos for tribes they and their forefathers had encountered in the 6th century in the north of the Pontos. It is not improbable that the Greek colonizers of the north coast of the Black Sea had been so anxious to find the fabled tribes of the Argonaut legends and Aristeas' poem in their new home in Scythia, and so ignorant of those tribes they did encounter that they used the old terminology liberally (perhaps the best example would be the Kimmerian toponyms in the Crimea). This second possible explanation, for the same reason as the first, goes only part way to explaining the many associations discussed above.

The explanation which seems best able to account for all the transferences is that posited in Chapter 1. The rapidly expanding Greek geographical horizon forced a reorientation of pre-existing literary ethnographies. As the earliest ethnographies of the Caucasus and Transcaucasia fell right across the earliest continental boundary (the Phasis) and the world's greatest mountain range (the Rhipaians) the tribes in these ethnographies could not help but trail off after the continental boundary when it receded from the Caucasus to the Ukraine and Central Asia, and after the Rhipaians when they receded to be the Urals, T'ien Shan and Altai mountains. Herodotos' value is in no way diminished by seeing him as a participant in this very interesting and complex process. It was perhaps his very genius that led him to be more responsible than many other ancients for the transference of tribal names, descriptions and
histories from a Caucasian to a trans-Eurasian context. That Herodotos used reliable first hand information when writing on Scythians (both east and west of the Don) is not disputed, but his work seems in part to be the result of an attempt to marry this new information with the information contained in pre-existing literary ethnographies. As use of some tribal names had drifted with Greek colonisation from the south east Pontos to the north Pontos in the 6th and 5th century, Herodotos was led into unconscious reorientation of earlier ethnographies.
CHAPTER 3.

HELLANIKOS, DAMASTES AND EASTERN SCYTHIANS.

Hellanikos' work.

Most of the discussion of Hellanikos' work on Scythians has, in modern times, centred upon attempts to identify the work or works in which Hellanikos dealt with these people. That Hellanikos wrote a work devoted to Scythian matters has never been disputed. Apart from the numerous fragments which appear to deal with Scythian matters, Stephanos twice referred to a Σκυθικά by Hellanikos. Whether such a work was a separate monograph, or part of a greater ethnographic work and whether Hellanikos dealt with Scythians in his Skythika alone, or in other works as well, are matters of some dispute. Before attempting to place Hellanikos' work in the context of the traditions of writing on Scythians, these matters may be discussed.

Citations in ancient sources of Hellanikos' ethnographic works include seventeen separate titles: Αἰγυπτιακά, Περσικά, Σκυθικά, ἡ εἰς Ἀμμονος ἀναθαλίς, περὶ Λυβίας, Κυπριακά, Φοινικικά, Αἰολικά, Λεσβικά, Ἀργολικά, περὶ Ἀρκαδίας, Βοιωτιακά, Θεσσαλικά, Κισαλίς Ἔθνων, περὶ Ἐθνῶν, Ἐθνῶν ὀνομασίαι, Βαρβαρικά νόμιμα. Kullmer, in 1902, was the first to attempt a classification of these works, postulating the existence of two works, a Κτισείς and a Βαρβαρικά Νομίμα into which all the other works fell. Those dealing with Asia Minor, Greek cities and colonisation belonging to the first major work, and the Persika, Aegyptiaka and Skythika belonging to the second. Jacoby, unlike Kullmer, did not attempt to place the Skythika, but like Kullmer attempted to reduce the number of separate works of Hellanikos. Jacoby's only postulate is that the titles περὶ Ἐθνῶν, Ἐθνῶν ὀνομασίαι and Βαρβαρικά νόμιμα may all refer to the same work.

Pearson took the investigation furthest when, in 1939, he noted that Stephanos twice cited Hellanikos' Skythika on Scythian tribes, that Strabo listed Hellanikos as one of several

1 Stephanos, Ἀμαοκος and Ἀμύργιον (Hell F 65).
authors whose writings on northern tribes are valueless, that Clement of Alexandria made mention of Hellanikos on Hyperboreans beyond the Rhipaians, that the Photios-Souda cited Hellanikos' *Barbarika Nomima* on Thrace, and finally that a Scholiast on Apollonos cited the *Peri Ethnon* of Hellanikos on the Sindoi and Maiotai Scythians, and concluded that the *Peri Ethnon* and the *Barbarika Nomima* were probably the one and the same work, and one which incorporated within it a distinct *Scythika*. Noting further that Stephanos used Hellanikos' *Ktiseis* on certain east-coast Pontic tribes, Pearson sought to make the further identification of the *Ktiseis* with the *Peri Ethnon* and *Barbarika Nomima*. Pearson's attempted reconciliation of references is, however, as van Paassen pointed out in 1957, based on the assumption that Hellanikos could only have dealt with Scythians in one work.

Avoiding the above assumption, van Paassen makes the suggestion that Hellanikos may have described Scythian tribes in the framework of both non-Greek world geography (in the *Barbarika Nomima* or Ethnon Onomasiai) or Greek history and geography (in the *Ktiseis* to be equated with the *Peri Ethnon*). If Scythians were dealt with by Hellanikos in both works, in which work was the greater part of Hellanikos' description of the Scythians, in particular the part entitled *Scythika*, to be found? Van Paassen suggests that the Scholion of Apollonios which mentions Hellanikos' *Peri Ethnon* on the Sindoi and Maiotai means that the *Peri Ethnon* and *Ktiseis* are identical. Van Paassen further suggests, however, that as the Sindoi and Maiotai are non-Scythian, and could not come into a *Skythika*, the *Skythika* was not part of the *Peri Ethnon*. As these tribes need not have been considered non-Scythian, this need not be the case, and as Stephanos cited Hellanikos' *Skythika* on two tribes, the 'Ajia Góxos and 'Ajjupoló, who could not easily have found their way into a discussion of Greek colonisation, if the *Barbarika Nomina* was separated from the *Ktiseis*, Hellanikos' *Skythika* must have belonged to the former.

---

5 Hell. F 70.
9 F 64 & 65.
10 Strabo XI.vi.2 and XII.iii.21, which deal with tribes too far from the Pontic coast to have qualified for the *Ktiseis*, are probably fragments of the *Skythika* division of the *Barbarika Nomina*. Their Hellanian nature will be argued later in this chapter.
Hellanikos' sources and influence.

The place of Hellanikos' work in Greek ethnographic tradition has been as disputed an issue as the organisation of his works. In 1929 Aly favoured identifying Hellanikos as the source of numerous passages in later texts dealing with Scythians and other northern tribes, considering him independent of Herodotus, and dependent above all on Hekataios. In 1951 Harmatta believed Hellanikos, when writing on the Scythians, to be dependent upon Herodotus, when not using original contemporary information. It will be argued below that Hellanikos was indeed independent of Herodotus and that his so called 'original' information came from Aristeas or Hekataios.

The case for Hellanikos' dependence upon Herodotus was first put in the 3rd century A.D. when Porphyrios claimed the Barbarika Nomima was taken from Herodotus' and Damastes' work. In more recent times, Kullmer has suggested that Hellanikos based his work's format on Herodotus, particularly in the way he dealt with Scythian matters in the middle of a discussion of Persian matters, and Harmatta that his Skythika 'was based on materials derived from Herodotus and probably other old sources'. The case, however, is not strong.

Porphyrios' statement can not carry much weight as it is probable that Hellanikos was the senior of both Damastes, traditionally his student, and Herodotus. As Pearson argues, since the author of the De malignitate knew of Hellanikos' Persika but did not seize upon the work for its criticisms of Herodotus, Hellanikos' work may have predated Herodotus. Though not a demonstrable proof that Hellanikos' work on the Scythians predated Herodotus', there is the suspicion that Hellanikos' work was at least independent of Herodotus'. Kullmer himself, while noting the similarities between Hellanikos' note on the Getai in Thrace (F 173, the Souda s.v. Ζημολαξίτης) and Herodotus IV.95, noted also

12 Harmatta, 'Миоценские северные племена и Гелланика', 1951, pp.91-111.
13 F 72. καὶ τῇ ὑμίν λέγει τὰ Βαρβαρικά Νόμιμα Ἑλλανίκου ἔκ τῶν Ἡροδοτοῦ καὶ Δαμαστοῦ συνήκται.
15 See discussion later in this chapter.
16 Pearson, Early Ionian Historians, 1939, pp.206-7 and De malignitate ch.36 p.869 A (=F 183), where, in relation to Herodotus, Hellanikos is counted 'among earlier writers'.

==
the dissimilarities and concluded that Hellanikos was using not only Herodotos but also Hekataios\textsuperscript{17}. The suspicion that Hekataios was independent from Herodotos is strengthened by the following observations.

Strabo's description of Massagetai customs, though bearing a close superficial resemblance to Herodotos' account, deviates sharply at two points\textsuperscript{18}. Firstly, Herodotos wrote that tribesmen who die of disease are not eaten as a pious sacrifice, but buried, while Strabo wrote that they were left out for wild beasts to eat. Considering the importance the Zoroastrians of Baktria placed upon the later custom, the difference between the two accounts must represent more than a faulty transmission. Strabo's account must have been drawn from a source other than Herodotos. Secondly, Herodotos was definite concerning the total absence of iron from the land of the Massagetai, while Strabo said there was a little.

Conversely, the resemblance between Strabo XI.vi.2 and Diodoros II.43 is strong, particularly in the enumeration eastern nomadic tribes. Strabo referred to the writers ἐτι πρῶτερον who distinguished between the northern tribes and:

'called those who lived above the Euxine and Ister and the Adriatic "Hyperboreans" , "Sauromatians" and "Arimaspians", and they called those who lived across the Caspian Sea in part "Sacians" and in part "Massagetai"...'.

Diodoros offered a similar catalogue of regions and tribal names; the Maiotis, Caspian, Sakai, Massagetai, Arimaspoi, Sauromatai\textsuperscript{19}. That out of all the possible Scythian tribal names the same ones (with the sole exception of the Hyperboreans) should occur in both texts, and be located in similarly defined regions, suggests a common source. Who might this common source have been?

Strabo's source must be one of those authors refered to in the same section as οἱ παλαιοὶ τῶν Ἑλλήνων συγγραφείς and οἱ δὲ ἐτι πρῶτερον. The former of these, 'the ancient Greek historians' may be identified above all as Ephoros. The identity of 'those of still earlier times' is not immediately evident. The candidates for the identification would, however, seem to be named in XI.vi.3;

'On could more easily believe Hesiod and Homer in their stories of the heroes, or the tragic poets, than Ktesias, Herodotus, Hellanicus, and other writers of this kind'.

\textsuperscript{17} Kullmer, 'Die Historiae des Hellanikos von Lesbos', 1902, p.676.
\textsuperscript{18} Her.I.215-6 and Strabo XI.viii.6.
\textsuperscript{19} See Chapter 2 for an investigation of the historical implications of Diodoros' account of Scythian expansion.
Leaving aside Hesiod and Homer, whose contributions to the subject are well documented, and the ἄλλοις τοιούτοις, the three remaining possibilities may now be examined.

Ktesias, though known to have written extensively on the Sakai and Scythians, is not known to have mentioned Hyperboreans, Sauromatai or Arimaspai. Though Herodotos is known to mention all the tribes, he did not consider them Scythian, named them together only in that section where he followed Aristeas' Arimaspia, and was not fully confident of the existence of two of them. The only remaining possibility, of those Strabo names, is Hellanikos. Norden suggested Hekataios was 'the still older writer', but Aly pointed out that as he is not named, it is probably Hellanikos. Jacoby too considered the Strabo passage an Hellanikan fragment, but offers no reasons. The case in favour is not substantial, but ground for suspicion exists.

In XII.iii.21 Strabo spoke of those who call:

'the Scythians beyond the Borysthenes River "Alazones", and also "Callipidae" and other names- names which Hellanicus and Herodotus and Eudoxus have foisted on us'

Although none of these tribal names correspond to those in XI.vi.2, the sets of tribal names are not mutually exclusive and may have both been drawn from the same work. This further evidence of Strabo's familiarity with Hellanikos' work may add to the case in favour of judging him the original source of the information in XI.vi.2. It is not, however, necessary to conceive of direct use of Hellanikos. Eudoxos, Ephoros and Eratosthenes all used Hellanikos and were all used by Strabo, so they qualify well as intermediaries.

Hellanikos' tribes.

20 See Chapter 6.
21 On the Hyperboreans, IV.13, 32-36 and on the Arimaspians, although uncritical of reports on them in IV.27 is sceptical in III.116.
23 Jacoby, FürH 1a (Kommentator), p.473) says only that it was 'wirtschaftet mit eratosthenischem material. Der tadel geht vielleicht eher auf die ἔρατοικά, wie auf die Σκυθικά', presumably on the grounds that the mention of Kyros' war with the Massagetai and subsequent mention of histories of Persians, Medes and Syrians might suggest that an account was given of the northern tribes only within the context of a Persian history. This, however, need not follow, particularly as it is not simply the Massagetai who are referred to by Strabo but tribes as far west as the Istros. Though these tribes may be seen to have been found mentioned in a Σκυθικά, since such a work is known to exist.
24 See Chapter 7 & 8.
If Hellanikos was the ultimate source behind Strabo XI.vi.2, then he was probably the source behind the corresponding passage, Diodoros II.43, and if this were so, then it is Hellanikos who may be responsible, as was suspected in Chapter 1 and 2, for the form of the Scythian legend of origin and expansion and the early history of the Sauromatai took in the work of Diodoros, Pliny and Flaccus. This suspicion may now be strengthened further by an investigation of Hellanikos' possible use of nine terms: 'Ὀργεμπαίοι, Ἦνίοχοι, Κοραξίοι, Σινδοί, Μαϊάται, Σκύθαι, Ἀμύργιοι, Ἀμαθόχοι and Ἑπερβόρειοι.

In a section drawn from Aristeas' Arimaspia, Herodotos mentioned the 'Ἄργινατοι. In numerous later works, however, where 'Ἄργινατοι may have been expected, 'Ὀργεμπαίοι, Arimphaei, Arempheos or Arimefi are found. Aly believes the source for such a rendition of the name is a choice between Hekataios, Hellanikos, Damastes and Eudoxos, but as Damastes' and Eudoxos' work may be argued to go back to Hekataios and Hellanikos, the choice is effectively between these two.

Stephanos, in his entry under Χαριμάται, cited Hellanikos on several east coast Pontic tribes:

'KHARIMATAI; A tribe on the Pontos. Palaiphatos in the tenth book of his Troika, "The Moskhoi and Kharimatai being next to the Kerketai, who rule the Parthians up to the Euxine Pontos". And Hellanikos in his The foundations of tribes and cities "The Moskhoi and Kharimatai dwell above the Kerketai, the Heniokhoi below them, and the Koraxoi above".

The Kerketai mentioned by three other scholars: Ps. Skylax, whose source in general will later be argued to have been a 5th century Periplous (perhaps that of Hekataios or Hellanikos), Strabo, who cited as his authority Artemidoros, who Strabo said was not at

25 Zenobios V.25: 'Orgempaioi do not have homes, nor do they eat anything living. They, even the women, are bald on account of the nature of the water they drink'; Pliny VI.35; Mela I.19; Ammianus XXII.8, respectively.
28 Skylax 73: 'The Kerketai. After the Sindic harbour comes the Kerketai, a tribe'. On the Skylax Periplous see Chapter 7.
this point using an historian of the Mithridatic war\textsuperscript{29}, and Zenobios, a 2nd century A.D. writer of anecdotes\textsuperscript{30}. Though not all of the above testify to direct use of Hellanikos, it does appear that his notice on such east Pontic tribes as the Kerketai, perhaps originally drawn from Hekataios, did become part of the literary tradition. Aly has further argued that if Hellanikos was Zenobios' source on the Kerketai, he may have also been Zenobios' source on the 'Ωργηματίοι, and thus responsible for the non-Herodotean tradition explored above\textsuperscript{31}.

Hellanikos' dependence upon Hekataios, independence of Herodotos, and favour among later writers can be further explored. Two other east Pontic tribes, the 'Ηνιόχοι and Κοραζοί, are included in Stephanos' Hellanikan catalogue under the entry 'Χαριμαται' and in Skylax's \textit{Periplus} 76-77. Another two tribes, the Σινδοί and Μαιοται Εκυθαί are named in a Scholion to Apollonios Rhodios IV.321 which noted that:

'Hellanikos in his \textit{Peri Ethnon} says "As one sails through the Bosporos, there are the Sindoi, above these the Maiotai Scythians'\textsuperscript{32}.

Though Herodotos made mention of both Sindoi and Maiotai, he did not include them in any ethnographic catalogue, and used Maiotai in a general sense, not as a designation for a Scythian or any other tribe. Hellanikos' source is therefore much more likely to be the same as that used by Ps Skylax, who in 71-72 also placed the Maiotai next to the Sindoi, probably Hekataios\textsuperscript{33}.

The Amyrgioi.

Still further exploration may be ventured with an investigation of the term 'Αμύργιοι. Under this term Stephanos entered the following; 'Αμύργιοι πεδίον Εκυθήν, Ἐλλάνικος Εκυθίκος τὸ ἐθνικὸν 'Αμύργιος, ὁς αὐτὸς φησίν. Herodotos mentions the tribe in VII.64:

\textsuperscript{29} Strabo XI.ii.14: 'After Bata Artemidorus mentions the coast of the Cercetae, with its mooring places and villages, extending thence about eight hundred and fifty stadia' but 'The more trustworthy historians of the Mithridatic wars name the Achaii first, then the Zygi, then the Heniochi, and then the Cercetae and the Moschi and Colchi, and the Phtheirophagi who live above these three peoples and the Soanes, and other small tribes that live in the neighbourhood of the Caucasus'.

\textsuperscript{30} Zenobios V: 'Among the Kerketai the workmen carry heavy loads, until such time as someone buys them'.

\textsuperscript{31} Aly, 'Barbarika Nomima', 1929, pp.49-50.

\textsuperscript{32} Own translation. Kullmer, 'Die Historiae des Hellanikos von Lesbos', 1901, p.679, notes this passage without comment.

\textsuperscript{33} See Chapter 7.
The Sacae, who are Scythians, had on their heads tall caps, erect and stiff and tapering to a point; they wore breeches, and carried their native bows, and daggers, and axes withal, which they call "sagaris". These were Amyrian Scythians, but were called Sacae; for that is the Persian name for all Scythians.

If a still earlier writer such as Hekataios dealt with the 'Amyrgioi Scythians' and if Hellanikos did not take his information from Herodotos, it is possible that Hellanikos took his information from Hekataios, but Herzfeld can not be justified in seeing Stephanos' entry as a Hekataian fragment when Hellanikos is clearly the authority being cited. The exact location of this tribe and plain has been the subject of some fierce debate. Three locations have generally been favoured.

The Gedrosian and Persian desert area was favoured for identification with the Amyrgioi plain by Thomas in 1906, but his thesis that Saka penetrated these parts in Achaemenid times is largely recognised as deficient.

The identification of the Amyrgioi's homeland with the western Pamirs was favoured by Tomaschek, Marquart, Herrmann, Junge and Litvinskij. In support of this identification Herrmann argued that the tribal names 'Amyrgioi', 'Saka haumawarka' and the Babylonian 'Gimirri umurga', were all derived from the old Iranian word for bird, 'Meregha', and that these were the griffons whom Aristeas would seem to have guard gold in the Pamirs. Junge argued that the Amyrgioi may be identified with the Haumavarga and their homeland must have been the region from which Strabo's Tocharoi and Sakaraukoi fell upon the Greko-Baktrian Kingdom, a region he considers to be in or near the Pamirs. Litvinskij argued that there is ample literary and archaeological evidence for Saka habitation of the Pamirs in early Achaemenid times and that the Pamir toponym Munjan and hydronym

---

34 This conclusion was tentatively reached by Junge, Saka-Studien, 1937, pp.29-30, 'Die Vorlange für den Ausdruck des Hellanikos, die die "Sakai Amyrgioi" in eine Ebene setzte, ist vielleicht dieselbe Hekataios stelle'. Junge later adds (p.30 n.1) 'Obwohl es inhaltlich auf Hekataios zurückgeht, gehört das Fragment in der erhaltenen Form doch zweifellos Hellanikos'.

35 Herzfeld, 'Sakastan', 1932, p.10.

36 Thomas, 'Sakastana', 1906, p.199. For the most complete discussion and rejection of this thesis see Daffina, L'immigrazione dei Saka nella Drangiana, 1967.


38 Junge, Saka-Studien, 1939, p.85. See also Abaev, Геродотовские Skythai Georgoi', 1981, pp.74 & 76.

**Murgab** might come from the tribal name 'Amyrgioi'\(^{40}\). Litvinskij believed, like Junge, that the Amyrgioi fell upon the Greko-Baktrian Kingdom from the Pamirs in the 2nd-century B.C.\(^{41}\).

The area around Merv, Margiana, has been favoured by Grigor'ev, Struve, Bernshtam, Dandamaev and Hamis\(^{42}\). This identification has found two justifications. The first is that the hydronym **Murgab** is not just to be found in the Pamirs, but is also to be found in the region of Merv. The second is that Herodotos (VII.64) brigaded the Amyrgioi Scythians with the Baktrians, and Margiana is not only adjacent to Baktria but geographically inseparable from it.

The steppes on the Syr Darya and Ferghana were first suggested by Herzfeld when, in 1932, he noted that Megasthenes' claim that the Hemodos mountains separated India from the Sakai, and seeing the Pamirs as the Hemodos, he favoured locating the Amyrgioi Saka beyond the Pamirs, and identifying them with the Haumavarga of the Iaxartes. It was against these people, he believed, Kyros had campaigned\(^{43}\). This region was favoured more recently by P'jankov, who suggested in 1968 that Polyainos' Saka King was an Amyrgioi King, and that the Amyrgioi were Demodamos' Sakai\(^{44}\). The, case can be strengthened by noting that Polyainos' Amorges ruled an open territory in which thirst overcame Dareios' army. This could not be the Pamirs, but might be the Kyzyl Kum region.

Though Herrmann's and Litvinskij's suggestion that Saka inhabited the Pamirs in Achaemenid times is highly plausible, their suggestion that Hellanikos' Amyrgioi also dwelt in the Pamirs is not. Herzfeld and P'jankov probably come closer to defining the Hellanikan conception. They place the tribe in the central Asian steppes.

Having attempted to demonstrate above Hellanikos' independence of Herodotos and dependence upon Hekataiōs, the discussion may now turn to Harmatta's claim that three

\(^{40}\) *Ibid.*, pp.121-123. The derivation of Munjan from Amyrgioi was first suggested by Morgenstierne, 'The name Munjan', 1931, p.444.


\(^{43}\) Herzfeld, 'Sakasten', 1932, p.10.

\(^{44}\) P'jankov, саки', pp.13-14; Polyainos VII.12. On Demodamos see Chapter 12.
texts, two fragments and one testimonium, suggest Hellanikos was not only independent of Herodotos, but also of Hekataios? The discussion may now turn to deal with these texts, Harmatta’s arguments for believing they evidence Hellanikos’ independence from Herodotos and Hekataios alike, and the counter arguments for believing they evidence the heavy influence of pre-Herodotean, in all probability Hekataian, literature in Hellanikos’ work.

The first text is the testimony of Agathemeros, Geographias Hypotyposis, I.1 (T12a):

\[
\text{‘Αναξιμάνδρος ὁ Μιλήσιος, ἀκοινοτής θάλεω, πρῶτος ἔτολμησε τὴν οἰκουμένην ἐν πάναι ἡγεῖται. μεθ’ ἔν Ἑκαταίος ὁ Μιλήσιος, ἄνὴρ πολυπλανῆς, διηκρίβωσεν ἀπετεθανήν τὸ πράγμα. Ἑλλάνικος γὰρ ὁ Λέσβιος, ἄνὴρ πολυστῶρ, ἀπλάστως παρεδόθη ἡν ἰατοῦ ᾿Εκαταίον αἰτοῦ τὸν ἕλκει ἐν τῷ Ἑκατάιον μεταγράφας Περίπλου ἔγραψεν. ἐξ ἐκ Ανδροκρίτου καὶ Ἐυδοκίου καὶ Ἀλλοιτινῆς Γῆς Περίπλου καὶ Περίπλους ἐπραγματεύσαντο.}
\]

Harmatta has argued that Agathemeros’ inclusion of Hellanikos in his list of notable Greek geographers suggests some independence from pre-existing literary tradition. This argument is not, however, compelling. Agathemeros credited Hellanikos with no more than being a πολυστῶρ and adding that ἀπλάστως παρεδόθη ἡν ἰατοῦ ᾿Εκαταίον. The three other writers Agathemeros named in the list, Damastes, Demokritos and Eudoxos certainly carried out no original research in the field of history or geography. Thus, far from placing Hellanikos outside a literary tradition, Agathemeros placed him within the non-Herodotian Ionian geographical tradition which we might trace back to Hekataios and Aristeas.

The second text is the Hellanikos fragment in Papyrus Oxyrhyncus 1241:

\[
	ext{αἰδηρία ἄε ὅπλα πρῶτος Ἑλλάνικος κατασκευάζον ἔμενων Σκιθῶν ὅμως ᾿Ευνία.}
\]

45 Own translation: Anaximandros the Milesian, a pupil of Thales, first ventured to draw the known word on a tablet. After him Hekataios the Milesian, a man of many travels, treated the subject so accurately that it is met with admiration. For Hellanikos the Lesbian, a man of much knowledge, has given sincerely a history. Then Damastes the Sigeion wrote a Periplous copying for the most part from the things of Hekataios. Next Demokritos and Eudoxos and certain others took in hand Ges Periodoi and Periplus.

46 Indeed Agathemeros in the same passage claimed Damastes copied out most of Hekataios’ Periplus.
That 'Saneunos' may come from an Iranian form 'Sāna-vana', 'conquering his enemies/victorious over the enemy', was reason enough for Harmatta to suppose that Hellanikos was the first to record this piece of Eurasian folklore\textsuperscript{47}. Not only Harmatta, but Rostovtzeff and Phillips too believe Hellanikos was recording a genuine Scythian legend in giving the very suitable title of 'conqueror of enemies' to the King who invented iron weapons\textsuperscript{48}. This does not, however, mean that Hellanikos was the first to record the tale. The tale itself might date back to the 10th century B.C. when, after the collapse of the Hittite empire, iron technology was introduced into Transcaucasia\textsuperscript{49}. The Scythians were indeed associated with iron-working in the plays of Aiskhylos, whose source was probably Hekataios or Aristeas\textsuperscript{50}. Aristeas is not, however, known to have used the term ξυθαπαλεία in the generic sense in which Hellanikos used it when he called Saneunos ξυθαπαλεία. Hellanikos have drawn the tale from the Arimaspia and couched it in his own terms, or drawn it and the terminology from Hekataios. This tale might then be yet another example of Scythian matters recorded in Greek literature, having their origins in the context of 8th-7th century Transcaucasia.

The third text is Stephanos' entry on the Ἄμαδόκοι, Σκυθικὸν ἔθνος, Ἑλλαδικὸς ἐν Σκυθικοῖς. Harmatta has argued that as the Amadokoi were known to neither Herodotos nor, judging from extant fragments, to Hekataios, they must have dwelt in the far north east near the 'new northern peoples first mentioned in Herodotus', the Irkai, Thyssagetai and Argempaiai. With the extension of the Greek horizon along Scythian trade-routes at the end of the 5th century, the tribe was heard of, and their name recorded for the first time by Hellanikos\textsuperscript{51}. As Harmatta's arguments are significant not only for the evaluation of Hellanikos' method, but also for the reconstruction of Central Asian ethnography, and the classical tradition of presenting this ethnography, the subject of the Amadokoi warrants special investigation.

The Amadokoi.

\textsuperscript{47} Harmatta, 'Мифические северные племена', 1951, p.96.
\textsuperscript{48} Ibid., pp.97-98; Rostovtzeff, Skythien und der Bosporus, 1931, pp.22-23; Phillips, 'Saneunos the Scythian', 1968, p.385.
\textsuperscript{49} See Phillips, ibid, p.386. This region was at the time dominated by 'Scythians', as is shown by researches summarizes by Sulimirski, 'Scythian Antiquities in Western Asia', 1954, pp.283, 286, 288-91 & 293.
\textsuperscript{51} Harmatta, 'Мифические северные племена', 1951, pp.108-9 & 110.
Though Harmatta noted in 1951 that the Amadokoi were not mentioned by Herodotos or by Hekataios\textsuperscript{52}, in any extant fragment of his work, in 1954 he addressed the problem of how to account for the many other contexts in which names very similar to Amadokoi are to be found\textsuperscript{53}. These names are as follows: 'Ἀμάδοκος is recorded as the name of several Thracian princes from the 4th to the 1st century B.C., \textit{Imadochi} is the name of tribe Pliny (VI.19-20) located along with the Essedones in the Caucasus, the \textit{Μοδακαί/Μοδακαί} is the name of a tribe Ptolemy (V.ix.16) located in north Sarmatia at the confluence of two branches of the Rha (the Volga and Kama), and 'Ἀμαδόκα is the name of lake Ptolemy (III.v.15 & 28) located next to the Borysthenes. These names Harmatta accounted for in the following way. The Thracian kings named 'Amadokos' borrowed there names from the Iranian-speaking Scythians, in whose language \textit{āmādaka} means 'eaters of raw meat'\textsuperscript{54}. Pliny's \textit{Imadochi} was intended to be direct transcription of Amadokoi but under the influence of the name which preceded it in the tribal catalogue, the \textit{Icatali}, the first vowel of Amadokoi was erroneously replaced with an 'I'. They came to be associated in Pliny's model with the Essedonians, who should live at the foot of the Rhipaians, by the linking of the Caucasus with the Rhipaians in the north\textsuperscript{55}. Ptolemy's 'Modokai' was the 2nd century A.D. Iranian form of the name. So many Iranian tribal names recorded earlier in Classical literature with an initial 'A' are recorded by Ptolemy without it, that the change may reflect the phonetic evolution of Iranian languages. The Modakoi were thus actually dwelling in the 2nd century A.D. at the confluence of the Volga and Kama, where Ptolemy located them\textsuperscript{56}. Ptolemy's lake 'Amadoka', so far from the Volga 'Modokai', probably took its name from an Iranian colony at the Borysthenes end of the Borysthenes-Volga trade route\textsuperscript{57}. Harmatta's conclusion is that the tribal-name 'Amadokoi' and all its variants, go back to the term Iranian speakers attached to the Uralic speaking peoples of the Volga-Kama region, the \textit{āmādaka}, 'eaters of raw meat'\textsuperscript{58}.

Though Harmatta has made a valiant attempt to accomodate all 'Amadokoi' variants into a single model, his arguments are far from clinching. Even if they understood a little Iranian, it is doubtful that Thracian kings would adopt a Scythian name meaning in Iranian 'eaters

\textsuperscript{52} Harmatta, 'Un peuple Finno-Ougrien dans la tradition de l'antiquité', 1954, pp.276-277.
\textsuperscript{53} Ibid., p.299.
\textsuperscript{54} Ibid., p.299.
\textsuperscript{55} Ibid., p.296.
\textsuperscript{56} Ibid., pp.295-6.
\textsuperscript{57} Ibid., p.297.
\textsuperscript{58} Ibid., pp.300-1.
of raw meat'. Even if Pliny had brought Imadochi and Essedoni together in the Caucasus out of a fallacious confusion of the Caucasus with the Rhipaians, as is possible, there are no grounds for associating the tribes of the Rhipaians with historical peoples on the Volga. The likelihood that Ptolemy was accurately reflecting contemporary Iranian pronunciation and that the Hekataian tribe still went by its only slightly changed name six centuries later is very small. Colonisation as an explanation of the association of the name not only with the Volga, but also with the Borysthenes, should be a last resort. Finally, linking the Amadokoi with a Finno-Ugrian group on grounds that the term is derived from an Iranian description of the tribe's customs, though not an invalid procedure, is a hazardous one.

Rather than supposing the tribe was originally located in the north, where Ptolemy located them, and were transferred to the south, where Pliny located them, and that this transference was the result of the Caucasus being confused with the northerly and mythical Rhipaians, the tribe might be thought to have been originally located in the Caucasus, where Pliny located them, and then transferred to the north, where Ptolemy located them. This transference might have been the result of the Rhipaians ceasing to be associated with the Caucasus, with which they were associated in the 7th century B.C. When, as a result of the expanding geographical horizon the concepts of the Rhipaians and the Caucasus separated, and the Rhipaians drifted northwards, several originally Caucasian tribal-names followed.

As has been argued in Chapter 1, in the 7th century B.C. the concepts of the Rhipaiian mountains and the Hyperboreans were probably associated with the Caucasus. The case in favour of seeing Hellanikos as playing an intermediary role in the literary tradition, and standing between those who associated the Amadokoi with the Caucasus and those who associated the tribal-names with much more distant lands, would be greatly strengthened should it be possible to establish that Hellanikos mentioned the tribal-name in the context of the Rhipaiian mountains and the Hyperboreans. There are reasons that this may have been the case.

Though Herodotos (IV.33-35) calls the Hyperborean ambassadors to Delphi Arge and Opis, and Hyperoche and Laodike, Pausanias (I.iv.4) calls them Hyperokhos and Amadokos. Thus though Stephanos said Hellanikos called the Amadokoi Scythians, there is a non-Herodotian association of the term with Hyperboreans. Could Hellanikos have been responsible for such an association? A strong case can be put for Hellanikos using the term Hyperborean quite freely.

Theodoret, clearly upon consulting Clement, wrote: καὶ γὰρ Ἑλλάνικος ἐν ταῖς ἱστορίαις ἐφ᾽ τοὺς Ὑπερβορεῖους...χρωμένους. Is it possible that Hellanikos used the 'Hyperboreans' as a generic term, as he seems to have used 'Skythai', perhaps even producing a Hyperborean ethnography in which Amadokoi Skythai featured? Aristotle seems to have consulted such an ethnography, but whether this was a Hekataian or Hellanikan work is impossible to say.

Damastes.

As a student of Hellanikos, it would seem appropriate to include Damastes in this study. Little is known about the life and writing of Damastes, and accordingly most scholars either fail to mention him, or do so but briefly. Damastes is, however, known to have written a work variously known as 'Ἐπικούρεια κατάλογον καὶ πόλεων, περὶ Εὐνύμνησιν and περὶ πΛΑΟΥΣ', and as Stephanos' entry under 'Ὑπερβορεῖοι makes clear, in this work he dealt with Scythians: 'Hyperboreoi, a tribe...But according to Damastes, in his Peri Ethnon, above the Scythians dwell the Issedonians, above these the Arimaspoi, and above the Arimaspoi the Rhipaian mountains, from which the Boreas blows. Snow never leaves them. Beyond these mountains Hyperboreans extend to the other sea'

Who was Damastes' source?

60 Theodoret, de Graecorum affectibus curandis disp. XII, vol.IV, p.1024.
61 See Chapter 9.
62 On Damastes life and works see Schwatz, 'Damastes', 1901, pp.2050-51, and Jacoby, FGrHist. 5. Rostovtzeff, Skythien und der Bosporus, 1931, p.4 mentions him only as one of the early contributors to the ethnographic conception of the north Black Sea region. Van Paassen, The Classical tradition of Geography, 1957, p.138 simply writes: 'Damastes, a contemporary of Herodotus, is said to have frequently taken Hecateus as an authority'.
63 T 1, F 1 and T 4 respectively.
Junge suggested Aristeas, without offering reasons, but perhaps upon consideration of the similarities between Damastes' ethnography and Aristeas' as preserved in Her. IV.1364. Hekataios, the other obvious candidate, is discounted by Junge for two reasons. Firstly, the description was too fable-like for one who 'so weit sehen können, ehrlich bemüht war, den Dingen auf den realen Grund zu kommen', and secondly, Damastes' \( \tau \iota \upsilon \nu \varepsilon \tau \varepsilon \rho \alpha \nu \theta \delta \lambda \alpha \sigma \alpha \nu \alpha \nu \) could be the same as Hekataios' ocean stream, to which Herodotos alluded in IV.3665. Neither reason is substantial. Hekataios may have been rational, but there is nothing fabulous about Damastes' catalogue. Hyperboreans were as much a part of rational geographies as the encircling ocean. The absence of griffons from Damastes' catalogue, particularly in the light of his reputation for romanticism, may even suggest a rationalising influence66. Just as Herodotos used both \( \theta \delta \lambda \alpha \sigma \sigma \alpha \) and \( \alpha \kappa \varepsilon \alpha \nu \delta \zeta \), so might have Hekataios, and Damastes' may well have found his \( \theta \delta \lambda \alpha \sigma \sigma \alpha \) in Hekataios' work.

Aristeas is a possible source, but so is Hekataios, and in the light of Agathemeros' claim that Damastes simply rewrote most of Hekataios' \emph{Periplous} 67, it is probable that Damastes' source was Hekataios, whose source in turn was Aristeas68. The above suspicion is reinforced with Agathemeros' claim that of Anaximander, Hekataios, Hellanikos and Damastes, Hellanikos alone did not illustrate his Periegesis with a map. As Anaximander and Hekataios are known to have done69, it is not only implied, but also probable that Damastes too did so. As Aristeas produced only a poem, Damastes almost certainly borrowed his map, along with his text, from Hekataios.

Having established the high probability that Damastes used Hekataios' work, Damastes' relationship with Hellanikos might be reviewed. When Porphyrios claimed Hellanikos composed his \emph{Barbarika Nomima} from the work of Herodotos and Damastes, he would seem to suggest that Hellanikos was their junior70. Hellanikos' use of Herodotos has been shown, however, to be improbable. Dionysios of Halikarnassos said Hellanikos was

---

64 Herodotos' catalogue varied only in the inclusion of Griffons, and Damastes' only in the inclusion of the Rhipaia and Boreas.
65 Junge, \emph{Saka-Studien}, 1939, p.19 and 46.
66 See Strabo I.iii.1.
67 5 F 4 = Agathemeros I.1.
68 This is exactly the conclusion presented, though without any supporting arguments or discussion in the recent work by Lindegger, \emph{Griechische und römische Quellen zum Peripheren Tibet}, 1979, p.62.
69 Kirk and Raven, \emph{The Presocratic Philosophers}, 1971, pp.103-104.
70 5 F 5 = Porphyry. b. Euseb. PE X 3 p.466 B.
Herodotos' senior\textsuperscript{71}. The Souda said Damastes was Hellanikos' pupil\textsuperscript{72}. Such a relation as the Souda suggested would account for many of the resemblances between the two writers\textsuperscript{73}.

Conclusion.

It might be concluded that though Hellanikos' work on Scythians seems to be derived from Herodotos or original researches, it was derived primarily from the work of Hekataios. It might also be argued that Hellanikos' influence on the later Greek tradition of geography was stronger than usually supposed. He may not only have mediated in the transmission to Pliny VI.xix.50 of such names as Sacae, Massagetae, Arimaspi, Napaei, Palaei, Arimphaei, Imadochi and Essedones, but may have also mediated in the transmission to Strabo XI.vi.2 and Diodoros II.43 of such names as Sakai, Massagetai and Arimaspoi. Damastes, in all probability Hellanikos' student, would seem to have used both Hellanikos and Hekataios. Indeed, one of the lessons learnt from Hellanikos might have been how to use Hekataios\textsuperscript{74}.

\textsuperscript{72} 4 T 9 = 5 T 1.
\textsuperscript{73} Schwartz, 'Damastes', 1901, pp.2050-1 has Hellanikos the elder. See van Paassen, \textit{Classical Tradition}, 1957, p.231 on the correspondences between the scope of their works.
CHAPTER 4.

HIPPOKRATES AND THE SAUROMATAI.

Introduction.

There is a lengthy discussion of Sauromatai and Scythian matters in a treatise attributed to Hippokrates and entitled Περὶ ἀρώματος καὶ ὕδατος τῆς γῆς (On Airs, Waters and Places). An allusion in this treatise (ch.17) to Sauromatai west of the Don has brought Hippokrates treatise into a debate of great relevance to the present study. The debate over the ethnic, cultural and linguistic affinities of the people the ancient Greeks called the Sauromatai, over the date of the Sauromatai crossing of the Don and over the relationship between the people called Sauromatai and those later called Sarmatian. Accordingly, before turning to the Hippokratian material and considering its significance, a review of modern scholarly debate on these questions might be offered.

Sauromatians or Sarmatians.

In 1922 Rostovtzeff vigorously argued the separate historical and ethnic identity of the Sauromatai and the Sarmatians. He argued that the latter's origin was among the Saka-Massagetai of Central Asia, and that they first arrived on the middle Don in the second half of the 4th century B.C.1 The Sauromatai, on the other hand, he conceived of as being the earlier inhabitants of the Don, practicing γυναίκοκρατία, and not active west of the Tanais till absorbed by the later arrivals, to whom they gave a variant of their name. In 1926 Rostovtzeff offered a more detailed hypothesis of the Central Asian antecedents to the Sarmatian migrations, speculating upon the role of the tribe the Chinese called the Yüeh-chih in forcing one wave of polychrome working, Iranian-speaking, Saka after another across the south Russian steppes, while forcing other Saka down upon the Baktrian and Parthian Kingdoms and on into India2. Rostovtzeff argued the same theory in 19363. He believed the Sauromatai were not Sarmatian, though the names of both people were derived from the same original name 'Saruma'. He believed the Sauromatai were a mixture of Iranian Scythians and Gynaikokratic Maiotai, in sympathy with Herodotos' account of the Sauromatai origins. He does, however, add, that:

1 Rostovtzeff, *Iranians and Greeks in South Russia*, 1922, pp.112-115.
2 Rostovtzeff, Сарматские и индо-斯基фские древности, 1926, pp.256-258.
3 Rostovtzeff, 'Sarmatae and Parthians', 1936, pp.91-104.
There is no doubt—though we have no trustworthy tradition to prove it—that Sauromatian tribes often crossed the Don and engaged in war with their nominal overlords, the Scythians. Traces of these Eastern Scythians have been found in graves of the Scythian period in the region of the Dnieper.

Rostovtzeff's thesis of the Sauromatai's and Sarmatai's separate cultural identity was accepted by Grakov in 1927, but Rau's analysis of the material from the Volga and Urals encouraged Grakov to revise his position. In 1947, armed with the results of intense post-war excavations, Grakov produced a full refutation of Rostovtzeff's ideas. The refutation consisted of arguing three cases. The first was the unity of the culture in the vast Sauromatai-Sarmatian territories. The second was the similarity in funerary customs and women's social standing between the Sauromatai as described by Herodotos and the later Sarmatians as evident from archaeological evidence (though he appreciated that the number of graves of armed Sarmatian women was not enough enough to support the notion that they were a race of Amazons, he supposed that the martial role of women had seen a gradual decline since the days when the Sauromatai were first seen as Amazons). The third was the periodisation of Sauromatian-Sarmatian culture into the Sauromatian period (VII-IV cent. B.C.), early Sarmatian period (end of the IV-II cent. B.C.), middle Sarmatian period (end II cent. B.C.-11 cent. A.D.) and the late Sarmatian or Alan period (II-IV cent. A.D.).

The theory that Sauromatai and Sarmatians could not be distinguished penetrated relevant scholarship quickly. In 1955 Zgusta argued that Σαυροματάι and Σαρματάι were variants of the same name, just as the personal names Σαυρομάτης (the name of several Bosporan Kings) and Σαρμάτης (the 'Sarmatian' King in Polybius, XXVI, vi.13) were variants, and Αλάνου (Ptolemy III.v.19) and Αλάουι were clearly variants. In 1956 Tret'jakov and Mongait wrote:

'Sarmatians, or Sauromatai, as ancient writers 5th-3rd centuries B.C., call them, had already at the end of the 5th century, beginning of the 4th century B.C., begun to penetrate in various groups from the region of their original settlement to the right bank of the Don', and refer to the notices in Ps.Hippokrates and Ps.Skylax.

4 Ibid., p.92.
5 Rau, Die Gräber der frühe Eizenzeit, 1927, pp.84ff.
9 Tret'jakov & Mongajt, Очерки истории СССР, 1956, p.507.
Excavations at the other end of Eurasia, in the Altai and T’ien Shan mountains led the German ethnographer Jettmar to speculate in 1951 that in the period 1,000-700 B.C. there can here be found: ‘the qualities which we demand for the ancestors of the Nomad Scythians and Sauromatae’, clearly following the Soviets in choosing the word Sauromatae and not Sarmatians, but perhaps having some sympathy for Rostovtzeff’s theory of the Sarmatian’s eastern origins.10

K.F.Smimov followed up Grakov’s work.11 Though agreeing with Rostovtzeff that the Sauromatai crossed the Tanais at an early date, which upon consideration of Ps. Hippokrates’ statement (to be discussed in full later) he gives as the early 5th century12, he wrote in 1963:

‘In general we do not see the Sauromatae as part of the unknown tribes of the Azov area, which disappeared from the historical arena as a result of the invasion from the east of new Sarmatian tribes, but as a group of various Sarmatian tribes, on the basis of which the largest group, known in historical writing as the political unity of the Sarmatians, was formed, playing a significant role in the ancient history of Central Asia, and a still more important role in the north Caucasus and north Black Sea ...’13

Smirnov and Petreko believed this greater Sarmatian culture took its form from the mixture of Andronov and Srybnoi culture during the 8th and 7th centuries on the steppes east of the Don, near the Volga and south Urals, but had contacts with both the tribes of the forest steppe to the north and north-east, and with the Saka Massagetai tribes of the Aral and Khazakhs Regional of this culture, the Issedonians, whom Herodotos also described as giving women a privileged place in society were an ‘eastern Uralian’ variant.14 Though Smirnov, an archaeologist, writes: ‘The analysis of the written sources does not come into the problem of my researches’,15 he does attempt such an analysis. Rather than stoop to a philological investigation, however, Smirnov labels Herodotos’ and Diodoros’ accounts of

12 Ibid., 1957, p.8.
Sauromatai origins as fanciful and called upon the 'scientific disciplines of archaeology, anthropology and linguistics' to unravel the sense in the stories. In 1962 Gagloev, approaching the problem through an interest in the origin of the Alans, did stoop to a discussion of sources, but with no more success. After a sketch of the history of scholarly consideration of Scythian-Sarmatian-Alan relations, he undertook a survey of ancient literature. Unfortunately the overview was characterised by a complete lack of critical thought, every ancient equation between Scyths and other peoples being accepted as a reflection of some historical reality, leading to the conclusion:

'Thus, both Armenian historians, and Greco-Latin literary tradition stress the Scythian origin of the ruling dynasties in Parthia, Armenia, Bactria, and of the Alan-Massagetai of the northern Caucasus'

and that:

'on the basis of the strong correspondence of Greek, Latin, Armenian and Georgian historians, it is impossible not to come to the conclusion, that these historians stress the genetic link of the Alans with the Scythians...'

If this method of historical reconstruction were, however, pursued to its logical end, Scyths founded nearly every state on the Eurasian periphery. Turning to the specific question of the relationship between the Scyths and Sarmats, Gagloev refers to Herodotos, Hippokrates, Diodoros, Strabo, Curtius Rufus, Pliny, Julius Solinus and Pomponius Mela, concluding:

'that the classical authors clearly conceived of the ethnic affinity of the Scythians and Sarmatai and their affiliation with Iranians'

Notable here by its absence is critical historiography, and any distinction between the terms Sauromatai and Sarmatai and the concepts behind the terms. Nevertheless, in a discussion of Rostovtzeff's objections to the equating of the above terms, Gagloev makes the useful point that the lack of references to Sarmatian women need not be an obstacle to such an identification. He saw Sarmatian penetration of the Black Sea steppes as a gradual process, beginning in the 3rd century.

Meanwhile in 1963 Klein sought to explain the origins of the Scythian 'catacomb' burials in terms of local developments and the survival of a Bronze Age culture from the steppes.

16 Ibid, 1964, pp.188-191. Quotation from p.188.
18 Ibid., p.118 and 124. Several errors in spelling English and German titles suggests Gagloev did not have first hand familiarity with the European studies of the source material.
20 Ibid., p.129.
north of the Caucasus\textsuperscript{21}. Similarly, Sinitsyn suggests that the similarities between burials on the Dniepr and north Caucasus about 400 B.C. were due to the migration of the original Scythians from the Caucasus about 600 B.C.\textsuperscript{22} Such a delayed but abrupt autochthonous development is, however, most unlikely, and Sulimirski is perhaps correct in seeing these changes as a result of 5th and 4th century B.C. Sauromatai migrations from the country of the Don and lower Volga\textsuperscript{23}. In 1963, Sulimirski himself however had little success in reconstructing early Sarmatian history, attempting to correlate the Sarmatian crossing of the Don in the later half of the 4th century with either the growth of a Massagetai empire in the 3rd century B.C. (sic.), or 'the pressure from other [undefined] Sarmatian tribes further east'.

In 1966 A.P. Smirnov returned to K.F. Smirnov's hypothesis, arguing that the Scythian, Sauromatian and Saka cultures were similar, as they had a common origin, the Andronov culture\textsuperscript{24}, and that the Sauromatai were a conglomeration of tribes from the Volga and south Ural area\textsuperscript{25}, who began to penetrate Scythian territory in the 4th century B.C.\textsuperscript{26}.

In 1967 Jettmar points out that though the initial frontal attack on Rostovtseff's position was perhaps ideologically motivated, the later Soviet theory of a cultural unity in the region since the late Bronze Age, would seem correct\textsuperscript{27}. Sulimirski's major work on the Sarmatians in 1970, though suffering from many inconsistencies and weaknesses in the areas of philology and linguistics\textsuperscript{28}, did upon strength of archaeological evidence arrive at K.F. Smirnov's conclusion that the Sauromatai were the cultural predecessors of Sarmatians. K.F. Smirnov himself, in a review of Sulimirski's book, naturally enough agrees with Sulimirski on the origin of the Sarmatians, but does point out several unconvincing uses of archaeological and ethnic identifications\textsuperscript{29}.

\textsuperscript{23} Sulimirski, \textit{ibid.}, pp.102-3, 110.
\textsuperscript{24} A.P. Smirnov, \textit{Скифы}, 1966, p.93.
\textsuperscript{25} \textit{Ibid.}, p.88.
\textsuperscript{26} A curious date, considering it is arrived at upon consideration of Hippokrates' work. A.P. Smirnov, \textit{ibid.}, p.109.
\textsuperscript{27} Jettmar, \textit{Art of the Steppes}, 1967, p.59.
\textsuperscript{28} Particularly in what are perhaps over-confident mixings of archaeological, Greek, Chinese and Persian terms. In \textit{Art of the Steppes}, pp.82-84, for example, he writes of the development of a Prokhorwarka branch of Sauromatian culture under the influence of the Massagetae.
In 1971 Machinskij reviewed the earlier ideas of Rostovtzeff, Grakov and Smirnov on the subject of Sauromatians and Sarmatians, and came to the following conclusion: 

"...in the V-IV centuries a new nomad confederacy, known to the Greeks under the name of Sarmatians came from the east and took the stepes on the Tanais as the border between the Scythians and Sauromatai."

Later:

'along with some Sauromatai and Maiotian tribes, they drove westward, and by the end of the IV-III century, had taken the eastern and central part of old Scythia'30.

This conclusion would seem to accommodate both the earlier theories.

Machinskij makes two points of particular interest when he writes:

'It is hard to know whether the name "Sarmatians" was the newcomers' self appellation or whether they took it on uniting with the Sauromatai on the Don. It is hard to say who the chief force behind the later move westward into former Scythia was, the newcomers or the Sauromatai'31

As Machinskij is wise to point out, categoric answers to these questions are impossible. It is thus surprising that in answer to his own question, 'From where did the Sarmatians come?' Machinskij suggest 'the Issedonians', mention of whom ends at about the time that of the Sarmatians begins. As has been discussed in Chapter 2 above, 'Issedones' is a term belonging to a much earlier, and in all probability Caucasian, context and has no place in discussion of later Central Asian ethnography.

The debate as to when the Sauromatai-Sarmatians crossed the Don, is surprising not simply for the apparently esoteric nature of the question, but also for the very little attention given in the debate to the material discussed in Chapter 2, which suggests that the people originally called Σαυρομάται were closely associated with the Scythian activity both south of the Caucasus and west of the Don as early as the 6th century, and for the very little attention given to the methodological problems involved in approaching the subject.

In the above debate there are two main camps. There are those who conceive of a separate Sarmatian people, who only in the third century B.C. began crossing the Don, and who conceive of a relationship between the peoples called Sarmatians and those called Sauromatai, and upon the evidence of Ps.Skylax and Ps. Hippokrates the dating of the first crossing to the beginning of the 4th century. Herodotos, by stating so clearly that the Scythians lived to the west, and the Sauromatai to the east of the Tanais, has been

31 Ibid., p.50.
interpreted by a century of scholars as setting for the migration a *terminus post quern* of the end of the 5th century B.C. The indications in Herodotos to the contrary were ignored, and even those few who discussed Hippokrates' notice, assumed it referred to a post-Herodotean period. Discussion might now turn to the Hippokratic material itself.

**Hippokrates' work.**

At first sight the 'Scythian' section of the Hippokratic treatise 'On airs, water and places' (ch.17-22) seems totally independent of any literary tradition, be it Hekataian or Herodotean. Rostovtzeff concluded that 'Ohne Zweifel beruht dieser Traktat auf persönlichen Verkehr mit den Völkern, welche der Verfasser uns vorführt', calling the work 'Eine Perle ionischer Beobachtungskunst'. Subsequent Russian scholars adopted the same position. A.P.Smimov and Grakov, believing Hippokrates made no use of pre-existing literature, made uncritical use of his text. Zhebelev concurs with Rostovzeff, but noted a correspondence between Herodotos' and Hippokrates' work at one point, the account of the Enares.

Rostovzeff did, however, see the possibility of a strong literary influence in the treatise. The Soviet scholars, being interested in the treatise only as source for the study of Scythians and sensitive to the apparently new information, have been insensitive to historiographical problems. Thus El'nitskij, though offering a thorough coverage of classical references to the north, does not consider these in terms of literary traditions. Accordingly, he concludes his comparison of Ps. Hippokrates' account of *anari* and Herodotos' account of *anari*, Arimaspians and Amazons, with the simple comment that

---

35 Rostovzeff, *Skythen und der Bosporus*, 1931, p.24: 'Ohne die persönlich Bekanntschaft des Verfassers mit den Skythen leugen zu wollen, glaube ich doch, dass er, ebenso wie Herodot, auch literarische Quellen aus früher Zeit benutzt hat, aus welchen er einen beträchtlichen Teil seiner Kenntnisse geschöpft hat' and '...wenn er eine literarische Überlieferung benutzt had, so ist es jedenfalls eine gewesen, die einen ganz anderen Charakter trug als jene, welche wir bei den ionischen Historikern und Geographen finden.'
36 El'nitskij, Знания древних, 1961.
here we are meeting with a local culture and mythical motif, in various stages of their literary treatment, interpreted through ancient notions\(^37\).

Kallistov, who does seek to understand the relationships between the ancient writers does not discuss at any length Hippokrates' place in these relationships\(^38\). Gagloev and K.F. Smirnov both make but the briefest mention of Hippokrates' definition of the Sauromatai as Scythian\(^39\), Gagloev believing Herodotos and Hippokrates are in agreement on the Tanais separation of the Scythian and Sauromatai\(^40\). Moshkova, offered a one-sentence reference to Ps. Hippokrates when introducing his study of the identity of the Syrmatai and the probability of an early 4th century Sauromatai crossing of the Don, without arguing the relevance of the Hippokratic reference to his study\(^41\). Machinskij too, though recognising that the Amazon legends are associated with the Sauromatai by Herodotos and Hippokrates alike, and though offering a thorough review of scholarship on the chronological relationship between Hippokrates and Herodotos, offers no study of literary influences in Hippokrates work\(^42\). The Soviet scholars left the arguing of the case for a heavy literary influence to the western philologists, amongst whom Trüdinger, Aly, Jacoby, Diller and Pohlenz have all argued the derivation of various sections from either Herodotos, Hekataios or the 'Ionian tradition'\(^43\).

A detailed investigation here of the problem of date and authorship could do no more that lead the discussion to the same general conclusions to which most modern scholars have come. The text might be dated by form and style to the late 5th century\(^44\), and the author

\(^{37}\) *Ibid.*, pp.31-33. El'nitskij does not, however, attribute to Ps. Hippokrates the more definite characteristic of rationalising the Amazon myths in his account of the Sauromatai.

\(^{38}\) Kallistov, 'Античная литературная традиция', 1945, pp.182-197.


\(^{40}\) Gagloev, *ibid.*, p.127.

\(^{41}\) Moshkova, К вопросу о сирматах', 1977, p.208.


was probably one of the ἀτροποφισταὶ, perhaps of the Knidian school, numerous in this period.

Whether the historical Hippokrates was the author, the original collector of material from which the work was later fashioned, or neither, and whether the two parts of the treatise were originally two different works by two different authors, or not, can not be determined with any confidence. The determination of these questions is not, however, essential to the useful investigation of the treatise as a source on Scythian-Sauromatian ethnography. So with the above definition of the probabilities in mind, and with 'Hippokrates' henceforth being used as a convenient synonym for the actual author(s), discussion might now turn to Hippokrates' comments on the Sauromatai.

Hippokrates' Sauromatai.

Hippokrates opens Chapter 17 of his 'On airs, water and places' with the words: ἐν δὲ τῇ Ἐυρώπῃ ἔστιν ἔθνος Ἑλληνικός, ὁ περί τὴν λίμνην οἶκεῖ τὴν Μαυρίτιν διαφέρον τῶν ἐθνῶν τῶν δαλών Σαυρομάτων καλεύντα. This passage is immediately significant in two respects. Firstly, the Sauromatai are regarded as a Scythian tribe. Secondly, the Sauromatai are regarded as living in Europe. By locating the tribe in Europe, Hippokrates must have conceived of their location as west of the Maiotis and Tanais, for in ch.13 it is the Maiotis which is named as dividing the continents:

'As to the dwellers on the right of the summer rising of the sun up to Lake Maeotis, which is the boundary between Europe and Asia, their condition is as follows...'

Pohlenz, who has here recognised a problem, defines the problem as an inconsistency between Hippokrates' conception of the tribe being in Europe, and Herodotos' conception

47 For a detailed discussion on the material in Hippokrates' treatise which deals more with the western Scythians than with the eastern, see Gardiner-Garden, Two conceptions of the Royal Scythian Empire, M.A. thesis, 1981, Chapter 4.
of the tribe as being in Asia\textsuperscript{48}. This is not the problem. Herodotos at no point says the Sauromatai are to be found in Asia, nor while dealing with the northern tribes does he attempt to divide any of them between Europe and Asia. In fact, as it appears Herodotos favoured the definition of the Phasis as the border between the continents, the Sauromatai may have been conceived by Herodotos to be in Europe\textsuperscript{49}. The problem is rather in Herodotos locating the tribe east of the Tanais, while Hippokrates, for the reason indicated above, must have conceived of them as living west of the Tanais.

There are three possible explanations for the differences in Hippokrates' and Herodotos' conceptions, as detected above. Firstly, Hippokrates is at this point writing loosely and did not mean to place the Sauromatai in Europe. Pohlenz suggests that Hippokrates was more concerned with other matters\textsuperscript{50}. Levine believed Hippokrates considered the Makrokephaloi, Phasis dwellers and Scythians all to be European need not imply habitation west of the Maiotis, for the first of the above two people are clearly considered east of the Maiotis-Pontos\textsuperscript{51}. Secondly, Hippokrates, wishing to designate the Sauromatai as Scythians for the sake of preserving his medical theory, overlooked the fact that this group of Scythians actually lived east of the Tanais, and placed the people in Europe, west of the Tanais, where they could dwell with the 'other Scythians'. Thirdly, the tribe Herodotos called 'Sauromatai' had, late in the 5th century, migrated from the east to the west of the Don, where the treatise located them.

As the continental division of medical subjects was of paramount importance to the treatise\textsuperscript{52}, and as Levine's claim is simply insupportable, the Makrokephaloi and Phasis

\textsuperscript{48}Pohlenz, \textit{Hippokrates}, 1938, p.19. He later suggests (p.45) 'Das Verhältnis zu Herodot ist leider nicht eindeutig zu bestimmen. Bei der Schilderung der Sauromaten gehen beide auf die ältere ethnographische Literatur zurück'. The Soviet archaeologist Anfinov, 'Племена Прикубанья в Сарматское время', 1949, p.241, on the contrary, claims that Herodotos and the author of this treatise place the Sauromatai in the same place, around the Maiotis.

\textsuperscript{49}Her.IV.36-38. See also Chapter 2.

\textsuperscript{50}Pohlenz, \textit{Hippokrates}, 1938, p.19.

\textsuperscript{51}Levine, \textit{Hippocrates}, 1971, p.137.

\textsuperscript{52}This is not simply a recurring theme, it is Hippokrates' explicit starting point (ch.12): 'Now I intend to compare Asia and Europe, and to show how they differ in every respect, and how the nations of the one differ entirely in physique from those of the other.
dwellers very clearly being designated as Asian\textsuperscript{53}, it is difficult to accredit the first possibility with much probability. It is to be admitted that in the tract it is not always easy to fathom the author’s conception of the continental division. Where for example, is ‘the right of the summer risings of the sun up to Lake Maiotis’?\textsuperscript{54} The question is neither asked nor answered by any modern scholar, yet it is surely a significant question. It is clear from other passages in the work that the sunrises were supposed to have a definite position. Asia Minor was believed to lie along the equatorial axis of the map, Scythia along the north (across the summer equinox) and Egypt and Libya opposite along the south (across the winter equinox)\textsuperscript{55}. If, like Epheroros’ map\textsuperscript{56}, Hippokrates’ was orientated south-north and the words ‘Summer rising’, ‘Winter rising’ etc. were written on the border, then the sense of ‘right of the summer risings of the sun’ is immediately evident. It was a reference to the lands of north Asia from the eastern extremity, westward as far as the Maiotis, Hippokrates’ continental border.

There can be, therefore, no doubt that Hippokrates did conceive of the Makrokephaloi and Phasis dwellers as Asian, and the Sauromatai and other Scythians as Europeans, west of the Maiotis. The second explanation is more conceivable, but as the treatise seems nowhere else consciously to falsify circumstances for the benefit of theory, simply selecting evidence judiciously, this possibility too seems inappropriate.

The third of the above possibilities has been advanced by no Western Hippokratic scholar. It did, however, occur at an early date to Soviet Sakologists interested in the change in fourth century Scythian culture and the origin of the Sarmatians. Thus K.F. Smirnov wrote in 1957:

\textsuperscript{53} The description of these people falls between the passage (ch.13): ‘As to the dwellers on the right of the summer risings of the sun up to Lake Maiotis, which is the boundary between Europe and Asia, their condition is as follows...’ and the passage (ch.17): ‘Such is the condition of the inhabitants of Asia. And in Europe is a Scythian race, dwelling round Lake Maiotis, which differs form the other races. Their name is Sauromatai...’

\textsuperscript{54} εν δεξιή του χαίρου ἀναταλέουν θερινῶν μέχρι Μαίοτιδος λύμνης Jones notes, in the 1923 Loeb edition, p.108, n.3, that τῶν θερινῶν is Coray’s version. Most manuscripts have τῶν θερινῶν. A 15th century manuscript om its any qualifying word.

\textsuperscript{55} For example, in ch.12, Asia (i.e. Asia Minor): ‘lies towards the east midway between the risings of the sun.’ and in ch.19: ‘The sun comes nearest to them only at the end of its course, when it reaches the summer solstice, and then it warms them but slightly and for a short time’ See in particular Heidel’s discussion of the matter, The Frame of the Ancient Greek Maps, 1937 (1976), pp.19-20.

\textsuperscript{56} See Chapter 8.
'Not later than the end of the 5th century B.C. part of the Sauromatai crossed to the right bank of the Don, as we discover from the testimony of Hippokrates, locating them "in Europe" around the Maiotis lake57.

Similarly, Machinskij wrote in 1971 that though Hippokrates does not so much as hint at a migration, he does place the Sauromatai in Scythia, and thus, in the period of 10 to 20 years separating Herodotos and Hippokrates:

'a great bulk of Sauromatai must have moved from steppes east of the Tanais to "Scythian steppes" west of the Tanais...'.

Moskova, as noted above, would seem to have interpreted the line as evidence for an early 4th century migration of Sauromatai58.

The ramifications of this third explanation would go far beyond those of the other two, for it would not only be significant as a judgement upon the accuracy of the author and text. On this argument it would be possible to accept the text at face value. It would also be significant as an historical notice on western Eurasian tribal movements. More significantly still, this notice pushes back the dates for the Sauromatai migration to which some scholars came upon consideration of Skylax' reference to the Syrmatai, by half a century or more. Even if the circumstances have been simplified the original author of the treatise must have been aware of a large-scale Sauromatai presence west of the Don.

The second point of significance in these lines is the qualification of the words ἔθνος ἐχθρίκον with διαφέρου τὰν ἔθνεων τὰν ἄλλων. This is a formula characteristic of Ionian geographical writing which goes to some lengths to stress the individuality of people by emphasizing both their peculiar charateristics, and by contrasting these with those of other peoples59.

Several further questions are raised by the description of the Sauromatai. This description corresponds closely with the traditional description of the Amazons, as found for example in Herodotos60. Whereas Herodotos offered a lengthy account of how the Sauromatai

57 K.F.Smírov, Проблема происхождения', 1957, p.18.
59 e.g. Her.IV.104-107 & 117.
60 See Herodotos' description of the Amazon origin of the Saruomatai, IV.110-117. IV.117: 'In regard to marriage, it is the custom that no virgin weds till she has slain a man of the enemy; and some of them grow old and die unmarried, because they cannot fulfil the law' parallels Hippokrates ch.17.7: 'They do not lay aside their virginity until they have killed three of their enemies, and they do not marry before they have performed the traditional sacred rites.'
originated in a union of Scythians and Amazons, Hippokrates mentioned no such mixed origin. While Herodotos used the name 'Amazon' to designate these warrior women but did not apply to the name the usual derivation α-μωτριξ (breastless), Hippokrates does not call these women Amazons, but does record the fact that they have no right breast. The reason for these differences may be that Hippokrates did not take his account of the Sauromatai from Herodotos, as a superficial comparison of the respective texts may suggest. Postulating a fuller common source might account both for the great similarities and slight dissimilarities between Hippokrates' and Herodotos' account. It is unclear who Hippokrates and Herodotos might have been using when describing the Sauromatai in Amazon terms, but the prime candidate must be Hekataios.

The more general question of why Hippokrates, omitting any description of the Sauromatai men, the physique of either sex and of the region's climate and topography should have bothered at all to include the Sauromatai in his treatise is raised by Levine, but left unanswered. The answer is not, however, difficult to find. As both Pohlenz and Heinimann suggest, the tribe is mentioned for the same reason as are the Makrokephaloi, their peculiar abnormality (in the case of the Sauromatai, the absence of the right breast) can be explained by νόμος (custom). This offers a contrast to the description of the people of the Phasis whose physical appearance and constitution is determined primarily by environment. For Hippokrates, both environment and νόμος played important roles in the formation of the φυσικής. Both these factors have been introduced in the discussion of the Phasis-dwellers, the Makrokephaloi and Sauromatai, as both are postulated as responsible for the determination of the physical constitution of the Scythians. The

---

61 Her.IV.110-117.
62 Hippokrates ch.17.12: They have no right breast; for while they are yet babies their mothers make red-hot a bronze instrument constructed for this very purpose and apply it to the right breast and cauterise it, so that its growth is arrested, and all its strength and bulk are diverted to the right shoulder and right arm' Levine, *Hippocrates*, 1971, p.142, having raised the problem of the similarity between Hippokrates' Sauromatai and the Amazons, curiously goes on to write of Herodotos' Kallippidai. The relation between the Herodotean description of this tribe and the above problem is far from self-evident and is nowhere made clear.
64 Pohlenz, *Hippokrates*, 1938, p.19: 'Er erwähnt den Stamm aus dem gleichen Gründe wie vorher die Makrokephalen, weil er ihre abnorme Eigenart rational erklären kann: Auch hier wirkt der Nomos ein.' Heinimann, *Nomos und Physis*, 1945, p.17, in his interpretation of the treatise in terms of the role of νόμος and φυσικής comments on the text at this point with the remark, 'Es soll ein Beispiel für den Einfluss des νόμος auf die μορφή geben.'
65 Hipp. ch.15.
description of the Scythians followed immediately upon that of the Sauromatai and is in many ways the most significant and comprehensive case study made in the treatise.

It is, moreover, not as if the description of the Sauromatai is without medical value in its own right and includes no original information. As has been pointed out above, the Hippokratic account would not seem to be derived from Herodotos. Even where it appears closest to Herodotos' description of the Amazons it differs in several respects. Herodotos (IV.117) and following him, Mela (III.34) said a warrioress needs to kill one enemy before being permitted to marry. Hippokrates says three and goes on to add information which is not to be found in Herodotos:

'A woman who takes to herself a husband no longer rides, unless she is compelled to do so by a general expedition'66

Whether this material was extracted from Hekataios or collected first-hand is not clear. The account of how and why the right breast is cauterised is not only original but also an application of contemporary medical theory, which assumed strength could be so transferred. As Joly suggests, 'Ce phénomène de transfert n'a évidemment rien de scientifique, mais est bien dans la ligne de la médecine cnidienne'.

Conclusion.

It might be concluded that though Hippokrates' work on Scythians and Sauromatai, in all probability sketched by the historical Hippokrates but worked into its extant form by his students, seems to be derived from Herodotos, it was derived primarily from Hekataios' work and original researches. It might, moreover, be argued that though most modern scholars date the displacement of the Scythians west of the Don by a new 'Sauromatai-Sarmatian' group to the beginning of the 3rd century B.C., the Hippokratic treatise evinces knowledge of the Sauromatai west of the Don as early as the end of the 5th century B.C.

66 Hipp. ch.17. Cobet, 'Miscellanea, Philologica et Critica...', 1860, p.77 suggested the correction of the text 'An Amazon woman who takes (εφηνηταί) to herself a husband no longer rides' to '...who finds (εφηνηταί) herself a husband...' This is senseless moralistic perversion of the text. For a more sober study of the passage see Kuklina, "О воздухе, водах и местностях", 1970, pp.229-230.

CHAPTER 5.

THE PONTIC GREEKS AND THE MAIOTAI.

Introduction.

The same winds currents and technology which made possible the travels of Hekataios, Herodotos, Hippokrates and many other Ionian scholars, were also making possible the travels of Athenian merchants1. Such men as Sokrates, Plato, Xenophon, Lysias and Demosthenes lived in an age of growing Athenian interest in, and awareness of, the economic and political circumstances of the north Euxine cities, particularly those embraced within, what modern scholars have termed, 'the Bosporan Kingdom'.

The Persian Wars marked a turning point in the nature of Aegean-Euxine economic ties. With the foundation of the Athenian conferacy in 478 B.C., Athens came to control the Hellespont, Propontos and Thracian Bosporos. With the growth of a Bosporan confederacy under the 'Arkhaenaktidai' kings between 480 and 438 B.C., Pantikapaion came to control most of the trade from the north Pontic region. The end result was a shift in the balance of Aegean-Euxine trade. The major trade link ceased to be that between such Ionian cities as Miletos and such north-west Euxine cities as Olbia, and became that between Athens and the north-east Bosporan kingdom2. Of the miriad of commodities shipped between these two centres, that which played the most important role in the political and economic history of the ancient Greek world was without doubt the grain being shipped south to Athens3.

---

1 See Ch.1 at 100.
The start of the intense Bosporan-Athenian trading relationship seems to coincide with Spartokos' rise to power in 438/7 B.C., and this with Perikles' Pontic expedition. Having failed to secure grain imports from Egypt, Perikles seems to have sought to secure grain imports from the Euxine cities. To this end Athens involved herself in the internal affairs of several Euxine cities. Athenian involvement in the affairs of Heraklea is well documented and it is possible that it was at this time that the Athenians settled Nymphaion, which their admiral Gylon gave to the Bosporans in 405, just before the collapse of Athenian sea power. The Athenian presence in the Pontos may also have had something to do with the dynastic change at Pantikapaion. Whether the dynastic change was orchestrated by Athenians or was a reaction against Athenian manoeuvres is a matter of debate.

Whatever the answer to the above question, Athenian-Bosporan relations in the fourth century were exceedingly strong. Numerous texts and inscriptions testify to the great value Bosporans and Athenians alike placed on their trading relations. Demosthenes, for example, in his speech against Leptines' law repealing all tax exemptions, reveals that Leukon, ruler of the Bosporos, had exempted from taxes all grain carrying ships bound for Athens, and had supplied Athens even when supplies were short, while Athens had made Leukon an honourary Athenian citizen, and exempted from taxes all ships bound for the Bosporos. Deinarkhos, in his speech against Demosthenes, revealed that there had been a debate over whether the Bosporan rulers Satyros

---


6 V.D.Blavatskij, 'Архаический Боспор', 1954, p.43.

7 Rostovtzeff, in his *Iranians and Greeks in South Russia*, 1922, ppp.65-66 and 'The Bosporan Kingdom', 1930, pp.563-565 expresses the belief that Athens was 'anxious to control the two shores of the Kimmerian Bosporos in the same way in which she controlled the Thracian Bosporos' and associated the establishment of an Athenian cleruchy at Nymphaion on the west of the straits and perhaps also at Stratokleia on the east, with the foundation of the new dynasty at Pantikapaion. The remnants of the old dynasty may have taken refuge in Theodosia. See V.D.Blavatskij, *Arhaiceskij Bospor*, 1954, pp.44, *Anon. Periplus*, 77, and Isokrates, *Trapez*, 5.


and Gorgippos should have bronze statues set up in their honour\textsuperscript{10}, and a relief representing the two Bosporan rulers Spartokos and Pairisades was set up in the Piraeos in 346 B.C., along with the text of a decree reaffirming the Athenian commitment to honour Spartokids with crowns at each Panathenaea and to exempt them from taxes\textsuperscript{11}.

The Bosporan cities did not, however, trade with Athens alone. They traded vigorously with the tribesmen of the Crimea, Maiotis and Kuban region. Indeed, the success of their trade with Athens depended upon the success of their trade with neighbouring tribes, and vice-versa. This interrelation was clearly well appreciated by those merchants involved in the case for which Demosthenes wrote his 'Against Phormio' speech. Phormio had taken a ship load of goods to the Bosporos, but:

> 'finding that business in the Bosporos was bad owing to the war which had broken out between Pairisades and the Scythians, and that there was no market for the goods which he had brought, he was in great perplexity...'

It is in this context of increasing communications between Athens and the Bosporan Kingdom, and between the Bosporan Kingdom and the tribes in the Maiotis and Kuban region, that the fourth-century conception of the ethnography of this region can best be understood. This increasing communication and contact had profound effects on the culture of both the Bosporans and the Maiotian and Kuban tribes. The effects of this contact can be read in the Greek legends on Sindic coinage\textsuperscript{13}, the Iranian names of Bosporan citizens\textsuperscript{14}, the indigenous

\textsuperscript{10} Deinarkhos, Against Demosthenes, 43.
\textsuperscript{11} Tod. 167 (IG II.2.212 and Minns No.28).
\textsuperscript{12} Demosthenes, Against Phormio, 8. The interrelationship was clearly equally well appreciated by Zhebelev, who wrote in his 'Народы северного Причерноморья в античную эпоху', 1938, 1, p.161, that 'without close ties with the indigenous inhabitants Bosporos, Chersonesos and Olbia would not have survived, for they were dependent on them to a significant degree for all the requisites of their economic life.'
\textsuperscript{13} Scholarship on this subject includes the following important contributions. Krushkol, 'Золотая монета синдик', 1946, pp.164-5; Moshinskaja, 'О государстве синдов', 1946, pp.203-208; Shelov, 'Монеты синдов', 1949, pp.111ff; Shilov, 'Синдские монеты', 1951, pp.204ff; Zhebelev, Северное Причерноморье, 1953, pp.123 & 171; Berzin, 'Синдика, Боспор, и Афины', 1958, p.124.
\textsuperscript{14} Rostovtzeff, Iranians and Greeks, 1922, p.156. For a catalogue of Iranian personal names found on inscriptions from the north Pontic Greek cities see Zgusta, Die Personennamen griechischer Städte der nördlichen Schwarzmeerküste, 1955, pp.59-208. On Pantikapaion minting coins with such Scythian motives as griffons and on Crimean Scythians minting barbarised copies of local Greek issues in the 4th century B.C. see Shelov, 'К вопросу о взаимодействии греческих и местных культов в северном Причерноморье', 1950, pp.62-69.
the indigenous ceramics in Bosporan tombs\textsuperscript{15}, and the establishment of a Crimean Scythian state\textsuperscript{16}. It is, however, with the literary record of ethnographic conceptions that we are here primarily concerned.

Four records of these conceptions are Polyainos' account of a 'Maiotian' heroine's adventure, the official Bosporan inscriptions, the writings of Xenophon, and Diodoros' account of the Bosporan civil war of 310/9 B.C. These may now be examined in turn.

Polyainos' Tirgatao story.

Polyainos (VIII.55) offered the following story:

Tirgatao of Maiotis was married to Hekataios, king of the Sindoi, who dwelt a little inland from the Bosporos. Satyros, the tyrant of the Bosporos, brought back from exile this Hekataios, who had been banished from his kingdom, and gave to him in marriage his own daughter, demanding that he kill his previous wife. Since he was in love with the Maiotian woman, Hekataios could not bear to kill her, and shutting her up in a strong fort, he ordered that she live under guard. Tirgatao, however, evaded the guards and escaped. In great haste Hekataios, Satyros, and their men looked everywhere, for they were afraid lest she provoke the Maiotians to war, but they were unable to find her. The Maiotian woman, crossing deserts and rough tracks, hiding in the woods during the day and walking at night, came at last to the so-called Ixomatai, where there was a kingdom of her relatives. Since her father had died, she married the successor to the kingdom and provoked the Ixomatai to war. She won over many of the warlike tribes around the Maiotis, and she overran the Sindic land of Hekataios and ravaged the kingdom of Satyros, so that both sent messages of supplication, gave Satyros' son Metrodoros hostage and begged to be granted peace. She agreed, but they, though agreeing, did not in fact keep their oath, for Satyros persuaded two friends to flee as suppliants to her and to conspire against her. They fled, and Satyros demanded them back. She respected the law of supplication and often wrote back that she was assuring the suppliants of their safety. But they attacked her. While one was talking to her about important matters, the other drew his sword. But he mishit in his attack, her belt taking the full thrust. The guards came running and tortured them both. They confessed to the attack devised by the tyrant. Again Tirgatao waged war, slaying the hostage and filling the land with all the horror of rapacity and murder, till Satyros himself died in despair, and his son Gorgippos who succeeded to the kingdom, came himself as a suppliant, gave her enormous presents and put an end to the war\textsuperscript{17}.

\textsuperscript{15}See Maslennikov, \textit{Этнический состав населения Боспорских городов}, 1978, pp.24-37.


\textsuperscript{17}As the only English translation of this passage published to date is that in Shepherd, \textit{Polyaenus's Stratagems of War}, 1793 (1974), my own translation may here be of use.
There are several problems associated with consideration of this story. The first is establishing who the original source for the story may have been, and how the story came to take its present form. The second is assessing the story's historicity and determining the historical context of the events it relates. The third is interpreting the story as evidence on the nature of Bosporan, Sindic and Maiotian relations. The fourth is using the story to understand better the ancient ethnographic concepts of the Maiotian region.

The first problem is the story's historiographical passage. Rostovtzeff counted the story among a series of stories on the heroism of women (γυναικῶν ἀρετάς)\(^\text{18}\). This was popular literary form in the Hellenistic period, and Rostovtzeff argued that the story was a Hellenistic reworking, probably drawn by Polyainos from Douris' *Historiae*, of a Bosporan story, based in turn upon actual events\(^\text{19}\). Though the story would indeed seem to have been infused with Hellenistic rhetoric and moralising, for which Douris may be partly responsible, and to contain many historical elements, that it first took shape inside the Bosporan capital, Pantikapaion, is, however, doubtful.

An anti-Bosporan bias can be detected in the story. The writer's sympathies are clearly with the 'Maiotian' queen and not with the Bosporan King, who is called a tyrant. Considering the great lengths the Bosporan dynasts went to popularise themselves as 'Arkhons' of Bosporos and Theodosia, and 'Kings' of the Sindoi and Maiotai, the reference to Satyros as ὁ Βοσπόρου τύραννος strongly suggests a non-Bosporan hand in the composition or transmission of the story\(^\text{20}\). The hand may have been that of a chronicler writing in any of a dozen Pontic cities, but two cities stand out as distinct possibilities. The first is Khersonesos, where there would

---

18 Rostovtzeff, *Skythien und Bosporos*, 1931, p.118. Melber, 'Über die Quellen und den Wert der Strategemensammlung Polyäns', pp.654-660, the only scholar to date to produce a work dedicated to the study of Polyainos' sources, discusses at length Polyainos' stories of female heroism but omits all mention of the Tirgatao story.


seem to have been a school of history writing from the 3rd century B.C. onwards\textsuperscript{21}. The second possibility is Herakleia Pontika. This city had extensive connections with cities in the Crimea-Bosporan area, connections which Bosporan expansion threatened. Indeed, Heraklea conducted a major war with the Bosporan dynasts Leukon I and Satyros I\textsuperscript{22}. Burstein has suggested Herakleia Pontika went to Theodosia's aid to forstall a Bosporan take over of Khersonesos, an Herakleote colony, and gave up the war when the Spartokids guaranteed Khersonesos' autonomy\textsuperscript{23}. As there is no record of the Spartokids ever guaranteeing Khersonesos' autonomy, but there is numismatic evidence that Theodosia and Herakleia enjoyed a close economic relationship, it is more probable that Herakleia was struggling to preserve not just the autonomy of Khersonesos, but her own economic influence in the Bosporan region\textsuperscript{24}.

The second problem associated with this text is that of the historical context of the events related. The Satyros here mentioned was believed by Latyschev, to be Satyros I (c.433/32-389/88)\textsuperscript{25}. In 1913 Minns objected to such an identification on several grounds\textsuperscript{26}. Firstly, Harpokration (s.v. Theodosia) and a scholion on Demosthenes' \textit{Against Leptines} have Satyros I die at the siege of Theodosia and not in the Sindika. Secondly, the Ixomatai are not heard of again until much later. Thirdly, Metrodoros is a late type of name. Fourthly, inscriptions evidence suggests Satyros I was succeeded by Leukon, not Gorgippos.


\textsuperscript{24} See Zolotarev, \textit{Два типа редких монет Феодосии IV в. до н.э.}, 1984, pp.89-92. Phanegoria and Theodosia, both of which minted imitations of Heraklean coins before being taken over by the Spartokids, had clearly fallen under Heraklean influence at an early date.


\textsuperscript{26} Minns, \textit{Scythians and Greeks}, 1913, p.573.
In 1915 Rostovtzeff also doubted the identification of this Satyros with Satyros I, but on very different grounds. Having detected a heavy third century Hellenistic flavour in the story, Rostovtzeff believes it is more probable that the third century writer used a story associated with the reign of Satyros III than one associated with as early a king as Satyros I. Though continuing to detect a third century Hellenistic hand in the story's composition, by 1931 Rostovtzeff was more ready to admit the possibility that the original story dated back to the reign of Satyros I, and he adopted Latyschev's conclusion. It was not, however, till 1935 that Minns' objections to the early context were met in full.

In 1935 Werner argued the following case. Firstly, there is no contradiction between Polyainos' account of Satyros' dying of despair at the time of Tirgatao's invasion of the Sindika, and Harpokration's account of his death while besieging Theodosia. Secondly, there is no need to proscribe Ixomatai from the early fourth century just because they were active in the third century. Hekataios even makes mention of a tribe called 'Iξιβάται'. Thirdly, there can be no grounds for objecting to 'Metrodoros' when Herodotos (IV.138) gives such a name to a tyrant of Prokonnessos in Dareios' day. Finally there is no need to see this Gorgippas as other than the father of Kamasarye, wife of Pairisades I, Leukon I's son, and thus Leukon's contemporary nor to interpret Strabo XI.ii.10 as admitting only a recent Sindic independence, and excluding the possibility of the above dynast founding Gorgippia in about 389/83. Werner added that Gorgippas may have chosen a Sindic wife to consolidate his power. This may indeed be the reason for his daughter's marriage to Pairisades, and the reason the inscriptive record of the Gorgippas' rule was uncovered in Sindic lands.

27 Rostovtzeff, 'There is no contradiction between Polyainos and Harpokration', 1915, pp.32 & 58-77.
28 Rostovtzeff, Skythien und der Bosporus, 1931, p.119.
30 Rostovtzeff found this apparent contradiction difficult to remove, postulating two different traditions about Satyros' death.
31 Stephanos: 'Iξιβάται, ἐφυγός πρὸς τῇ Πόντῳ προσεχές τῇ Σινδικῇ Ἐξ Ἀγ.
32 IOSPE II.346.
33 Werner, 'Die Dynastie der Spartokiden', 1935, p.432, argues, upon numismatic grounds, that the town could not have been founded later than the first century B.C., and that as the town is not mentioned in the Periploi of Skylax and Artemidoro, but is mentioned by Strabo, whose source is Theophanes of Mytilene, the town could not have been founded earlier than the third century B.C. (though it is unclear how Artemidoro can be said not to have mentioned the town when his work is not extant). Indications that Gorgippas was himself ruler of Gorgippia might also be found in tile stamps and a gold cylinder found there bearing his name. See Minns, Scythians and Greeks, 1913, p.573 n.7.
34 Werner, ibid., 1935, p.440.
In 1951, though apparently ignorant of Werner's work, Harmatta adopted the same position by supporting Rostovtzeff's 1931 conclusion. In 1961 Werner reaffirmed his position in a brief account of Iaxomatai raids into the Sindika during the reign of Satyros. In 1974 Burstein wanted to take this dating for granted.

The only remaining problem is how to reconcile the story's reference to Gorgippus inheriting Satyros' throne with titulary and other evidence which suggests Leukon was Satyros' successor. Latyschev had suggested that Gorgippus inherited the throne but divided his kingdom into a European and an Asiatic half, giving the former to his brother to rule and keeping the latter as his own domain. In the latter he founded Gorgippia and left inscriptive records. Gorgippus died before Leukon. Leukon then assumed control of both halves of the Empire. The scenario was adopted by Werner in 1951 but in 1966 Ustinov saw the need to revise it. Ustinov argued that though Leukon and Gorgippus may have been brothers it is doubtful that the empire was ever simply split in two and that the legitimate Bosporan king would choose to rule only the Asiatic dominions. He concluded that Leukon probably inherited his father's throne, and installed his younger brother as ruler of Sindika, local puppets having failed to manage properly Spartokid interests. Of the two theories it is difficult to say which is the more useful.

The third problem associated with interpretation of the Polyainos story is the assessment it affords of Bosporan, Sindic and Maiotian relations. It has even been argued that Satyros, at a time when he should have been busy enough trying to take Theodosia, involved himself in Sindic affairs, not out of an unquenchable desire to expand his kingdom, but out of a desire to put in order his family's homeland. It has also been argued that as no source mentions a war

---

37 Burstein, 'The war between Heraclea Pontica and Leucon I', 1974, p.410. He is, however, a little ungenerous when he writes: 'Werner had no need to advance so complicated a hypothesis since he, like Latyschev and Beloch before him, had no difficulty in showing that Leucon I did, in fact, have a co-regent for part of his reign, namely, his brother Gorgippus...'. Werner's arguments were necessary to meet all of Minns' objections.
38 Latyschev, 'Краткий очерк истории Боспорского царства', 1909, p.76.
39 Werner, 'Die Dynastie der Spartokiden', 1935, pp.440-2. IOSPE II.343, in which Leukon is called 'Archon of Bosporos and Theodosia', might be early, while IOSPE II.6 and 7 might be late.
between the Bosporans and Sindoi, the formers' incorporation of the latter was a peaceful process, reflecting the states' common Hellenised natures and economic interests. Both arguments have major weaknesses.

In the first place, there is no evidence that the Spartokids came from the Sindika, and it is perhaps naive to assume that a powerful dynast would only involve himself in the affairs of another state for family reasons. The Kuban was an agriculturally much richer land than the Crimea, and control of the region would ensure a more secure Bosporan control of trade from the Euxine to the Maiotis. In the second, the Bosporan incorporation of the Sindika was probably anything but peaceful. As Blavatskaja and Ustinov have pointed out, it is possible to interpret Polyainos' story as evidence of substantial local Sindic resistance to the Bosporan annexation manoeuvres. Polyainos wrote that:

'Satyros, the tyrant of the Bosporos, brought back from exile this Hekataios, who had been banished from his kingdom, and gave to him in marriage his own daughter, thinking it proper for him to kill his previous wife [the Maiotian, Tirgatao].'

Artamonov suggests it was not impossible that Hekataios was dethroned by the same man who later reinstalled him, Satyros. This may have been so, had Hekataios' marriage with Tirgatao represented an alliance with the Iaxomatai, had the alliance been perceived by the Bosporans as a threat, and had Hekataios been reinstated by the Bosporans only after promising to change his politics, but this is unlikely to have been the case. If he had been in close alliance with the Iaxomatai and expelled by the Bosporans, he would not have been expected to have imprisoned the Iaxomatai princess and been reinstated by the Bosporans. It is much more likely that he had been expelled by an Iaxomatai raid and found a refuge in Pantikapaion. But why should the Iaxomatai expel a dynast with whom they had only recently sealed a marriage alliance? Though it is not impossible to imagine appropriate circumstances, there is one further possibility. Hekataios was not expelled by Satyros or the Iaxomatai. He was expelled by his own, or at least by one group of his own, people, the Sindoi.

The above passage might easily be interpreted as being a description of a conflict between two Sindic factions, one representing the interests of the Hellenized and pro-Bosporan elite, backed

---


44 Artamonov, 'К вопросу о происхождении боспорских спартокидов', 1949, p.37.
by Satyros and led by Hekataios (who not surprisingly has a very Greek name) and the other representing the interests of the local and perhaps slightly pro-Tirgatao native population, backed by the neighbouring Maiotian tribes. The native faction might have at one stage succeeded in expelling Hekataios, leaving his Maiotian wife unharmed and at liberty in the Sindika. The pro-Bosporan faction then succeeded in reinstalling Hekataios and having him reject his Maiotian wife in favour of Satyros’ daughter. It is possible that the Maiotai went to war, not simply to avenge the insult made on Tirgatao, but to resist the Bosporan Kingdom’s expansion into the agriculturally rich Kuban region— an expansion for which Hekataios was being made the local agent.

The fourth problem associated with Tirgatao’s story is assessing what the original author meant by ‘Iaxomatai’. Variants of the name are numerous. As Kamenetskiij points out, in Greek we find 'ιαζομαται 45, 'ιαζαμαται 46, 'ιαζαμαται 47, 'ιζιβαται 48 and in Latin, Ixamatae 49, Iaxamata 50, Exomatae 51, (Agamathas) and Asgomatae 52. The alternation of z and j, b and m and the relation of the Latin to the Greek forms was explained satisfactorily long ago by Müllenhoff 53. Yet does this mean that all the ancients who used one of these tribal names shared the same conception of the tribe they were designating, and could they in fact be said to be describing the same tribe?

There have been numerous attempts to identify the tribe so designated with other known tribes or tribal groups. The earliest identification was with ‘Sarmatians’. Ukert identified the tribe as Sarmatians in 1816 54. In 1892 Müllenhoff considered all names ending in -μαται, (Ixamatai, Sauromatai, Xarimatai) to be the names of Sarmatian people, and identified the Ixamatai with those who reappear later in the west under the name ‘ιαζωγιες, along side the Roxolanoi 55. Minns was of the same mind in 1913, adding that Polyainos makes them

45 Ps.Skymnos 874-5 and Ps.Arrian 72.
46 Ephoros in Stephanos, 'ιαζαμαται.
47 Ptolemy V.viii.16-25.
48 Hekataios in Stephanos, 'ιζιβαται.
49 Mela 1.19, 114.
50 Ammianus XXII.viii.31.
51 Valerius Flaccus 144.
52 Pliny VI.21.
Maiotian 'by mistake'\textsuperscript{56}. The alternative to 'Sarmatian' was soon seen to be 'pre-Sarmatian'. In 1931 Rostovtzeff associated the Hekataian \textit{Ixibatai} with the pre-Sarmatian Maiotian-Sauromatai\textsuperscript{57} and in 1936 described the Jazamatai/Jaxomatai as 'One of the most important and probably most hellenized Scytho-Maeotian tribes' who had been: 'driven out of their native country near the Sea of Azov and then conquered a part of the steppes between the Don and the Dnieper... Then they advanced again to the west, and since they were part of the Sauromatae of the earlier tradition they were the first to receive the name of Sarmatae'\textsuperscript{58}.

Rostovtzeff clearly believed the Ixamatai to be Sauromatian, which amounted to being a mixture of Iranian Scythians and Maiotian tribes.

The Sarmatian theory was revived by Gajdukevic, who in 1949 sought to make a distinction between the Maiotai, who live by agriculture and fishing on the Maiotis coast, and the Sarmatian nomads of the hinter-steppes, 'Jaxamaten, Siraker und anderen sarmatischen Stämmen'. He suggested that the Maiotians, fearing Bosporan intentions, allied themselves with the nomads (i.e. the Sarmatian Jaxamatai) to fall upon Satyros' Asiatic holdings, in particular the Sind, over which Satyros' son-in-law and puppet, Hekataios, ruled\textsuperscript{59}.

The Sauromatai label was used in 1951 by Harmatta. Though recognising the necessity of regarding Tirgatao as a Iaxomat, Harmatta concluded she was called a Maiotian 'because some of the Greek authors regarded the Ixomatae, too, as Maeotae... (but)... The Ixomatae were really one of the tribes of the Sauromatae...'\textsuperscript{60}. Similarly, in 1962 and 1963 K.F.Smimov conceived of both the Ixibatai and Iazamatai as Sauromatian tribes, but Smirnov managed to accomodate the Jazygi in his ethnographic model by seeing them as a Sarmatian tribe, formed on the basis of Sauromatai culture\textsuperscript{61}.

The Maiotian theory was revived in 1970 with Kamenetskij arguing five main points. Firstly, the Hekataios fragment in Stephanos' entry under '\textit{lξiβατα}', wherein the Ixibatai are said to dwell next to the Pontos, indicates the tribe's original homeland lay to the south of Sindika on the Euxine coast. Secondly, Demetrios of Kallatis identified the tribe as Maiotian in Ps.Skymnos 880. Thirdly, Polyainos called the tribe Maiotian and located them in the Kuban.

\textsuperscript{56} Minns, \textit{Skythians and Greeks}, 1913, pp.120-121.
\textsuperscript{58} Rostovtzeff, 'The Sarmatae and Parthian', 1936, p.92.
\textsuperscript{60} Harmatta, 'The Golden Bow', 1951, pp.118-119.
\textsuperscript{61} Smirnov, 'Repartition des tribus sarmates en Europe Orientale', 1962, p.3 and \textit{Савроматы поло жь и южного приураля}, 1963, p.6.
Fourthly, later references to a tribe on the Don only indicate a northerly migration. Fifthly, the 6th century, when the tribal name is first recorded, is too early for Sarmatians to be neighbours of the Sindā.

Four years later Vinogradov successfully countered nearly all Kamenetskiǐ's arguments. Firstly, Hekataios could easily have used 'Pontos' to designate the Maiotis as well as the Euxine, such a usage being found in Ps. Skylax 70. Secondly, there is no real opposition in Ps. Skymnos 880 between Demetrios' conceptions of Iaxamatai-Maiotai and Ephoros' conception of Sauromatai-Maiotai. The Maiotai were not necessarily even mentioned by Demetrios or Ephoros, the point really being the conceptual identity of the Iaxamatai and Sauromatai. Thirdly, Polyainos, though calling Tirgatao Maiotian and her father's tribe Iaxamatai, does not ever directly call the Iaxamatai Maiotian. It is, moreover, clear from the account of the long journey Tirgatao had to take from the Sindoi to the Iaxamatai, that the Sindoi and Iaxamatai were not close neighbours. Fourthly, the allusions in the works of Ps. Skymnos, Pliny, Mela and Ptolemy to the tribe on the eastern shore of the Maiotis, just south of the Tanais, can not all be dismissed as being allusions to a late location.

To Vinogradov's arguments may be added the following. Firstly, if the Iaxamatai were a local tribe, why are they not mentioned in the inscriptions of 370's which testify to Bosporan sovereignty over such peoples as the Sindoi and the 'Maiotian' tribes, the Dandaroi and Psessoi? It is inconceivable that the tribe which wrought such destruction in the 380's could be subdued within ten years and not even named as a subject. It is conceivable, however, that the devastation was, as Polyainos in fact suggests, the result of a long-distance raid. Secondly, though Vinogradov does not reply to Kamenetskiǐ's argument that the sixth century was too early for Sarmatians to be neighbours of the Sindi, there is a ready reply. Kamenetskiǐ's argument is with a fictitious foe. Though he finds modern references to the Iaxamatai as Sarmatians, he will not find any ancient reference to the Ixabatai as such. If those scholars who call the Iaxamatai Sarmatian were, as Kamenetskiǐ assumes, prepared to call the Ixabatai of the 6th century Sarmatians, then they would certainly not be helping to clarify the situation. This is not because 'Ixabatai' is only an early form of the name Iazamatai, but because the

64 Ibid., p.154.
65 Ibid., p.157.
66 Ibid., p.155-6.
67 See discussion in the section on official Bosporan inscriptions.
political affinities and ethnic composition of the tribe almost certainly changed in the intervening period.

In conclusion, it might be noted that there are three names most commonly used to label the Iaxomatai, 'Sauromatian', 'Maiotian' and 'Sarmatian', and two geographical locations most commonly proposed for the tribe, the Black Sea coast just south of the Sindika and the Azov coast just south of the lower Don. Ephoros clearly called the Iazabatai, 'Sauromatai', and Polyainos clearly considered the term Maiotian embraced the Iaxamatai, but there is little sense in us today making unqualified use of any of these labels or locations. It seems more useful to imagine the following. Hekataios, c.500 B.C., used the term 'Ixibatai' for a people dwelling on the Black Sea coast, whom Herodotos might have called Sauromatai. The term then assumed different associations. A Pontic historian of the 4th century B.C. used a variant form of the older tribal name, Iaxomatai, to designate a new people, perhaps the old Ixabatai under control of those invaders from the lower Volga who are usually known as Sarmatians.

One other element that links the Iaxomatai back to those people Herodotos called Sauromatai is the element of matriarchy. The Greeks were intrigued at an early date by the position of women in Sauromatai society. Their descriptions and history of the Sauromatai are thoroughly permeated by Amazon imagery and legend68. In 1947 Grakov brought forward archaeological evidence that in this society women really did bear arms69. Polyainos' Tirgatao story can be interpreted against this background. In 1951 Harmatta pointed out that though Tirgatao had married her father's successor:

'It is Tirgatao who persuades the Ixomatae to start the war, who negotiates with Hecataeus and Satyrus, who concludes peace; the attempt of the hirelings suborned by the king of Bosporus is made on her life, it is she who starts the war again and finally concluded peace with Gorgippos...'70.

Though it may be necessary to allow for literary licence in playing up the role of the woman to conjure Amazon images, it is significant that the husband was the dead king's successor. This Harmatta explains as:

'an intermediate form between the matrilineal and the patrilineal system with regard to succession to the ruler's or leader's office, viz. with the so-called indirect matrilineal succession in which succession is on the female line, but the rights of the woman


69 Grakov, Гуаіокротоумевол (Пережетики матриархата и сарматов),1947, pp.106ff.

devolve partly or entirely upon her husband, so that, in effect, power of inheritance goes from the father-in-law to the son-in-law.\footnote{Ibid.}

Tirgatao was energetic enough to exercise real power, and the society matriarchal enough for the husband to accept only nominal power.

There is one element of Polyainos' account which Harmatta ignores. Tirgatao's father had died and been succeeded before she herself married the successor.\footnote{The lines are as follows: τὸν μὲν δὴ πατέρα τετελευτηκότα κατέλαβε τῇ δὲ διαδεξαμένη τῇ ἀρχῆν συνοικηκάσα. Though there is no word in the text for the 'afterwards'} According to Harmatta's model the old king's successor should have been Tirgatao's actual husband, Hekataios. Clearly Hekataios' honeymoon period with the Iaxamatai did not last a day longer than his honeymoon with Tirgatao. Hekataios did not seek Iaxamatai aid to be reinstalled, so had probably fallen from their favour before his expulsion. As suggested earlier, the Iaxamatai and maybe even Tirgatao, may have had a hand in his expulsion. The Iaxamatai king probably died in a period when Hekataios was enjoying favour only among the Bosporans. The importance of his alliance with Tirgatao and the Iaxamatai had clearly been reevaluated by Hekataios. When Tirgatao's father died in her absence, the Iaxamatai saw no need to elect Hekataios their new king. This would have meant subjecting themselves to the pro-Bosporan Sindic faction. They elected their own king, and Tirgatao had to marry him upon her return. He became the nominal head and she the effective one.

The name 'Tirgatao' has itself been seen to suggest that this princess acted in the capacity of a military leader. The etymologies from Iranian offered by Miller, Minns, Vasmer and Harmatta, \textit{tigra + tavah} 'arrow/sharp + power/strong', might not only reflect her status as a woman warrior,\footnote{Miller, \textit{Oсетинские этюды}, 1887, III, p.27; Minns, \textit{Scythians and Greeks}, 1913, p.39; Vasmer, \textit{Die Iranier in Südrussland}, 1923, p.54; Harmatta, 'The Golden Bow', 1951, p.120, who suggests a semantic equivalence with 'śubala' in Rig-veda VI.75.9, 'strong, powerful through the arrow' and translates 'Tirgatao' as 'die Kraft des Pfeiles habend' or 'durch den Pfeil Kraft habend'.} but, if 'arrow' is here a symbol from the tribe, the etymologies might also reflect her status as tribal leader.\footnote{See Harmatta's lengthy study of such symbolism among Eurasian and Near Eastern people, in 'The Golden Bow', 1956, pp.107-149.} The Iranian etymology is, however, far from certain.

Names similar to 'Tirgatao' occur in two Caucasian contexts. Lukian has a certain Tigrapatès ruler of the Caucasian tribe the Lazoi, and clay tablets from Alala* of the 2nd millenium B.C.
Mitanni preserve the feminine name 'Tirgutawiya'. Though it is possible that the King of a Caucasian peoples in the Hellenistic period might have an Iranian name, it is impossible that a Mitannian in the 2nd millennium B.C. would. Should 'Tirgatao' be regarded as a Caucasian name, and should this have actually been the name of the Iaxomatai princess about whom Polyainos offers his story, then the Ixomatai may have been the Ixbatai of Hekataios. The Ixbatai may have migrated north from the Caucasus with the Scythian horde returning from the Near East, but sometime between this 6th century migration and the 4th century events which Polyainos related they received an Iranian ruling group and came to be known as by an Iranian form of their tribal-name. This scenario would fit in well with the scenarios of significant Caucasian Iranian mixing, both as the Scythians crossed southwards over the Caucasus in the 7th century and as they returned northwards over the Caucasus in the 6th.

Though Polyainos' Ixamatai might seem to culturally resemble Herodotos' Sauromatai, they seem also to fall within Herodotos' definition of Maiotians. While Herodotos frequently (IV.21, 57, 102, 110 & 116-122) listed Sauromatai in his catalogue of tribes to the east of the Scythians, commencing at the Tanais, in IV.123 he claimed that beyond the Sauromatai and Boudinoi dwell the Thyssagetai and that:

> 'four great rivers flow from their country through the land of the Maeotians and issue into the lake called the Maeotian; their names are Lycus, Ourus, Tanais, Syrgis'.

As these rivers were probably a strict enumeration from east to west, it is possible that the land of the Maiotians was conceived of as straddling the Tanais, and not confined to the Asiatic shore of the Maionitios. It is probable, therefore, as El'init'skiy believes, that:

> 'In the mouths of the ancient Ionian geographers, who were serving in this case as the source for Herodotos, the word probably had a territorial, but not a tribal significance'.

Similarly, Strabo writes:

> 'Among the Maecotae are the Sindi themselves, Dandarii, Toreatae, Agri, and Arrechi, and also the Tarpeis, Obidiaceni, Sittaceni, Dosi, and several others. Among these belong also the Aspurgiani, who live between Phanagoria and Gorgipia, with a stretch of five hundred stadia.'

---


76 See Chapters 1 and 2.


78 Strabo XI.ii.11. His source was probably Artemidoros of Ephoros, writing as the end of the 2nd century B.C. Cf. Strabo's citation of Artemidoros in XI.ii.14; Shilov, 'О расселении мелитских племен', 1950, p.109.
The *Periplus* nature of the description makes it clear that 'Maiotai' simply designated tribes about the Maiotis coast, while the subsequent account of those τῶν τῶν ἱπποσκοπῶν Μαίοταν τῶν Αστερευτῶν who were later subjected to the Tanaites, makes it clear that 'European' Maiotians, west of the Tanais, were conceivable. To most early fourth century travellers, geographers and historians, 'Maiotai' might then be related to 'Sauromatai' in the way that a generic designation of all people in a wide geographical region might be related to the particular designation of one group in that region.

It was only with some difficulty that after Satyros' death Leukon managed to take Theodosia. Herakleia Pontika had come to the city's aid with a major force of forty ships, no doubt fearing the economic consequences of Pantikapaion gaining a monopoly on Crimean trade. Polyainos' account of this war in VI.4, is significant not least for its reference to Leukon's use of Scythian troops, whose foreign identity Leukon clearly sought to exploit when threatening to use them against his own hoplites if they did not stand their ground. Good relations with the Scythians, control over Theodosia and the Sindika, must all have contributed to the vigorous trade in Leukon's reign between Athens and the Bosporos. There is no more colourful illustration of the close economic relationship between Athens and Leukon's Bosporan Kingdom than Demosthenes' speech against a law which would cancel tax exemptions granted to such benefactors of Athens as Leukon. These same factors, along with the possible retirement of the Iaxomatai from the west Kuban, may have also aided Leukon in expanding his Asiatic dominion.

**Bosporan Inscriptions.**

---

79 Ps. Aristotle, *Oeconomica* II.ii.8; Polyainos IX.iii.4. Burstein, 'The War between Heraclea Pontica and Leucon I', 1974, pp.401-406, argues at length that the war these sources describe must be dated to the early years of Leukon's reign, and was directly responsible for the grain price increase and commercial difficulties recorded by Lysias, *Against the Corn Dealers*, 14 and Demosthenes XXXIV,8. See also Burstein, *Outpost of Hellenism*, 1976, pp.42-45 and Zolatarev, 'Два типа редких монет *Θεόδοσια*, 1984, pp.89-93.

80 Polyainos VI.4: 'The Heracleotes made an expedition with many ships and were disembarking where ever they wanted. Leukon seeing that his soldiers were cowardly and not resisting, drew up the hoplites before the disembarkment of the enemy, and behind these to the rear, drew up the Scythians. He simply ordered the Scythians, should the hoplites shrink and allow the enemy to land, to immediately fire and to kill them'. Own translation.

To continue the investigation of 4th century conceptions of Maiotian ethnography and Bosporan-tribal relations into the mid-4th century, the discussion might turn from consideration of Polyainos' story to consideration of the official Bosporan inscriptions.

Though in one inscription Leukon is simply said to be 'Arkhon of Bosporos and Theodosia', this was probably erected early in his reign, and in the period of Gorgippus' rule of the Sindika\(^\text{82}\). The inscriptions which have Leukon 'Arkhon of Bosporos, Theodosia and the Sindoi, and King of the Toretoi, Dandaroi and Psessoi' and 'Arkhon of Bosporos and Theodosia, and King of the Sindoi, Toretoi, Dandaroi and Psessoi', were probably erected after Gorgippus' death, when Leukon became sovereign of the Asiatic dominions as well\(^\text{83}\). The reference in one inscription to ruling the Sindoi as Arkhon, and in the other to ruling them as King, may not simply be a mason's error\(^\text{84}\). The difference may reflect a change in Bosporan-Sindic relations\(^\text{85}\). The nature of this change is, however, unclear. It is equally unclear whether Leukon simply inherited sovereignty of the Toretoi, Dandaroi and Psessoi from Gorgippus, who, after settling Sindic affairs, may have extended his Asiatic dominion to include these people, or whether he inherited no more than direct sovereignty over the Sindoi from Gorgippus, and conquered these other people himself.

Leukon's son and successor, Pairisades I reigned from c.349 to c.310 B.C. He is variously referred to in his inscriptions as 'Arkhon of Bosporos and Theodosia, and King of the Sindoi, Toretoi and Dandaroi\(^\text{86}\), 'Arkhon of Bosporos and Theodosia, and King of the Sindoi and all of the Maeotians\(^\text{87}\), 'Arkhon of Bosporos, Theodosia, and King of the Sindoi, all of the Maeotians, and Thatai\(^\text{88}\), and finally, as above with the addition of 'Doskoi'\(^\text{89}\). Clearly Pairisades' sovereign domain was initially comparable with his father's, though the title in all

\(^{82}\)IOSPE II, 343.


\(^{84}\)Zhebelev, 'Боспорские этюды', 1953, p.172 suggests the line should not have been '

\(^{85}\)Ustinov, 'К вопросу о присоединении синдик к боспорскому государству', 1966, p.130. Though an error of the magnitude Zhebelev, 'Боспорские этюды', 1953, p.172 suggests may easily enter a literary tradition, though Zhebelev says examples of such errors are often met in inscriptions, it seems unlikely that an error of this kind would be tolerated on an official inscription.

\(^{86}\)IOSPE II, 344; perhaps also IV, 419.

\(^{87}\)IOSPE II, 10; II, 11, 345; IV, 418.

\(^{88}\)IOSPE II, 5, 8, 346.

\(^{89}\)IOSPE II, 347.
but what were perhaps the earliest inscriptions, substitute $\text{Μαίωτος πάνυτυς}$ for Toretai, Dandari and Psessoi. Sovereignty over the Thatai and Doskoi must have been secured in his own reign.

Pairisades' titles give rise, however, to some questions. Why, for example, do they vary from Strabo XI.ii.11, firstly in not including the Sindoi and Doskoi among the Maiotians, and secondly in making separate mention of the Psessoi and Thates? These questions might be answered as follows. In the first place, Strabo included the Sindoi and the Doskoi among the Maiotian people, even though Pairisades' inscriptions did not, because Strabo used 'Maiotian' loosely for any peoples dwelling on the Maiotian coast, while the inscriptions used 'Maiotian' in the narrower sense of the Toretai, Dandaroi and Psessoi. The Bosporans, of necessity more sensitive to local political, ethnic and linguistic distinctions than either Strabo or his source, distinguished the more hellenized, dynastically related, economically important, and to some degree geographically isolated Sindoi\textsuperscript{90} from other east Azov peoples, and distinguished the recently conquered Doskoi, from the long ago conquered Toretai, Dandaroi and Psessoi. In the second place Strabo probably omitted to list among the Maiotians the Psessoi and Thates, peoples mentioned in the inscriptions, not because he did not consider them Maiotian, but because he did not intend his list to be exhaustive. The list ended with έλλαοι παέ ύους. Though Shilov has argued that the omission suggests the tribes lived inland and not on the Maiotian coast\textsuperscript{91}, it might be noted that Pairisades clearly included Psessoi under 'Maiotian' and that Mela (I.114) located the Thatai on the Maiotian coast.

One other question posed by Pairisades' inscriptions is whether, in the absence of any literary reference to wars between Pairisades and such peoples as the Thatai and Doskoi, it ought be assumed that the expansion of the Bosporan kingdom under Pairisades was achieved peacefully and without set backs? Though there are no records of wars with Thatai or Doskoi, Tod has astutely observed that in one of Pairisades' inscriptions (IOSPE II, 8) the tribal name preceding 'Thatai' has been erased\textsuperscript{92}. This erasure, Tod suggests, may have been because of a successful revolt. It may be possible to go still further than Tod, and suggest that as the Thatai are associated with the Doskoi at the end of another inscription (IOSPE II.347), it may have been the far-off Doskoi who at one stage revolted. The term 'Bosporos' is, surprisingly, absent from this inscription, and Pairisades is said to be simply the Arkhon of Theodosia.

\textsuperscript{90} On these aspects of the Sindoi-Bosporan relations see Boltunova, 'Поконечческий декрет из анары и некоторые вопросы истории Боспора', 1964, pp.145-149.

\textsuperscript{91} Shilov, 'О расселении ломских племен', 1950, pp.110 & 116.

\textsuperscript{92} Tod, Greek Historical Inscriptions, 1950, p.206.
Whether this means Pantikapaion had been temporarily wrestled from Pairisades' hands is unclear. Demosthenes reference in Against Phormio 8 to a war between Pairisades and the Scythians, probably a reference to a war with tribes in the Crimea, does, however, suggest that Pairisades expansionist policy met with resistance on at least one front. Thus, though the omission of Bosporos and the erasure of a tribal-name may evince nothing more than careless workmanship on the mason's behalf, it is more probable that they evince set-backs in Pairisades' program of expansion.

Xenophon.

Yet another avenue for the investigation of early 4th century conceptions of Maiotian ethnography is the work of Xenophon. Xenophon twice made remarks about Scythia of relevance to the study of Maiotian ethnography: firstly in his relatively early work, the Memorabilia II.i.10, and secondly, in his later Kyropaedia I.i.493. These references may now be discussed in turn.

In Xenophon's Memorabilia II.i.10 Sokrates is credited with claiming that 'In Europe the Scythians rule and the Maeotians are ruled'94. As Gajdukevic notes, this would seem to be an allusion to the Royal Scythian Empire95. There are, however, several problems with the passage. Skylax and the anonymous Periplous, both located the Maiotians next to the Sauromatai, the first tribe across the Tanais and in Asia96. The anonymous Periplous makes two further remarks. Firstly, that 'the tribe [of the Maiotians] is called Iazamates, as Demetrios said, (it is because of them that the Maiotis Lake is so called)'. Secondly, 'As Ephoros writes,
the tribe is called Sauromatai...'. Thus, the Maiotians are here conceived of as dwelling to the
east of the Maiotis, that is, across the Tanias and in Asia. In the Xenophon passage, Sokrates
spoke only of Europe. The apparent inconsistency may be resolved in any of four ways.

Firstly, Sokrates or his interpreter Xenophon, may have considered the Phasis the boundary
between Europe and Asia, consistent with a very wide body of thought, and the east Maiotis
coast thus part of Europe. Could Basileioi Scythians, however, have been overlords to tribes
east of the Maiotis at this time? Gajdukevic argues upon three grounds that they were97.
Firstly, although Herodotos (IV.21) described the Royal Scythian Empire as ending at the
Bosporan strait, he added that occasionally the Cimmerian Bosporos freezes and 'the Scythians
dwelling this side of the fosse lead armies over the ice, and drive their wains across to the land
of the Sindi'. Lukian (Toxaris 55) similarly refers to Scythians crossing into the Sindika.
Secondly, a Scythian presence east of the Maiotis during the later fifth century would seem to
be evident from the archaeological remains designated as exemplifying the 'Kuban culture'98.
Thirdly, Xenophon, in the above passage, implied the Scythians ruled tribes east of the
Maiotis99. The case is not convincing. The freezing of the Bosporos would not have been a
sufficiently reliable means of maintaining a Basileioi Empire east of the Bosporos, the Kuban
culture predated the period under consideration and Xenophon's passage is open to several
interpretations.

Secondly, perhaps it is the identity of both the Maiotians and Scythians which is being
confused. The Maiotians, it has been noted, were sometimes described as neighbours of the
Sauromatai and sometimes as a people embracing the Sauromatai, or even their simple
equivalent. The Sauromatai, were sometimes considered neighbours of the Scythians and
sometimes a Scythian tribe, or tribe ruled by Scythians. Given these possibilities, it is possible
that Sokrates' or Xenophon's source may have progressed from the concept of
Maiotian/Sauromatai identity to the concept of Maiotians as a tribe ruled by the Scythians. Why
then 'in Europe'?

Thirdly, and perhaps most probably, by Europe Xenophon meant the land west of the Tanais,
by Scythians he meant the Royal Scythians, and by Maiotians he meant the tribal group usually

97 Gajdukevic, Das bosporanische Reiche, 1949, p.41 Khazanov, 'Les Scythes et la
civilisation antique', 1982, pp.17-18 is of a similar opinion.
98 Gajdukevic, ibid., pp.41-42.
99 Ibid., pp.42-43.
termed the Sauromatai. Although Skylax and the Spartokids appear to have used the term Maiotai in the very narrow sense of some east Maiotian tribe, Sokrates and/or Xenophon may have been using the term in the older sense, discussed above, of any people bordering on the Maiotis, and thus even for people on the west Azov coast, ruled by the Royal Scythians? It is possible they were the same people Hippokrates called 'Sauromatian' and located in Europe.

The second Xenophon passage which may be examined is Kyropaedia I.i.4:

'...so that although there are very many Scythians, the Scythian [king] would not be able to master any other people, but is satisfied if he rules his own tribe'

As Xenophon later wrote in the same work that the tribes over which Kyros ruled included the Sakai, it is evident that he must have considered the Scythians as separate from the Sakai and is speaking in I.i.4 of a European tribe. Xenophon's conception here then is Herodotean and not Hekataian. The European nomads are Scythian, the Asian are Sakai. The concept of Scythians as an homogenous European people, subject to no other power and without subjects of their own, is not, however, consistent with that evident in the Memorabilia, where they rule the Maiotai. Why?

It is surprising how little consideration has been given in modern scholarly writing to this inconsistency. For the great majority of modern Xenophon scholars these passages in his 'lesser works' are of little significance, and thus left unconsidered. However, even works dealing with Xenophon's geographical conceptions, Sokrates' influence on Xenophon, and even those discussing in some detail Xenophon's Memorabilia and Kyropaedia, have neglected these passages and the challenge they present. Similarly more than a century of scholarship devoted to Scythian studies and even studies devoted exclusively to Maiotian

100 The term Maiotian may have been preffered to the term Sauromatai, having been popularised by the Bosporan Greeks.
102 ἄρθρος οὐ μὲν Σκύθης κατάπερ παμπάλλων ὑπάντων Σκυθῶν ἄλλοι μὲν οὐ δενδρὶ δύνατ' ἄν ἔθνους ἐπερεῖα, ἄγαπὴ η δὴν εἰ τοῦ ἔθνους ἅθρων διαλέγειν...  
103 Xenophon went on to write of other races ἐν τῇ ἔρυμπῃ which are similarly autonomous (including Thracians and Illyrians). He then contrasted these circumstances with circumstances in ἐν τῇ Ἀργά, where Kyros ruled many peoples and Xenophon included 'Sakai' in the long list.
105 Luccioni, Xenophon et le Socratisme, 1953.
106 Thus, though Strauss, Xenophon's Socrates , 1972, gives a commentary on Mem.II.i and the briefer Scythian passage in Mem.III.ix.2, he omits all mention of Scythians.
ethnography\textsuperscript{107}, have neglected Xenophon completely. Very few Scythian experts have noticed Xenophon's remarks\textsuperscript{108}, and to the present writer's knowledge none have noticed their inconsistency. The only scholar who seems to have noticed both passages and the inconsistency, the commentator Gigon, considered the inconsistency inexplicable\textsuperscript{109}. To understand how such an inconsistency may come about it is necessary to attempt an identification of the sources 'responsible' for the two conceptions.

The source of Mem.II.i.10, and whether Xenophon was here accurately reporting Sokrates, is very unclear\textsuperscript{110}. The present author will refrain from taking even the most tentative step into the complex field of Sokratic studies\textsuperscript{111}, but whether Sokrates was the immediate source or not, the key to the identification of the original source of the information may lie in the fact that it is the Maiotians who are described as Scythian subjects, and not any of the western tribes, of whom Hekataios and Herodotos make mention, Kallipidai, Alazones, Getai, Agathyrasi or Neuroi. The choice points to a contemporary Athenian source and not an earlier Ionian literary source\textsuperscript{112}. Given the diplomatic and commercial contacts between Athens and the Bosporus at the end of the fifth and in the early fourth century, first-hand reports on the tribes in the Maiotian region would have been readily available to Sokrates and Xenophon.

Mem. II.i.10 may be an accurate reflection of Sokrates' conception of the Scythians, a conception commonplace in his day. Other bits of commonplace conceptions can be found in Mem.III.ix.2, where Xenophon has Sokrates speak as follows:

'O of course Scythians and Thracians would not dare to take bronze shield and spear and fight Lakedaimonians; and of course Lakedaimonians would not be willing to face Thracians with leather shields and javelins, nor Scythians with bows for weapons'.

\textsuperscript{107} For example, Shilov, 'О расселении мёотских племен', 1950.
\textsuperscript{109} Gigon, \textit{Kommentar zum zweiten Buch von Xenophons Memorabilien}, 1956, p.31: 'Man möchte gerne wissen...auf wen die Nachricht, die Maioten seien die Utertanen der Skythen, zurückgeht. So weit ich sehe sich gar nichts darüber aussagen'.
\textsuperscript{110} e.g. Rostovtzeff, Skythien und der Bosporus, 1931, p.106.
\textsuperscript{111} For different understandings of the relationship between Xenophon and Sokrates see Breitenbach, 'Xenophen', pp.1769-76 and Guthrie, \textit{A History of Greek Philosophy}, III, 1969, pp.345-8.
\textsuperscript{112} As Gajdukevic notes, Das bosporanische Reich, 1949, pp.42-3: 'In diesem Satz spiegelt sich wahrscheinlich die nach Athen gelangte Nachricht wider, dass ein Teil der Maioten in Abhängigkeit von jener Gruppe der Nomaden-Skythen geraten sei, die am Kuban geblieben war'. 
The source for *Kyr. I.i.4* is not so easily discerned, particularly as the conception here evident is not historically appropriate. It is tempting to suppose Xenophon fabricated the statement for the purpose of his argument, but the reference to the Scythians as πολύ διάλεκτικον would seem to indicate some familiarity with, even dependence upon, the idealised conception of the Scythians, which stressed the nomads' number, invincibility and independence. Though the *Kyropaedia* defies precise dating, the work as a whole appears to be a reply to Plato's *Republic* on the problem of finding and educating leaders. It is this circumstance which may be responsible for Xenophon's new conception of Scythians.

Plato offers no evidence that he conceived of the Scythians in terms of a confederation or empire. He stressed rather the place of women in the society, and the relationship between the form of food production and climate on the one hand, and the form of the society on the other, clearly an Hippokratian inheritance. As Trüdinger points out, in formulating the 'ideal city' Plato contributed to the idealisation of tribal societies. Even though Riese argues that there is no trace of idealisation of northern peoples in Plato's dialogues, the use made of the Scythians in discussions challenging Greek values and systems, must have contributed to their subsequent idealisation.

---

113 For a review of the tradition which carried this conception see Meljukova, 'Античная литературная традиция о скифской нереволюционности', 1949, pp.105-110.

114 *Laws* 804 E, on Sauromatian women being trained for war, and 806 A on the Amazons. Strabo VII.i.7 reveals that Plato's work had also been drawn on in discussions of Scythian society (through Ephoros or Poseidonios?), claiming that the Scythians 'above all things have their wives and their children in common, in the Platonic way'. For Plato on βασιλική γυναικαί see *Rep.* 457 D, 458 C-D, 460 B-D, 540 and 543.

115 *Rep.* 370-372 & 435 E. Plato's polemic on the evils of living near the sea also became part of writings on Scythian society, for as Strabo adds to his idealised account of the people (VII.i.8); 'Moreover, Plato in his *Republic* thinks that those who would have a well governed city should flee as far as possible from the sea, as being a thing of wickedness, and should not live near it'. As the actual reference should be Plato's *Laws* (IV.704-5) and not the *Republic*, Plato had probably entered the discussion at an early stage and been misrepresented in later hands, either Strabo's or his source's. Similar remarks are found in Aristotle, *Politics*, VII.6.


117 In *Euthydemos* 299 E, as translated by Jowett, *The Dialogues of Plato*, 1970, '...and the Scythians reckon those who have gold in their own skulls to be the happiest (εὐσπαλιομεθατάτους) and bravest of men... and what is still more extraordinary, they drink out of their own skull's gilt, and see the inside of them, and hold their own head in their hands'. 
It may be that by the time Xenophon sat down to write the *Kyropaedia*, Plato had shown how to accommodate the northern nomads into a philosophical model. This accommodation was taken one step further shortly after Xenophon's death in the works of Ephoros and Theopompos. Ephoros was influenced by both new scientific and old idealised conceptions of the Royal Scythian Empire. Ephoros was able to reconcile the two conceptions by concluding that the Scyths did have subjects, but that they treated them justly. Xenophon was saved from having to rationalize the situation by his ignorance of the earlier and historically more accurate tradition, and was content to adopt the rather idealised notion of a society ruled by none and rulers over none\textsuperscript{118}.

Though Plato may be seen to have had an influence in the formulation of the conception of the Scythian state found in the *Kyropaedia*, the continuing influence of his early teacher, Sokrates, cannot be underestimated\textsuperscript{119}. Having forgotten the details of the conversation (purportedly between Sokrates and a certain Aristippos) which he had recorded in his *Memorabilia* some twenty years earlier, in his *Kyropaedia* Xenophon went on to detail what he then believed to be a Sokratic conception, not himself aware of the contradiction.

According to the Sokratic principles Xenophon believed he was applying in the later work, the Scyths had to be without subjects. Subjects were ruled only by those who deserved to rule them\textsuperscript{120}. That the Scyths ruled no one, highlighted the fact that in Asia all the peoples were subject to just one man, Kyros. Thus Kyros must have been of outstanding virtue. The point of *Kyr.* I. 1.4 is the superiority of Kyros' new monarchy over the older hereditary ones of Europe. In his reference to the Scyths Xenophon makes his point. The Scyths were simply used for the argument.

The difference between the conception of 'Scythian' found in the *Memorabilia* and that in the *Kyropaedia* may, therefore, be explained in terms of the former giving Sokrates' actual

\textsuperscript{118} This 4th century tendency to use the northern nomads in philosophy may be part of the same phenomenon Reverdin traced in his work 'Crise spirituelle et évasion', 1961, pp.83-166. After the Peloponnesian war there was an increasing tendency to turn to utopian ideas and to seek the embodiment of these ideas in foreign peoples.

\textsuperscript{119} On the Sokratic influence in Xenophon's *Kyropaedia* see Luccioni, *Les idées politiques et sociales de Xénophon*, 1949, pp.209-211 & 229-233, and *Xénophon et le Socratisme*, 1953, p.161 where Luccioni believes Kyros was to Xenophon both Sokrates' idea of an ideal monarch and Sokrates himself. In *Mem.* IV.6-12 Xenophon evidences his belief that Sokrates had sympathies with monarchy and in *Kyr.* III.1.16, Kyros appears as a 'Sokrates' for whom σοφοσεύτης was the most important virtue.

\textsuperscript{120} *Kyr.* VIII.1.37. Luccioni, *Xénophon et Socratisme*, 1953, p.155.
conception, derived from contemporary and common knowledge of the Maiotian region, and the later giving Xenophon's own, derived from contemporary philosophical conceptions (to which such Herodotean notions as a Royal Scythian Empire were alien) but couched in Herodotean terms (European 'Skythai', Asian 'Sakai').

Conclusion.

It might then be concluded that the study of the relationship between the Bosporan Kingdom and its tribal subjects and neighbours in the early to mid-4th century B.C. might be approached through various written records. Polyainos' Tirgatao story might offer a Khersonesian or Heraklean perspective on the relation, Bosporan inscriptions an official Spartokid perspective and Xenophon's geographical notes a mainland Greek perspective. It is noteworthy, that despite the close economic and political ties between the Athens and Bosporos, and between the Bosporos and the tribes of the Maiotian hinterland, during the first half of the 4th century, Xenophon is the only Mainland Greek who seems to have mentioned Maiotians, and he mentions them but vaguely. Though information on the Maiotis region had started to filter into Athens during the first half of the 4th century, this information was quickly brought under the control of literary tradition. The Bosporan Kings and the Khersonesian and Herakleote historians, however, saw a real political use for the very detailed information available to them.

Though the above records are brief and riddled with historiographical problems, it is possible to read in them the story of how Spartokid dynasts used their intermittently good relationship with the Scythians in the Crimea and philhellenic groups in the Sindika, to gradually incorporate into their Kingdom most of the tribes on the east Azov coast, and how this brought the Spartokids into direct, and often bloody contact with the newly arrived Sarmatian peoples, who were themselves attempting to use their intermittently good relations with Spartokid Dynasts and anti-Hellenic groups in the Sindika to incorporate into their confederacy the very same Maiotian peoples.

The late-4th century history of the tension between information about the Maiotis region and literary tradition and between an expanding Bosporan Kingdom and an expanding Sarmatian confederacy will be traced in Chapters 7, 8, 9 and 11.
CHAPTER 6.

KTESIAS AND THE EASTERN SCYTHIANS.

Introduction.

Ktesias, like his elder contemporary Hippokrates, was born into an Asklepiadai family and as an adult travelled widely. From his birth place of Knidos, Ktesias found his way to the Persian court, either in c.414 B.C. after enlisting in the army of the ill-fated rebel Pissuthnes, being captured by Tissaphernes and being turned over to Dareios II as a physician, or in 404 B.C. as one of the 300 Greeks who accompanied Kyros from Sardis to Babylon, where Dareios II lay dying and where he was retained by Dareios' successor, Kyros' elder brother, Artaxerxes II. In 401 B.C. Ktesias assisted Artaxerxes II at Kunaxa, while his younger contemporary, Xenophon, assisted, albeit in a different capacity, Kyros. After Artaxerxes' victory Ktesias was involved in several rounds of diplomatic activity, visiting Kyros' Greek mercenaries and the imprisoned Klearkhos, and acting as an intermediary between prominent Greeks and Persians as Sparta and Persia drifted towards war. Between his medical practice and diplomatic activity, and then upon his return to Knidos, Ktesias wrote numerous works. These included a περί Ίνδικα in 23 books, an Ἰνδικα in 3 books, a work entitled Περί τῶν κατὰ Ἀσίαν φόρων. In the extant fragments of these works, cited and uncited, there are numerous references to northern nomadic peoples and for this reason Ktesias' work demands considerable attention.

Unlike Hippokrates and Xenophon whose place in literary traditions and work on Scythians and Sauromatai has simply been ignored by modern scholars, Ktesias' work has the dubious distinction of actually being despised. Ktesias has been omitted from even the most extensive discussions of Scythians in classical literature. In other connections the


3 Rostovtzeff, Skythien, 1931; Borzsak, Die Kenntnisse des Altertums, 1936; Pearson, Early Ionian Historians, 1939; Ninck, Die Entdeckung von Europa, 1957; Müller, Geschichte der antiker Ethologie, 1972.
lowest of reputations is attributed to him by ancient⁴ and modern⁵ scholars alike. The identity of Ktesias' sources has been much debated, but their authority and credibility has generally been reckoned as low as Ktesias' own⁶.

A fairer judgement upon Ktesias' work is to be found in Bunbury, who though condemning the Indika as a 'tissue of fables' wrote that:

'Of the historical merits of the "Persica" in general, it does not fall within our province to speak; had the work been preserved to us in its entirety it would unquestionably have afforded us many interesting notices and casual details of a geographical character'⁷.

The suggestion that there may be some greater value still in Ktesias' work, has been made on only a few occasions⁸.

Whatever judgement might be passed on Ktesias' sources and method, his work offers a view from the heart of an empire which stretched from the Aegean to the Indus, from the Aral to Libya. The administrative centres of this empire, Sousa and Babylon were cosmopolitan cities and the royal residence, Persepolis, received embassies from all over the known world⁹. It is highly probable that Ktesias, attached to the Persian court for 17 years, came into contact with merchants, soldiers, and diplomats from the Central Asian...

---

⁵ Marquart, according to Henning, Zoroaster, 1951, p.21, called Ktesias 'The Father of Romances'. McCrindle wrote in his Ancient India as described by Ktesias, 1882 (1973), p.4, that 'Ktesias unfortunately was not only a great lover of the marvellous, but also singularly deficient, for one of his profession, in critical acumen' and that his work was 'little else than a tissue of fables and of absurd preverisions or exaggerations of the truth...'. See aslo Brown, The Greek Historians, 1973 and Drews, The Greek Accounts of Eastern History, 1973, pp.103-116. For a summary of further modern judgements see P'jankov, ibid., pp.28-30 and Gnoli, Sistan, 1967, p.95 n.5 and Zoroaster's Time and Homeland, 1980, p.92.
⁶ See the discussion of the matter in Jacoby, 'Ktesias', 1922, pp.2047-2051.
⁹ See for example Hicks, The Persians, 1979, pp.34-43, 107-131 and Dandamaev, 'Новые документы царского хозяйство в Иране', 1972, pp.3-27.
frontier provinces of Hyrkania and Baktria. Indeed, Ktesias referred to two Baktrians holding high positions in the court of Artaxerxes II, the King's eye, Artasyras, and the King's son-in-law, Orontes, and Xenophon refers to a large number of Hyrkanians in influential positions in Kyros' court. Though there are no records of Saka tribesmen rising to high office, Xenophon's story of a conversation between Kyros and a champion horsemen among his Saka troops does suggest that Saka horsemen were thought, at least in Xenophon's day, to have been stationed in the capitals from an early date. In Ktesias' day there were Hyrkanians, Baktrians and Saka troops serving in the Persian armies and Greeks living in Baktria and Sogdiana. Thus, though the stories Ktesias tells of the northern nomads might be nothing more than a 'tissue of fantasies', the fantasies were almost certainly not his alone. His fantasies may have been shared by others, and his accounts of events on the 'Central Asian' frontier, derived from those of others. Ktesias' stories and conceptions had, moreover, a strong influence on later scholarly writing on the subject. Ktesias' work fully deserves attention in the present study.

Investigation of Ktesias' conception of the history and ethnography of the 'eastern Scythians' and of the geography of the north might best be undertaken by examining the suspected Ktesian references to eastern Scythians in the order in which they would seem to have appeared in his Persika, and by examining the geographical conceptions implicit in the above Persika fragments and in suspected fragments of Ktesias' Periodos.

Ktesias' history.

Ktesias' Persika was a work in 23 books. The first 5 books covered the period from the establishment of the Assyrian Empire by Ninos to the end of the Median Empire, and may

10 Photius' epitome of Ktesias' Persika, ch. 50 & 57 respectively.
11 Xenophon, Kyropoedia IV.ii.8 and VIII.iv.25. This is doubtlessly anachronistic. Dareios I, who was satrap of Hyrkania before assuming the throne, probably brought most of the Hyrkanians to the capital. Xenophon's reference does, however, illustrate the capital's later cosmopolitan reputation.
12 Xenophon, Kyropoedia, VIII.iii.25-32.
14 Р'яницов, Средняя Азия в исследованиях античного историка Ктесис, 1975, pp.34-37. Dareios had carried off to Baktria the Greeks of Barka in Libya (Her.IV.204) and threatened to do the same to the daughters of the I onian rebels (Her.VI.9), while Xerxes had settled the Brankhidai of Didyma somewhere in Sogdiana (Strabo XI.xi.4, XIV.i.5, XVII.i.43).
have in some periods of the work's life been known under the separate title, Assyriaka. The next 6 were all devoted to the life and times of Kyros II. The final 12 books covered the period from the reign of Kambyses to the end of the eighth year of Artaxerxes II, Ktesias' employer.

Semiramis.

It was probably in Book I, after giving an account of Ninos' campaigns and the establishment of the Assyrian Empire, that Ktesias dealt with the Assyrian Queen Semiramis. Herodotos, Diodoros and Polyainos all mention this queen. Herodotos refers to her briefly in II.184, ascribing much less to her than to Nitokris. Diodoros, on the other hand, offers, in II.16-19, a lengthy account of how, after a miraculous birth, notable youth and marriage to the Assyrian noble Onnes, the Syrian-born Semiramis helped the Assyrians take the citadel of the Baktrian King Oxyartes, was appropriated by her infatuated king, Ninos, to whom she gave birth to a son, Ninyas, carried out an extensive building programme in Babylon, visited Egypt and Ethiopia, gathered a force in Baktoria, conducted an unsuccessful campaign against the Indian King Strabrobates, and then at the age of 62 disappeared. Ktesias is repeatedly cited as the source of this account. In II.20, however, Diodoros added that Athenaios and certain other historians are said to offer a different account, wherein she seized power from her husband. Polyainos' story in VIII.26 is different again:

'Semiramis, when in the bath, received intelligence of the revolt of the Sirakoi and, without waiting to have her sandals put on or her hair dressed, immediately left it, and took the field'.

A record she is said to have had inscribed on pillars included the following lines:

'I swayed the sceptre of Ninos: and extended my dominions to the river Hínamenes... and northward to the Sakai and the Sogdians...'.

The questions these stories pose are several. Was there an historical queen Semiramis of Assyria? What are the historical kernels to the above stories? Who were responsible for the various stages through which the story passed? These questions may now be discussed in turn.

15 Thus though most ancients seem to cite accounts of episodes falling within this period Ktesias' Persika, Strabo (XIV.ii.15) refers to two separate works, an Assyriaka and a Persika. On the structure of Ktesias' history see Jacoby, 'Ktesias', 1922, pp.2040-2043 and König, Die Persika des Ktesias, 1972, pp.28-33. In the study in hand episodes will be allocated to König's reconstruction, without arguments being offered on each occasion in support of these allocations.
There has never been any difficulty in seeing behind the name 'Semiramis' 'Sammuramat' the name of the wife of Shamsi-Adab V (824-811 B.C.) and mother of Adad-Nirari. Sammuramat's career has, however, provided Assyriologists with many difficulties. The first difficulty is that of determining Sammuramat's position in Assyria. Luckenbill, in his translation of, and commentary on, the Assur inscriptions, expresses the belief that Sammuramat acted as a regent for five years after her husband's death before her son, Adad-Nirari III, assumed full powers. Though this regent theory has been adopted by some historians, others have argued that this theory demands misreading the Nabu inscription and postulating an exception to all known Assyrian succession practices. The second difficulty is that of determining whether an Assyrian army was ever likely to have marched as far east as Semiramis is said to have marched. It has been suggested in Chapter that an organised Bactrian state may have in pre-Akhaemenid times. Ktesias' description, as it survives in Diodoros II.v-vii, of Baktriana in the pre-Akhaemenid period as a highly developed state, and Baktra as a capital surrounded by walls, capped by a citadel and filled with riches, has been confirmed by recent archaeological research, but there has been no archaeological confirmation of a campaign by the Assyrians as far east as Baktria.

Though the stories introduced above may have been appended to the life of Sammuramat, it is unlikely that either she or any other Assyrian ruler conducted military operations in Bactria, Sogdia, the land of the Saka, or India. Arrian's account (VI.24) of how Alexander's comrades listened to local stories of Semiramis' Indian campaigns does not necessarily suggest that Semiramis did actually campaign in the east. It might suggest

---


17 Luckenbill, ibid.


19 Schramm, 'War Semiramis assyrische Regentin?', 1972, pp.513-521; Millard and Tadmor, 'Adad-nirari III in Syria another Stele Fragment and the dates of his campaigns', 1973, pp.57-64; and Tadmor, 'The Historical inscription of Adad-Nirari III', 1973, pp.141-150, who concludes on p.147 that 'What remains is mostly the desire of the historian to seek authentic elements in the late and complex legends of Ctesias about Semiramis and Ninos'.


that Semiramis featured in an eastern Iranian epic tradition\textsuperscript{22}, in which case the story may have been adopted by the eastern Iranians before the Greek. Arrian's reference might, however, indicate only a Greek willingness to believe they were hearing Semiramis stories from the inhabitants of eastern Iran. It is possible, as Eddy, P'jankov and Gnoli suggest, that the linking of Semiramis with Baktia and India may have been encouraged by the expeditions to these lands of Kyros and Alexander\textsuperscript{23}. Eddy indeed argues convincingly that the Semiramis legend was revised by the Babylonians between 320 and 280 B.C. with the intention of attributing to the Babylonians achievements that rivalled recent Macedonian achievements. Thus, while the Semiramis legend was influencing the narration of Kyros' and Alexander's campaigns, Kyros' and Alexander's campaigns were influencing the narration of Semiramis' legendary exploits. To what episodes then in the history of Central Asia, if any, do the stories of Polyainos and Diodoros allude?

As Polyainos' Σάκας καὶ Σαγδαμ would seem to be analogues to the phrase 'Saka para Sugdam', found in Dareios' Behistun inscription, as Ερυθξες is also the name of the horse keeper in Polyainos' story about Dareios' unsuccessful Saka campaign, and as the canal system, which the inscription says Semiramis devised, was only developed in Akhaemenid times\textsuperscript{24}, the story would seem to have drawn heavily upon accounts of Dareios' reign. One other influence in the formulation of the story Polyainos preserves may have been, as Borzsák argues, the story of the Egyptian king Sesostris\textsuperscript{25}. Sesostris was said by Herodotos (II.103) to have 'passed over from Asia to Europe and subdued the Scythians and Thracians' and by Diodoros (I.iv.3-4) to have:

'passed over the river Ganges and visited all of India as far as the ocean, as well as the tribes of the Scythians as far as the river Tanais, which divides Europe from Asia',

and in I.iv.6-12 after subjecting all of Asia, to have crossed into Europe, campaigned as far as Thrace, and set up numerous stelae throughout his new domains. It was this prototype of a world conqueror that Borzsák believed Polyainos took as his model for Semiramis.

Diodoros does not refer to Sirakes, Sakai or Sogdoi. In this account Semiramis wins her fame in Baktia, where the King Oxyartes is defeated, and to which she returns later to prepare her campaign against India. Oxyartes was probably the Hellenised form of an

\textsuperscript{22} Barthold, 'K истории персидского эпоса', 1915, pp.258ff.


\textsuperscript{24} Eilers, Semiramis, 1971, p.13 and Borsák, ibid., p.65.

\textsuperscript{25} Ibid., pp.61-65.
actual Persian name, Uhsiata, and was also the name the Alexander historians gave for Roxana's father. Though it is possible that there were many famous chief called Oxyartes, it is also possible that Diodoros' and the Alexander historians' use of the name are linked through literary tradition. If there was a literary connection in which direction did the tradition flow? Did the Alexander historians use Ktesias' name for an ancient Baktrian king as the name of Roxana's father or did Diodoros use the name of Roxana's father in a reworking of Ktesias.

If Oxyartes had really been the name of Roxana's father, it would not just be expected to occur in the one reworking of Ktesias which Diodoros used, but in most, if not all, Alexander histories. Trogus, however, called Roxana's father Zoroastra. It may be that Roxana's father was given names drawn from much earlier texts in an attempt to enhance her pedigree image. It is not unlikely that Ktesias, who believed Zoroaster a Baktrian, referred to both Zoroaster and Oxyartes as Baktrian kings and that subsequent writers, believing Baktrian was as good as Sogdian, took their choice of these two Baktrian names, when selecting an appropriate name for Roxana's Sogdian father. Kleitarkhos may have used Ktesias and may have suggested Roxana's line went back to the King's Oxiartes and Zoroaster. Diodoros may have used Kleitarkhos and taken the first name to be that of Roxana's father. Trogus may have used Kleitarkhos but taken the second.

On the other hand, it may be noted that Diodoros' account of Ninos' campaigns included a description of the Akropolis of Baktra, which must have been written by someone aware of the difficulties Alexander had in conquering this city, and if this description could be planted back into the reworked Ktesian story, the king's name is also able to have been.

Of the above two possibilities the present author favours the second. The name of Alexander's well known opponent and father-in-law later displaced Zoroastres as the name of Ninos' opponent in Ktesias' story. As to who may have been responsible for the reworking of the Ktesian material, suspicion must fall on Kleitarkhos. Thus, despite
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27 Arrian IV.xix, xx; Curtius, VIII.iv.21-22; IX.viii.10; X.iii.11.
28 P'jankov, Средняя Азия, 1975, p.156.
29 Eddy, The King is Dead, 1961, p.124 suggested Diodoros may have been using Kleitarkhos, who was supplementing the Ktesian story with elements picked up from a post-Alexander Babylonian Semiramis legend.
repeated citation of Ktesias and offering Ktesias' figure on the length of the walls
Semiramis built at Babylon, Diodoros (II.vii.3) added:

'but according to the account of Cleitarchus and certain of those who at the time
crossed into Asia with Alexander, three hundred and sixty five stades; and these
latter add that it was her desire to make the number of stades the same as the day in
the year'\textsuperscript{30}

It is no coincident that Kleitarkhos' figure is also given by Curtius (V.i.26). Though the
relationship between the work of Kleitarkhos, Aristoboulos and Ptolemy is unclear, it does
seem that Arrian and Strabo worked chiefly from Aristoboulos and Ptolemy, while
Diodoros and Curtius worked chiefly from Kleitarkhos. The suggestion that Kleitarkhos
was involved in the transmission of Ktesian material into the Alexander tradition will
receive additional support from the arguments presented later in this chapter that
Kleitarkhos' father, had used Ktesias' history heavily in the writing of his own very
popular history. The rewriting of Ktesias does not, however, disguise what would seem to
be Ktesias' own 'duplication' of history in ascribing to Semiramis, conquests in Scythia
and Thrace which rightly belonged to, and which he himself attributed to, Dareios I.

Zarinaia.

From his discussion of early Assyrian history, Ktesias moved on, in his third book, to a
discussion of Median history. As has been argued in Chapter 1, the role played by Scythian
peoples in the demise of the Assyrians and the rise of the Medians was probably very
significant. Though no extant fragment mentions Scythians playing this role, and though
the Ktesian fragment of Diodoros II.23-28 has the Medes led by a Median Arbakes and
supported by recently arrived Baktrians, it is probable that the Medes were lead by a
Scythian named Arbakes and supported by Scythians from beyond the Caucasus. As has
also been argued in Chapter 1, the Saka of Central Asia may only have entered the history
of the Median kingdom when that kingdom later expanded to the north east. Diodoros cited
Ktesias when he gave the following account of this period of contact between the Medes
and Saka, in II.xxxiv.1-5:

'After the death of Artaeus, Ctesias continues, Arty nes ruled over the Medes for
twenty-two years, and Astibaras for forty. During the reign of the latter the
Parthians revolted from the Medes and entrusted both their country and their city to
the hands of the Sacae. This led to a war between the Sacae and the Medes, which
lasted many years, and after no small number of battles and the loss of many lives
on both sides, they finally agreed to peace on the following terms, that the Parthians
should be subject to the Medes, but that both peoples should retain their former
possessions and be friends and allies for ever. At that time the Sacae were ruled by
a woman named Zarina, who was devoted to warfare and was in daring and

\textsuperscript{30} Diodoros II.vii.3.
efficiency by far the foremost of the women of the Sacae. Now this people, in general, have courageous women who share with their husbands the dangers of war, but she, it is said, was the most conspicuous of them all for her beauty and remarkable as well with respect to both her and whatever she undertook. For she subdued such of the neighbouring barbarian peoples as had become proud because of their boldness and were trying to enslave the people of the Sacae, and into much of her own realm she introduced civilized life, founded not a few cities, and, in a word, made the life of her people happier. Consequently, her countrymen after her death, in gratitude for her benefactions and in remembrance of her virtues, built her a tomb which was far the largest of any in their land; for they erected a triangular pyramid, making the length of each side three stades and the height one stade, and bringing it to a point at the top; and on the tomb they also placed a colossal gilded statue of her and accorded her the honours belonging to heroes, and all the other honours they bestowed upon her were more magnificent than those which had fallen to the lot of her ancestors.

In his abridgment of Ktesia's history, Diodoros, a serious historian with a great task in hand, seems to have omitted that which later writers most enjoyed retelling - the tale of the love between Zarinaia and a Median leader. A certain Demetrios offered the following story:

'Stryraggeus, a Median man, having unhorsed a Sacian woman (for the women of the Sacae join in battle like Amazons), was struck with the youth and beauty of the Sacian and allowed her to escape. Afterwards, when peace was declared, he became enamoured of her and failed in his suit. He resolved to starve himself to death. But first he wrote a letter upbraiding the woman thus: "I saved you, ay, you were saved through me; and now I have perished through you"31.

That this is but a summary of a more detailed Ktesian story is clear, not only from the context, a defence of Ktesia's style, and from the absence of introductory epistolary formula32, but also from a comparison with the following Ktesian fragments.

Nikolaos of Damaskos offers the fullest extant version of the love-story:

'That Stryaggaios, after the death of Marmares, the King of the Saka, fell secretly in love with Zarinaia, and she with him. When he was coming near the town of Roxanake, where the palace of the Sakai was, Zarinaia went out to meet him, and looking upon him with much joy, she welcomed him and kissed him before everyone's eyes, got in his carriage, and, chatting together, they went into the palace. Zarinaia also welcomed most splendidly the army following him. Afterwards Stryaggaios went off to his lodging and sighed for his love of Zarinaios. Not being strong, he confided in the most trusted of the eunuchs who accompanied him. He advised him to be of good courage and, throwing off his cowardice, to speak with Zarinaia. He was persuaded, and jumping up, went to her. She received him happily and after much sighing, hesitation and blushing he said to her, that in his desire for her, he was burning up in passionate love. She, however, refused him gently, and said to him that the matter was shameful and injurious, and for him much more shameful and injurious, as he had as a wife Kbitaia, the daughter of Astibaros, whom she'd heard was much more beautiful than herself and most other women. He ought then be brave not only before the

31 Tr. Roberts, Demetrius, On Style, 213.
enemy, but also before such matters as when something pierces the soul, and should not, for the sake of brief pleasure, which he could get from his concubines, be sorry for a long time, as he would if Roitaia learnt of it. Leaving this aside she said he could ask for anything else. Having heard this he was completely silent, greeted her again and left. Greatly down at heart, he complained to the eunuch. In the end he wrote on a leather skin, and made his eunuch swear that when he'd committed suicide, he would give it to Zarinaia directly. He had written: "Stryaggaios says the following to Zarinaia: I saved you and am responsible for your present happiness. But you have killed me, and have done so unnecessarily. If you had handled the matter fairly, you should enjoy all things good and be happy, but if you did wrong, you should bear the same sorrow as I, for you have warned me of the same". Having written this he placed it under the pillow and bravely asked his sword for a departure to Hades. But the eunuch..33.

The Oxyrhynchus Papyri fragment, dating back to about the 2nd century A.D. introduced a god into the tragedy:

'...because you left...'. He said: 'Come, as a first step at any rate I will write a letter to Zarinaia'. He wrote: 'Stryaggaius speaks thus to Zarinaia: I saved you and it was by me that you were saved. But I have been ruined by you and have killed myself, because you were unwilling to grant me your favours. I did not of myself choose these evils and this passion, but this god is one in whom you and all mankind share. Now to whom he comes in gracious mood, to him he offers countless pleasures, and countless other benifits he confers upon him. But whomsoever he visits in anger, as he visits me now, on him he works countless evils and ends by destroying him root and branch and overthrowing him. This I infer from my own death. For I will call down no curses on your head, but will make this prayer on your behalf, the fairest that can be: if you had acted justly by me...'34

As the line Demetrios quoted from Stryaggaios' letter εγὼ μὲν σε ἐσώσα, καὶ μὴ μὲν δὲ με ἐσώθησεν ἐγὼ δὲ σὲ ἀπολομην, apart from an intrusive μὲν in the second clause, tallies exactly with lines 7-9 of the papyrus, Lobel and Roberts believe, 'we are entitled to regard the papyrus as containing not another rewriting of the story but the text of Ktesias'35. Though this may be the case, it is probable that the references to a divinity, found in no other fragment, was inserted into the Ktesian text by a late Hellenistic hand.

A version differing somewhat from those offered above can be found in the late anonymous work, De Mulieribus quae bello claruerunt, 2:

'Zarinaia. This woman, after the death of her first husband and brother, Kydraios, King of the Sakai, was married to Mermeros, the dynast of the land of the Parthians. When the King of the Persians invaded, she went to war and being wounded fled. Being hard pressed by Aggaios, she went to him as a suppliant and was saved. Soon after this her husband captured him and wanted to kill him. She

63 Own translation from the text in König, Die Persika des Ktesias, 1972, p.175.
35 Lobel and Roberts, The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, XXII, 1954, p.82.
wanted to save him. Not being able to persuade her husband, she freed some of the captives, with them killed Mermeron, and gave over the land to Persia, concluding a friendship with Persia, as Ktesias writes  

Finally, a brief reference to the story can be found in Tzetzes, *Chil*. 12, 894-899:

"The people, the Sakai, whose invention the shield (sakos) was/ and among whom the women fight together with the men/ as Ktesias has said, and many others. / "The women of the Sakai, fight on horse back/ and again, Stryalios, a certain man from among the Medes/ threw a woman of the Sakidae from her horse"  

The number of and variations in the above versions of the Ktesian Zarinaia story was doubtlessly a result of the wide circulation of an originally Ktesian story. Perhaps one of the main reasons for the wide circulation of the story was that it became, at a very early stage, part of a collection of stories about 'Remarkable Women'. At least six such collections are known to have existed, though modern scholars have shown little interest in the corpus.  

The fragments of Ktesias' Zarinaia story not only provided support for Jacoby's suppositions that Ktesias represents the transition from literary Ionic to literary koine and that Ktesias became 'der Vater des historischen Romans', they also illustrate the importance of the role played by Saka tribes in the affairs of the Median kingdom. But what, exactly, was the nature of this role? The historical and geographical context of Zarinaia's conflict with the Medians and the geographical location of Zarinaia's kingdom are both matters upon which the above fragments offer few clues.  

The only clue to the historical context of the conflict is the setting of events in Diodoros II.xxxiv.1 in the reign of Astibaras. Though Ktesias' Median chronology and king list are of notoriously dubious value, that Ktesias sets Zarinaia's conflict with the Medians in the reign of the eighth and last Median monarch suggests that the conflict was not part of, or a continuation of, Herodotos' period of 28 years of 'Scythian rule' (I.106), but was a

38 A notable exception is Stadter, who in his Plutarch's *Historical Methods, An Analysis of the Mulierum Virtutes*, (1965), p.8 noted references to at least five such works, other than the *Mulierum Virtutes* of Plutarch, to which he devoted a book.  
40 It is indeed curious that P'jankov, in his otherwise very thorough study of Ktesias' account of Central Asia, *СРЕДНЯЯ АЗИЯ В ИЗВЕСТИЯХ КТЕСИЯ*, 1975, pp.183-4, does little more than note the survival of Ktesias' Zarina story in Diodoros and the Anonimous *De mulierum*.  
41 See König, *Die Persika des Ktesias*, 1979, pp.119-121.
considerable time after Kyaxares had slaughtered the Scythian chiefs, and established an empire which included Parthia. Indeed it is possible that the conflict described may have happened in the very last years of Median supremacy, and that the Saka campaign of Kyros I, the first Persian king, was a response to the same Saka threat as his rival and predecessor, the last Median king, had had to face.

There is only one clue to the geographical context of the conflict. This is the reference in Diodoros II.xxx to Zarinaia having 'founded not a few cities', and having as her capital, the town of Roxanake. In Nikolaos' version Roxanake is called Ἡ πόλις ἐνθά Ἴδεος τοῦ βασιλείου Ἕν. The only other reference to this town might be Stephanos' reference to the town of 'Ῥαξονακάια'. Stephanos' reference to Φάσσαλα, πόλις ἐν Σάκαλις, might also have been drawn from Ktesias, where it might have been another of Zarinaia's towns, but this reference offers no further clues as to the geographical location of the Saka kingdom. The reference to Roxanake has been taken by some scholars to be an allusion to the district of northern Afghanistan once called Roshan, but as variants of Roxana, 'the shining one', were common in the, Iranian speaking world, this identification is of dubious value. Though numerous etymologies of Zarinaia's name have been offered, no etymology implies a particular geographical location. The only clues to the geographical location of her kingdom are that it was the Parthians who opened the door to the Saka, and that names very similar to Zarinaia and Roxanake occur in a Hyrkanian context in Ktesias' story of the attempted rebellion against Dareios I (epitomised in Photios' Bibliothèque, 54 & 55). In this story the satrap of Hyrkania, Teriteukhmes, married the King's daughter Amistris. Later, out of love for his

42 Stephanos, Ῥαξονακάια, πόλις το ἐθνικόν Ῥαξονακαίως καί Ῥαξονακαίατής καί Ῥαξονακαλαυτής.
43 Tarn, Greeks in Bactria and India, 1938 (1951), p.449.
44 There is even mention of a Ῥαξανά in a Pantikapaion inscription. See Vasmer, Die Iranier in Südrussland, 1923, p.49.
45 Grigorev, О скіфськом народе саках, 1871, p.96, suggested the name was derived from the Slavonic word for dawn, in modern Russian, 'Zarja'. Ahaev, Осетинский язык и голькотор, 1949, p.190, (cited Schmeja, Iranisches bei Lukian, 1972, p.27) connected the name with the ossetian woman's name 'Zarinä', and the pass word mentioned in Lukian, Toxaris, 40. When the Scythian Dandamis swam the Tanais to rescue his captured friend, The Sauromatae rushed at him with brandished javelins, intending to spear him to death, but he called out "Zirin". If anyone says that, he is not killed by them, but is received as coming to offer ransom'. If 'Zirin' and 'Zarinaia' are related then it is possible both go back to a word for gold, 'zarin(ä) in ossetian, 'zaranya' in Avestan Persian, 'zari' or 'dari' in old Persian, 'ziru' in Sogdian, and 'zarin' in middle Persian. See König, Die Persika, 1972, p.46 and Schmeja, Iranisches bei Lukian', 1972, pp.26-27.
sister Roxana and hatred of his wife, the satrap plotted to kill his wife and rebel. The satrap was killed before he could rebel by one of his companions, Udiastes, and the satrap's family were put to death by the Persians. Mitradates, Udiastes' son and the satrap's shield-bearer, had been sympathetic to the satrap and sought refuge in the town of Zaris. Though it is not stated, it is possible, that Roxana was a native of Hyrkania and Zaris a town in Hyrkania. It is possible then that Ktesias, with an excellent imagination for all but names, chose the names Roxana and Zarinaia for his two heroines as he knew of two towns in or near Hyrkania called Roxanake and Zaris and conceived of the two heroines as coming from near Hyrkania. It is possible then that Ktesias, with an excellent imagination for all but names, chose the names Roxana and Zarinaia for his two heroines as he knew of two towns in or near Hyrkania called Roxanake and Zaris and conceived of the two heroines as coming from near Hyrkania. Zarinaia's Saka may then have come from in or near Hyrkania. The association of Saka with towns need present no problem. The relationship between ancient nomads and towns in their region was probably much closer than most modern-day westerners imagine. This localisation must, however, remain only one possibility. Another possibility, cogently argued by Daffina, is Drangiana.

Saka and Derbikai.

From his account of Median history, Ktesias would seem to have progressed in Book VI to give an account of the career of Kyros I (559-530 B.C.), a career which saw the founding of the Persian Empire and which included a major expedition against the Saka. The route taken by Kyros on his eastern expedition has been the subject of detailed investigation by P'jankov and Khlopin. These scholars reconstruct a march by Kyros, eastward from his Parthian and Hyrkanian provinces, along the Tedjen river valley, through Areia and Drangiana, then northwards along the edge of the Hindu-Kush to the Oxos, then north west along the Oxos, eventually crossing the river to meet the Saka on the Sogdian plains. Ktesias' account of the Central Asian part of the campaign would seem to have featured the Saka King Amorges, and his wife Sarethre. Photios' epitome of what probably appeared in Ktesias' eighth book begins (in ch.3) as follows:

'And (he writes) that Kyros made war against the Sakai and that he captured Amorges, the King of the Sakai, husband of Sarethre. She, after the capture of her husband, gathered an army together and made war against Kyros, leading forward 300,000 men and 200,000 women. She conquered Kyros and captured alive, along

46 König, *ibid.*, suggested that Zarinaia may be so named because she came from the city of Zaris mention in the Terteukhmes story.
49 Translations will be from the Greek text presented in König, *Die Persika des Ktesias*, 1979.
with many others, Parmises, the brother of Amytis and three of his sons. For these Amorges was later released, when those ones too (P. and sons) were released'. Photios goes on to give an account in ch.4 of Kyros' campaign against Kroisos of Lydia, in which Kyros had the assistance of Amorges, and in ch.5 of the downfall of Oibaras. In ch.6 & 7 Photios epitomises Ktesias' account of Kyros' war with a nomadic people distinct from Amorges' Saka, the Derbikai:

'(ch.6) But Kyros marched against the Derbikai, of whom Amoraios was King, and the Derbikai stirred up their elephants from cover, and they routed Kyros' cavalry. Kyros himself fell from his horse and an Indian man, the Indians being allies of the Derbikai and from whom the elephants came, this Indian then, hit the overthrown Kyros with a spear below the hip joint in the thigh. He died from this, but at the time his own men picked him up still living and hurried back to camp. Many Persians and an equal number of Derbikai died in the battle. They were 10,000.

(ch.7) Amorges, having heard about Kyros, arrived on the spot hastily with 20,000 Sakai cavalry, and with war breaking out between the Persians the Derbikai, the Persians and Saka army won overwhelmingly. The King of the Derbikai, Amoraios was also killed; himself and his two sons. 30,000 of the Derbikai died and of the Persians, 9,000. The land went over to Kyros'.

Photius closed his epitome of Ktesias' account of Kyros in ch.8 with the following passage:

'But Kyros, being about to die, established his first son, Kambyses, King, and he appointed the younger son, Tanyoxarkes, as despot of Baktria and the land of Khoramnia, Parthia and Karmania, defining the country without boundaries. From the children of Spitames he appointed Spitakes satrap of the Derbikes, and Megabernes satrap of the Barkaniai. He ordained that all should obey his mother. And he made Amorges the right-hand friend of these and others.

Ktesias clearly believed two large nomad groups, Amorges' Sakai and Amoraios' Derbikai, played an important role in the history of the northeast in Kyros' day, but how exactly did he conceive of the ethnography of this region at that time?

There have been numerous attempted identifications and localisations of Amorges' Sakai. Thomas believed Amorges' Saka must have been those known later to Arrian as the Ariaspoi, inhabitants of Sakastana and that the Hellanikan Ἀμύριαν Πέντεν Σακάν was the Gedrosian or Persian desem. König believed that if Sparmitres was the real name of Amorges wife, and if this was derived from the Persian Sparmithra, 'the eye of Mithra', then it is probable that Amorges' Sakai dwelt close to Persia, in eastern Asia Minor. Both Thomas' and König's localisations are, however, unsatisfactory. Thomas' localisation of Amorges' Saka and Hellanikos' Amorgioi in Sakastana is grounded in his belief that Sakastana was settled by Saka as early as the sixth century B.C., and this belief

50 Thomas, 'Sakastana', 1906, pp.463 and 119.
has been shown to be of dubious historical value\textsuperscript{52}. König's localisation is based on the undoubted Iranian origin of Amorges' wife's name, but as Iranian names were scattered from the Danube to the Tarim Basin the Iranian origin of Amorges' wife's name offers no means of confidently locating Amorges' Saka. It is possible that Ktesias' conception of the location of Amorges' Saka did not differ greatly from Hellanikos' conception of the location of the Amyrgioi. Both Ktesias' and Hellanikos' names clearly came from the Persian name for one northern nomad group, the \textit{Haumavarga} or 'Hauma eating' Saka. As has been discussed in Chapter 3, the most probable locations of the people the Persians called the Haumavarga and who Hellanikos called the 'Amyrgioi' were the plains north of the Oxos, the Ferghana valley and the Pamirs. It is difficult however, on the basis of extant Ktesian fragments, to decide which, if any, of these locations Ktesias would have favoured as the location of Amorges' Sakai.

In the sections of Photios' epitome quoted above Ktesias appears to have discussed Amorges in connection with the war between Kyros and the Derbikai and Indians, as well as in connection with the friendship established between Kambyses and the despot of Baktria, Khoramnia, Parthia and Karmania. The Saka indeed, appear to be present at events in both west and east Central Asia.

Turning now to the Derbikes, extant Ktesian fragments give no clearer idea of Ktesias' conception of this people than they do of his conception of the Sakai. Sometimes it appears Ktesias may have associated the Derbikai with eastern Central Asia. Thus in Photios' epitome of ch.6 the Derbikai are said to have fought Kyros with Indian allies and Indian elephants, and Stephanos gave the following account of the \textit{Δυρβαιοι}:

'A tribe which stretches up to Baktria and the Indika. Ktesias in his \textit{Persika} book 10, "but the land lies to the south, the Dyrbaioi, whom stretch up to Baktria and Indika"'.

Othertimes it seems Ktesias may have associated the Derbikai with western Central Asia. Kyros' campaign was not the first context in which Ktesias mentioned the Derbikai. In Diodoros' list of nations subdued by the Assyrian Ninos (II.ii.3-4), where Ktesias is the cited source, the Derbikai seem to be closely associated with the land bordering on the Caspian Sea. Ninos ruled:

'all the barbarian nations who inhabit the shores of the Pontos as far as the Tanais; he also made himself lord of the lands of the Cadusii, Tapyri, Hyrcanii, Drangi, of the Derbici, Carmanii, Choramnaei, and of the Borcaini, and Parthyaei; and he invaded both Persis and Susiana and Caspiana, as it is called, which is entered by exceedingly narrow passes known for that reason as the Caspian Gates. Many other

\textsuperscript{52} See Daffina, \textit{L'immigrazion dei Saka nella Drangiana}, 1967.
lesser nations he also brought under his rule, about whom it would be a long task to speak. But since Bactriana was difficult to invade and contained multitudes of warlike men, after much toil and labour in vain he deferred to a later time the war against Bactriana'.

This association of the Derbikes with western Central Asia, can also be detected in Strabo XI.viii.8:

'on the other side of the Hyrcanians are Derbices; and the Cadusii border on the Medi and Matiani below the Parachoathras'

and in Strabo XI.xi.8, where the Tapyroi are located between the Derbikes and Hyrkanians53.

The association of the Derbikes with western Central Asia goes, in fact, beyond the geographical context in which the tribe is occasionally mentioned. Very often the tribe is described in terms identical with those used by Herodotos and others to describe the Massagetai, who most ancients would seem clearly to have associated with western Central Asia. Herodotos' description (I.216) of the Massagetai closely resembles Stephanos' description of the Dyrbaioi and Strabo's description (XI.xi.8) of the Derbikai. Thus, while Herodotos writes:

'Though they (the Massagetai) set no certain term to life, yet when a man is very old all his kin meet together and kill him, with beasts of the flock besides, then boil the flesh and feast on it. This is held to be the happiest death; when a man dies of a sickness they do not eat him, but bury him in the earth, and lament that he would not live to be killed. They never sow; their fare is their live-stock and the fish which they have in abundance from the Araxes'.

Stephanos writes that the Dyrbaioi:

'are happy, wealthy and very law-abiding men. They do noone harm, nor kill anyone. If they find gold, clothing, silver or anything else on the road, they do not take it up. They do not bake bread...except on account of sacrifices. They make barley meal much softer than the Greeks, and they eat barley bread.'

and Strabo writes that the Derbikai:

'slaughter people even for slight offences. The Derbices worship Mother Earth; and they do not sacrifice, or eat, anything that is female, and when men become over seventy years of age they are slaughtered, and their flesh is consumed by their nearest of kin; but their old women are strangled and then buried. However, the men who die under seventy years of age are not eaten but only buried.'

53 Henning, Zoroaster, 1951, p.26, mentions the Derbikes 'whom Ctesias wrongly localized on the Indian border while in fact they lived in the neighbourhood of Hyrcania'. This is insupportable. Ktesias was probably responsible for both localisations and neither can be said to be right or wrong.
Similar customs are attributed to the Derbikkai by Aelianos and to the Massagetai and Derbikes by Porphyros\textsuperscript{54}.

The correspondence in the way Massagetai and Derbekai customs are described could be explained in any of several ways. Firstly, two distinct tribes, the Massagetai and Derbikes, may have shared the same custom and were thus both recorded as having this custom. The descriptions, however, correspond too closely for such an 'historical' explanation to be entertained. Secondly, two distinct tribes, the Massagetai and Derbikes, may have been so closely associated politically and culturally, that the early record of this custom among one of the tribes was taken as evidence for the custom among the others. This would be possible were it not that ancient writers would seem not to have conceived of the Massagetai and Derbikai as neighbours. Herodotos (I.202) had Kyros killed by the Massagetai and made no mention of the Derbikai while Ktesias (Photios 6) had Kyros killed by the Derbikai and made no mention of the Massagetai. Thirdly, and most probably, the tribal-names Massagetai and Derbikai were, for the ancient Greeks, usually interchangable. The question of where the two names came from, and which version of the customs is the original version, are, however, very difficult to answer.

The name Derbikkai has been linked with the name of an ancient Demon 'Driwika'\textsuperscript{55}. This demon was said in the Videvdat I.8 of the Avesta to dwell near Harewa (Herat), and in the Rigveda II.xiv.3 called Drbhika. Though this may be so, it can not account for the variation in the use of the term as a tribal-name in the 4th and subsequent centuries. In the 4th century the name is used for a particular tribe. In subsequent centuries the use was dependant upon Ktesias.

One variation which can be detected in the stories associated with Massagetai and Derbikai customs is the age at which the elderly were sacrificed, for although all the above either

\textsuperscript{54} Aelianos, Poikile historia IV.1: 'The Derbikkai kill those over 70 years of age, sacrificing the men and strangling the women' and Porphyrios Peri apokhes empsukhon, IV.21: 'It is said that the Massagetai and Derbikes believe in automatically killing the most decrepit of their kin, for they prematurely sacrifice and eat the dearest of their elderly'. (Own translation).

\textsuperscript{55} This equation was first suggested by Geiger, Ostiranische Kultur im Altertum, 1882, p.204 (cited Gnoli, Zoroaster 's Time and Homeland, 1980, p.67 n.58). It was later adopted by Brunhoffer, Iran und Turan, 1889, pp.81f & 206ff. (cited by König, Die Persika, 1972, p.56), Christensen, Le premier Chapitre du Vendidad, 1943, p.62, König, Die Persika, 1972, p.56 and Gnoli, Zoroaster 's Time and Homeland, 1980, p.67 n.58.
specify no age or 70 years of age, Sextus Empiricus and Philostratos specify 60 years of age. In 1975 P'jankov suggested that the notices on the Derbikai can be traced back to Ktesias, while the notices on the 60 years of age can be traced back to a still earlier source, Hellanikos, who writes the following of the Hyperboreans: 'They lead 60-year olds out of the city gates and abandon them.' It is clear that Ktesias was aware of the earlier Hellanikan reference to killing of elders. Did Ktesias then, who never mentioned the Massagetai, but frequently mentioned the Derbikai, draw his reference to the latter from Hellanikos or Hekataios? It is possible that he did. Alternatively, Ktesias may have picked up the name Derbikai in his own day and transferred much of what Herodotos had associated with the terms Massagetai and Hyperboreans to this new name.

Variants of the tribal-name 'Derbikai' enjoyed a long life in classical literature. Curtius included the tribe in his catalogue of Dareios III's army:

'The Hyrcani had mustered 6000 as excellent horsemen as those nations could furnish, as well as 1000 Tapurian cavalry. The Derbices had armed 40,000 foot-soldiers; most of these carried spears tipped with bronze or iron, but some had hardened the wooden shaft by fire.'

Though Thomas believed this reference testifies to the power of the people as late as Alexander's own day, it is clearly little more than a formula drawn from the earliest tradition in which Hyrkanians, Tapurians and Derbikai are always mentioned together, and in which the names Massagetai and Derbikai are virtually interchangeable. Thus the attention Curtius pays to the question of which metals the Derbikai used, reflects the attention paid by Herodotos and Eudoxos to the question of which metals were used by the Massagetai.

Variants of the name Derbikai appear in similar contexts in still later literature.

57 P'jankov, 'MaccareTti coceziH hhaohij b' 1977, pp.55-56. Hellanikos F187 b)
58 Curtius III.ii.7.
59 Thomas, 'Sakastana', 1906, p.462.
60 See Chapter 7.
61 Dionysius Periegesis734, 738 located the Δερβίκαι on the river Mardos, between the Hykanioi, Tapuroi and Baktroi. Mela III.39 wrote 'Caspii, Amazones (Sauromatidae), Albani, Moschi, Hyrcani, in Scythico Amardi et Pestici et iam ad fretum Derbices'. Pliny VI.xviii.48 included in his catalogue of tribes near the Caspian, 'the Derbices, Oxus...'. Ptolemy VI.x.2 placed the Δερβικαὶ in the steppes north of Margiane, on the lower course of the Oxos, between the Daai, Masagetai and Tapuroi. Tabula Peutingeriana mentioned the Derbiccae between the rivers Nigrinus and Oxus. See Tomaschek, 'Derbikes', 1903, p.238.
To return now to the problem of Ktesias' conception of the Saka and Derbikai, it might be concluded that it is impossible to define accurately Ktesias' conception of these two nomadic peoples. It is tempting to subscribe to P'jankov's understanding of the Ktesian's conception:

'Sakai and Derbikai are two "Scythian" people. The Sakai were widely known of outside Ktesias. The Derbikai were, it appears, mentioned for the first time by Ktesias. Their names had two senses- a narrow (specialist) one and a wide (general) one. In the first, since the name "Sakai" belonged to the group of "Scythian" tribes of the eastern part of Central Asia, and the name "Derbikes" to the group of "Scythian" tribes of the western part of Central Asia, corresponding, perhaps, to the "Massagetai" of other authors. In the second sense, both names belong to "Scythian" in general. Ktesias had no clear conception of either the Sakai or the Derbikai. He oscillated between the two senses of the names.\(^{62}\)

It would be tempting to adopt P'jankov's understanding without reservation, were it not that P'jankov may have overlooked one very important aspect of Ktesias' concept of Central Asian ethnography. This aspect was an underestimation of the distance across Central Asia, from the Caspian Sea to India. Modern scholars might puzzle at Ktesias' apparent ability to associate both the Saka and Derbikai with both western and eastern Central Asia, but this is perhaps because we conceive of peoples being enumerated from west to east across the breadth of Central Asia. Ktesias, with no idea of the gap between the Caspian and the Aral, probably conceived of the Derbikai stretching from the Caspian to Baktria, and Amorges' Sakai dwelling to the north of them. This would fit in well with P'jankov's own model of Ktesias' northern ethnography. This model, based upon the way in which peoples are enumerated in suspected fragments of Ktesias' *Persika* dealt with above, has Ktesias conceive of the Parthioi, Khoramnioi and Baktrioi as lying on a central west-east axis, and the Barkanioi, Hyrkanioi and Derbikai as lying to their north on a south-north axis.\(^{63}\)

Dareios.

From an account of Kyros' life and the activity in the north east of the Sakai and Derbikkai, Ktesias proceeded to deal with the history of the Persian Empire from the reign of

---


Kambyses in Book XII to the reign of Araxerxes in Book XX-XXIII. The Saka feature very little in these books. In his history of the reign of Dareios (Book XIV), however, Ktesias offers very detailed accounts of at least three Persian 'Scythian expeditions'. Though modern scholars invariably believe Dareios marched in a single expedition form the Danube all the way to the Don, just as Herodotos said, from a close examination of Dareios' Behistun inscription and Photios Chapters 16 and 17, it is clear that Herodotos erroneously linked stories concerning two separate Scythian expeditions. The first expedition was sea-borne, took place in about 514/513 B.C. and led by Dareios himself. Ktesias gave a more accurate account of these expeditions than did Herodotos. Dareios would also seem to have made an expedition against the Saka of Central Asia, possibly more out of a desire to imitate Kyros than out of necessity. It was possibly Ktesias' lost account of this expedition that was the source for the anecdotes preserved in Polyainos' work concerning it. The chronological, geographical, historical and historiographical problems associated with these accounts are of great relevance to the study of traditions in the ancient literature dealing with Scythians, but as the present author has dealt with most of them at length elsewhere, they will not be discussed here.

The influence of Ktesias' Persika.

Having thus investigated all material suspected of deriving from Ktesias' Persika relevant to eastern Scythian matters, discussion might now turn to an investigation of the influence this material exercised on subsequent writing on the subject and to an examination of the material which would seem to be ultimately derived, albeit through numerous hands, from Ktesias' history. The work in which Ktesias' Persika would seem to have had the greatest discernible influence is Trogus Pompeius' history.

In the 2nd book of his epitome of Trogus' work Justin gave a detailed account of Scythian affairs. Whereas Justin's account of western Scythian affairs corresponds closely with Herodotos' account, his account of eastern Scythian affairs is clearly of a non-

64 For a full discussion of these problems see Gardiner-Garden, *Two Conceptions of the tribal-geography of the Royal Scythian Empire*, 1981, Chapter 7, End note D and Appendix III.

65 See Struve, 'ПОХОД ДАРИЯ I И САХОВ-МАССАГЕТОВ', 1946, pp.231-250. It was the details of Dareios' Central Asian expedition that Ktesias duplicated in his account of Semiramis' campaigns.

66 For example Justin's stories in II.v of rebellious Scythian slaves and Dareios' Scythian campaign correspond closely to stories in Her.IV.3 and IV.87.
Herodotean origin. In II.iii Justin gave a short account of the Scythians in world history, writing of their victories over Dareios, Kyros and Zopyrion, their foundation of the Parthian and Baktrian powers, and, in greater detail, their war against Sesostris. Herodotos offers different accounts of the war against Dareios, Kyros and Sesostris. In II.iv Justin gave a detailed history, including fourteen personal names, of the Amazons, said to be descended from a group of exiled Scythians. Herodotos' version had the Sauromatai who are descended from the Scythians exiles, these having taken Amazon wives, and included no personal names.

To investigate further the identity of the non-Herodotean source of Trogus' account of early eastern Scythian history discussion might turn from Justin to Jordanes. Jordanes' account of the war between the Goths and Vesosis of Egypt corresponds so closely to Justin's account of the Scythians' war against Sesostris, that Jordanes' source may have been Trogus. Trogus is indeed cited by Jordanes in ch.48:

> From their name or race Pompeius Trogus says the stock of the Parthians had its origins.

---

67 For example, Justin said the Scythians defeated Sesostris. Herodotos (II.102-3) said Sesostris defeated the Scythians, and 'marched over the country till he had passed over from Asia to Europe and subdued the Scythians and Thracians'. Justin said the Scythians took 15 years to subdue Asia, which remained a Scythian tributary for 1500 years. Herodotos said the Scythians ruled Asia for 28 years. Justin said the Scythians imposed 'only a moderate tribute, rather as a token of their power over it, than as a recompense for their victory'. Herodotos (I.106) wrote 'all the land was wasted by reason of their violence and their pride, for, besides that they extracted from each the tribute which laid upon him, they rode about the land carrying off all men's possessions'.

68 See Chapter 2.

69 Jordanes 47. The similarity was noted by Iliescu, 'Bemerkung zur gotenfreundlichen Einstellung', 1971, p.414. Jordanes twice cites Trogus, VI.48 and X.61.

70 There is no problem in Jordanes interchanging Gotes, Getae and Scythae.
Whether Jordanes used Trogus directly, or indirectly through Paulus Orosius is unclear. Jordanes' account of the conflict between Cyrus and the Getic Queen Tomyris corresponds closely to Justin's account of the conflict between Cyrus and the Scythian Queen Tamyris. Here a line from Trogus through Orosius is even more evident. Trogus is Jordanes' cited source, but Orosius' account is so similar to Justin's and Jordanes that he was almost certainly the intermediate between Trogus and Jordanes. Jordanes' claim that Tomyris founded the city of Tomis, may be inspired by his own imagination or a folk etymology but was certainly in keeping with a tendency evident in Trogus' work to attribute the foundation of nations and cities to Amazon queens. Justin's epitome of Trogus' history of the Amazons (II.iv) included mention of a plain near the Thermodon called Themiskyrlos, probably said by Trogus himself to have been founded by the famous Amazon of that name. Jordanes would, therefore, seem to be as ultimately dependant on Trogus' account of the Scythian and Amazon history, as Justin, Trogus' epitomiser, was. But who was Trogus' source?

Trogus' source for historical episodes later than the 3rd century B.C., the Scythian foundation of the Parthian and Baktrian nations, and Scythian successes against Zopyrion

---

71 In the context of an attempt to prove that Vesosis waged a war against the Goths, Jordanes wrote in ch.44: 'Concerning these female warriors Orosius speaks in convincing language'. It is possible that Orosius included in his own history the Trogean history of Scythian expansion. Other intermediaries besides Trogus and Orosius might have been Dio Chrysostom and Cassiodorus (both periodically cited). Mommsen's grounds for believing that Orosius was the only author other than Cassiodorus of which Jordanes made direct use, are unsound. As Mierow, in his introduction to The Gothic History of Jordanes, 1915 (1966), p.26, points out, Mommsen (in his editorial comments to Jordanes, Romana et Getica, 1882) errs when he says that Orosius is the only author Jordanes refers to by book number. Ptolemaios and Symmachus are also refered to by book (Jordanes III.16 and XV.83 respectively).

72 Jordanes X.61-62.

73 Jordanes X.61: Tunc Cyrus, rex Persarum, post grande intervallum et pene post DCXXX annorum tempores (Pompeio Trego testante) Getarum reginae Thomyre sibi exitiabile intulit bellum. Orosius, Historiarum Adversum Paganos, II.7: Igitur idem Cyrus proximi temporis successu Scythis bellum intulit. quem Thamyris regina quae tunc genti praeerat cum probibere transitu Araxis fluminis posset, transire permitis...

Justin I.viii.1: Cyrus subacta Asia et universo Oriente in potestatem adacto Scythis bellum infert. Erat eo tempore regina Scytharum Tamyris, quae non muliebriter adventu hostium territa, cum probibere eos transitu Araxis fluminis posset, transire permitis...

74 Jordanes offers foundation stories for three cities in Moesia; Tomis (62), Marcianopolis (Nicopolis?) (101) and Anchialos (108). It is possible that Jordanes had lived in these cities and picked up the etymologies from its inhabitants. Cf. Iliescu, 'Bemerkungen zur gotenfreundlichen Einstellung', 1971, p.417 n.52.
and the Romans, may well have been a Mithridatic historian, but who was his source for the Scythian-Amazon history? Gutschmid postulated a 4th century Athenian source, but offers no name or mechanism. The source was clearly not Herodotos, though Herodotos did mention a Queen Tomyris. The further investigation of this source's identity and use, is best pursued through an examination of Diodoros' work.

Diodoros' account of Scythian and Amazon history corresponds so closely to the Trogean account reconstructed above that use of a common source is probable. Diodoros' account of the Scythian-Sesostris conflict resembles Trogus. His history of the Amazons in II.45-46, while not including the great cast of leading Amazons and Scythians named by Trogus, corresponds with Trogus' history, as preserved in Justin II.iv at almost every point. The Amazon homeland was on the Thermodon river. A warlike Queen emerged and was responsible for the initial tribal expansion. Right breasts were burnt off. The city of Themisckyra and Themiskyrian plain is mentioned. The first great queen (Justin's Marpesisa) was succeeded by her daughter (Justin's Orithya). The daughter surpassed her mother in great deeds and further expanded the kingdom. Herakles made an expedition against the Amazons and met Queen Hippolyte. Penthesilea, at the time of the Trojan war, was the last great Amazon queen and the race soon afterwards dwindled out of existence. The correspondence between the accounts is not only close with respect to content, but also the order in which episodes are presented.

As Diodoros' source in the above account is not cited, observing the above correspondences does not in itself provide an identification for Trogus' source. Observing the similarity between Diodoros' story of the Saka queen Zarina in II.34.3-5 and his story of the Amazon queens in II.45-46 does, however, lead us to a source. As has been argued above, Diodoros' Zarinaia story is derived from a Ktesian Zarinaia story. Thus, though Diodoros' source on early Scythian history was argued in Chapter 3 to be Hellanikos, his source for this part of the early history would seem to be Ktesias.

Though often cited, Ktesias may not, however, have always been used directly by Diodoros. Though the close resemblance between Diodoros' Zarinaia story (II.34.3-5) and

75 Justin II.i.3 and II.iii.3-6 respectively. See Rostovtzeff, Skythien, 1931, p.107.
77 Diodoros I.iv.3-5. The same tradition is preserved in the work of Dikaiarthkos. Kees, 'Sesostres', 1923, pp.1861-1876, provides an overview of all the historical and historiographical problems associated with this story.
Diodoros' Amazon history (II.45-46) may suggest both stories were drawn from Ktesias, it may also suggest that Diodoros drew upon two different sources, one of which had reworked and recouched the story of the other. As Ktesias' Zarinaia can be seen in Justin's and Jordanes' Amazon queens, Marpesia and Orithya, as well as Diodoros' anonymous Amazon queen, it is probable that Ktesias' story of a Saka queen was used in the composition of at least one Amazon queen story before Diodoros' time. Who then was responsible for the marriage of Ktesias Zarinaia story and the Hellanikan Amazon history?

Jacoby long ago suggested Deinon played a role in transmitting and transforming Ktesias' Assyrian, Median and Persian history, but Schwartz, seemingly on the grounds that Deinon was the father of Kleitarchos, had earlier been the first to suggest Deinon may be 'das Mittelglied zwischen K. und der romanhaften Alexanderhistorie'. Jacoby agreed with the definition but added one qualification. Although Deinon appears to have been read widely in antiquity, so was Ktesias, and with regard to Ktesias 'dürfte die Wirkung nicht nur eine indirekte gewesen sein.' Jacoby accordingly suggested that Ktesias was used directly by Ephoros who was in turn source for Trogus' early Asian history (Justin I.1-3), that Ktesias was used directly for Trogus' Assyrian history, and that a combination of Herodotos, Ktesias and a third writer was responsible for Trogus' Median-Persian history. Neither Schwartz nor Jacoby, however, say who may have been used for Trogus' early history of the Scythians and Amazons (Justin II.1-5).

The above question was offered its first answer by Gutschmid, who claimed that Deinon was not only responsible for the content of the stories, but also for the pro-Scythian

78 Jacoby, 'Ktesias', 1922, p.2069: 'Dinon schient in hellenistischer Zeit allerdings das Hauptbuch gewesen zu sein (...), was wohl darauf beruht, das er die letzet, bis auf das Ende des Reiches herabgefuhrte Darstellung gegeben hat. Sie fusste in ihren älteren Teilen offensichtlich ganz auf K. natürlich mit der Massgabe, dass Dinon ihn in der Richtung effektvoll- rhetorische Ausgestaltung zu übertreffen sucht, ihn variierte und durch solche Mittel die stoffliche Abhängigkeit verdecte, ganz wie es K. selbst mit Herodot gemacht hat.' Jacoby successfully supports this conclusion with numerous examples.


80 Jacoby, 'Ktesias', 1922, p.2069: 'Poseidonios had ihn noch gelesen (Cic.de.divin. I.46); Plutarch benutzt ihn im Artaxerxes zur Correctur und Ergänzung des Ktesias; für den zweiten Teil von c.22 an, wo Ktesias versagte, liegt er wohl zu Grund (vgl.frg.29 = Plut.Artax. 30).
sympathies and anti-Herodotean polemics, and that Deinon's source was in turn a Persian authority. Rostovtzeff's response was to point out that it is highly improbable that stories in which the Persians are twice defeated by Scythians would be of Persian origin, and that elements of Scythian idealisation found in Trogus' work did not come from Ktesias or Deinon, but from a later source who simply drew upon the above two writers for material. Though the first response is appropriate, the second is not. The idealisation of Scythians had been a part of the historical literature long before Deinon wrote, so there is no reason why a romantic historian such as he might not have been responsible for the elements of idealisation in Trogus' work.

In 1964 Iliescu was prepared to concede Trogus' use of Deinon's *Persika* in the first book of his *Historiae Philippicae*, but was not convinced that Gutschmid proved use of Deinon in Trogus' second book, nor certain of the source of Trogus' idealisation. The caution with which Iliescu and Rostovtzeff have approached Gutschmid's thesis is commendable. Gutschmid did not discuss the Zarina story of the history of idealisation of Scythians. Having discussed these, however, the appropriateness of Gutschmid's thesis is clear. The material on early Scythians and Amazons in Jordanes and Justin might therefore be traced

81 Gutsmid. 'Die beiden ersten Bücher'. 1894, pp.87ff., concluded 'Als Quelle des ersten Buches ist Deinons Persische Geschichte nachgewiesen worden. Es erübrigt nun noch, zu zeigen, dass alle für den Urheber der skythischen Nachrichten des Trogus ermittelten Kriterien auf diesen passen' This Gutsmid does in pp.102-104, pointing to 1) the correspondence of Trogus with Arrian and Polyainos (the latter of whom is known to have used Deinon), 2) the contrasting of Egypt and Scythia, (cf Deinon, F 23b), and 4) use of folktales on Sesostris and the Scythians.

82 Rostovtzeff, *Skythien*, 1931, p.109, was not the first to regard Deinon's source as a problem, for Gutsmid wrote: 'Das einzige Bedenken, welches man gegen eine Ableitung des Abschnittes des Trogus über die Skythen aus Deinon haben könnte, dass dieser in seiner Persischen Geschichte keinen Anlass gehabt habe, die vollständige Geographie und Geschichte Skythiens zu behandeln, erledigt sich bei näherem Zusehen von selbst...'; and further that 'Die Nachrichten des Trogus enthalten also Nichts, was nicht in einer persischen Geschichte wie die des Deinon vorkommen musste'. Though this is perhaps a reasonable conclusion, it is not reasonable to say 'die Quelle der Nachrichten des Trogus über Skythien den persischen Standpunkt einnimmt...'


84 Iliescu, 'Bemerkung zur gotenfreundlichen Einstellung in den Getica des Jordanes', 1972, p.415 n.38. On the latter point, 'Und auch in diesem Fall wissen wir nicht, ob die "Verschönerung" der Anfänge der skythischen Geschichte bereits in der Vorlage gleichwohl welche es gewesen sein mag- zu finden war, oder sie dem Skythenliebhaber Trogus zu verdanken ist, um so mehr als es sich um weitzückliegende und längst vergessene Dinge handelte'.

back to Trogus, from him to Deinon and from him to Ktesias. Similar material in Diodoros may be traced back to Deinon, who used Ktesias, and Ktesias.

Thus, though Murray rejected attempts to accredit Ktesias and Deinon with a major role in Hellenistic historiography, believing it 'unnecessary to set up these two as the source of a type of Hellenistic history when their predecessor Herodotus is such a much more obvious candidate', it is clear that the above cycle of stories owe a lot more to Ktesias and Deinon than they do to Herodotos.85

**Ktesias' Geography.**

Though such scholars as Herrmann have suggested that Ktesias told his fabulous tales without too much concern for geographical context86, that Ktesias worked with some very definite geographical conceptions would seem probable considering that besides his *Persika*, *Indika*, and *Phoroi*, Ktesias wrote a geographical work variously called a *Periodos*, *Periegesis* and *Periploi*87. There are very few extant fragments of Ktesias' geographical treatise, but from those few fragments that are extant it is possible to speculate that the first book might have dealt with Egypt and western Asia Minor88, the second with Asia from the Caucasus eastward89 and the third with the west90. The extant fragments of the geographical treatise do not, however, give any grounds for determining the continental boundaries with which Ktesias worked. For an understanding of Ktesias' continental boundaries, it is necessary to turn back to Ktesias' *Persika*.

---

85 Murray, 'Herodotus and Hellenistic Culture', 1972, p.212.
86 Herrmann, 'Sakai', 1929, p.1174: 'Aber ob er mit seinen teilweise unglaubwiirdigen Erzahlungen bestimmte geographische Vorstellungen verbunden hat, ist...richt unwahrscheinlich'.
87 For discussion of Ktesias' *Indika* see McCrindle, *Ancient India as described by Ktesias*, 1882 (1973) and Jacoby, 'Ktesias', 1922, pp.2037-39. For discussion of Ktesias' *Phoroi* see Jacoby, *ibid.*, pp.2039-40. For the fragments of Ktesias' geographical treatise see FGrH 688 F 5-58.
88 Thus Stephanos' reference to Sigynnos 'a city of Egypt, as Ktesias (writes) in the 1st (book) of (his) Periplous', and thus the reference to the 1st book of Ktesias' Periodos in connection with the mountains and Makronai on the south Euxine coast in Scholia on Apollonios of Rhodes, II.1015.
89 Thus the reference in *Scholia to Apollonios of Rhodes*, II.399, to Ktesias' mention of the Kolkhis: 'That the Amaranta mountain is in the Kolkhian land, Ktesias informs in Book 2. The Phasis, however, flows from the Armenian mountains, as Eratosthenes says, and disgorges through the Kolkhis into the sea'.
90 Thus Stephanos' citating of Ktesias' Book 3 on the subject of the Sicilian city *Kosute*. 
Though it is evident from the *Periodos* fragment in *Scholia on Apollonios of Rhodes* (II.399) that Ktesias mentioned the Kolkhian Phasis in his geographical work, and though Herodotos' treatment of this river suggested that it was regarded in some quarters as a continental boundary, it is, as Jacoby noted in 1922, unlikely that it constituted a boundary for Ktesias. The river which would seem to have featured as the boundary between Europe and Asia in Ktesias' historical work was the Tanais. Ktesias' Asia would seem to have been bound by the Nile, the Tanais and the Indus. King Ninos, the hero of the Ktesian story, is said by Jordanes (*Getica* 5) to have conquered all of Asia 'to Libya on the side of Egypt, and to Europe on the side of the Danube', by Justin (I.i.5) to have crossed Asia to Libya, and by Diodoros (II.i.1) to have been 'seized with a powerful desire to subdue all of Asia that lies between the Tanais and the Nile' and (II.i.3) to have conquered nearly all Asia, subduing among other nations, the Egyptians, and 'all the barbarian nations who inhabit the shores of the Pontus as far as the Tanais'. The Nile as a continental boundary might seem to present a problem, with half of Egypt thus falling inside and half outside Asia. Ktesias might simply, however, have placed the whole of Egypt within Asia (thus dealing with both Egypt and Asia Minor in Book I of his *Periodos*) and might have conceived of the Nile dividing Egypt from Libya. The Tanais as a continental boundary was clearly an inheritance of the Hekataian-Hellenikan tradition.

As has been discussed in Chapters 1-4, a Don-Tanais was used at a very early date as a continental boundary. Ktesias' Tanais, however, did not stop at the Don, but clearly included the course of the Iaxartes as well, thereby serving as an effective boundary for north Asia as he knew it. Ktesias may indeed have played a principal part in the development of the concept of a Tanais which included within its course the lower Don and the Iaxartes, a concept which was to feature so prominently in the works of Eudoxos, Ephoros, Aristotle and some Alexander historians. It has been noted by Jacoby that despite his long residence in Asia and his production of a *Periodos*, Ktesias is included in no ancient list of geographers, nor once cited by Pliny. Jacoby indeed argues that apart from his compatriot Agatharkhides no ancient geographer used Ktesias' geography

91 Jacoby, *'Ktesias'*, 1922, p.2036.
92 For a fuller discussion of Ktesias' geographic concepts see P'jankov, 'Сведения Ктесия о владениях Бардии на востоке Ирана', 1961, pp.98-103, and 'История Персии Ктесия и средне-азиатские сатрапии Ахеменидов', 1965, pp.35-50. For an excellent reconstruction of the mental map with which Ktesias worked, see P'jankov, Средняя Азия в известиях античного историка Ктесия, 1975, p.22.
directly\textsuperscript{93}. Though Ktesias is not listed among famous ancient geographers, discussion of Ktesias' influence on ancient geography in the following three chapters would suggest that it was stronger than Jacoby believes.

Conclusion.

It might then be concluded that though modern scholars invariably underestimate the amount of Ktesian material accessible through extant accounts, underestimate the relevance of this material to the study of eastern-Scythians, and underestimate Ktesias' influence on subsequent historical and geographical writing, it is possible to reconstruct with some degree of confidence Ktesias' conception of the history and ethnography of the north-east, to gain from Ktesian material valuable insights into Persian perceptions of Assyrian, Median and Persian contact with Caucasian and Central Asian Scythians, and to see Ktesias, through the medium of Deinon, as having a major influence on subsequent writings on the subject of Scythian history. Discussion in the following chapters will suggest that, through the medium of Eudoxos, Ephoros and Aristotle, Ktesias may have also had a major influence on subsequent writings on the subject of northern geography.

CHAPTER 7.

EUDOXOS, SKYLAX AND THE SYRMATAI.

Eudoxos' work.

Eudoxos of Knidos (c.390 - c.340 B.C.) was not only a famous mathematician and astronomer. He was also a geographer, and in this capacity his role in the literary tradition concerned with Scythians and Sauromatai was not insignificant. Yet as a geographer Eudoxos is not famous, and his role in the above tradition has been overlooked by most writers1, and those who don't overlook him underestimate his significance. Borzsak, for example, wrote that Eudoxos 'scheint nichts von den nördlich des Istros liegenden Gebieten gewusst zu haben'2. The qualification Borzsak should have made is that Eudoxos had no personal knowledge of the tribes in this region, for that he wrote on northern tribes was recognised as early as 1907 when Hultsch arrived at the following reconstruction of his work3: Book I deals with Armenia and 'ist denn nach Nordost zu den Massageten und nach Nord zu den Chabarenern und andern Umwohnern des Schwarzen Meeres, weiter auch zu den Sarmaten fortgeschritten'. In Book II 'erscheinen die Skythen und eine sonst unbekannte Insel Asdynis des Asowschen Meeres'. In Book III 'aus welchem kein Fragment zitiert wird, ist den Völkerschaften das Nordens gewidmet gewesen'. In Book IV 'von Norden her dem eigentlichen Griechenland sich nähernd, Thrakien, Makedonien und die Chalkidike... behandelt'. Such a reconstruction is, however, untenable. A Scythian logos in Book II would be out of place. The fourth Book was the first of the periegesis of Europe, and it is there we would expect the logos. The Egypt fragments which Hultsch overlooked were more likely to come from Book II. Hultsch's reconstruction must be based upon the notion that Stephanos' citation of Eudoxos in his entry under Asdynis has admitted a gross textual error and that the island Asdynis lay not in the Μοιρικ

1 For example, Trüdinger, Studien zu Geschichte der griechiscen-römischen Ethnographie, 1918; Rostovtzeff, Skythien und der Bosporus, 1931, and van Paassen, The classical Tradition of Geography, 1957. Altheim, Weltgeschichte Asiens, II, 1947, pp.129-132 notes Eudoxos' sympathy for Zarathustra (Periodos F 38, 59) and suggests his move from Knidos to Athens unleashed an oriental stream into the Academy, but undertakes no investigation of Eudoxos' place in the geographical tradition.


(Μεριδώς) Sea of Egypt, as the manuscript reads, but in the Μαξιτιδός. Though Hultsch does not say so, he may have also been led to this reconstruction by reading the ἐν ὅ in Clement, Stromateis, V.64.5 as ἐν δευτέρα, instead of ὅ as in the numeral 4. Here the original text is indeed ambiguous.

It has only been in very recent years that Eudoxos' place in the above tradition has been appreciated. In 1972 Müller observed that the title Γῆς περίδός was also the title of the geographies of Hekataios and Damastes. Müller did not, however, recommend Hekataios or Damastes as Eudoxos' main source, preferring to list a whole range of sources: Homer, Hesiod, Hekataios, Herodotos, Xanthos and Ktesias. Müller also wrote of Eudoxos' conformity to the Ionian model in his attention to people, borders, mountains, climate, fauna, flora and languages, and, in a restatement of the belief Gisinger articulated in 1921, concluded that Eudoxos was basically dependent upon Herodotos. As supporting evidence Müller presented Gisinger's observations upon Eudoxos' definition of the Tanais as the boundary between Europe and Asia, and his division of the oikoumene into three continents- Europe, Asia and Libya. The first of these conceptions was, however, Hekataian, even though the second was Herodotean. A complete dependence upon Gisinger's work, led Müller away from exploring the possibility he himself had earlier raised, that Hekataios may have had some influence in Eudoxos' work, to assuming Herodotos was the main source.

In 1976 Pédech included Eudoxos in his overview of Greek geography, commenting that he was a contemporary of Aristotle, a sympathiser with the Pythagorean and Platonic school of thought, and had, like Hekataios, written a Description of the Earth in 7 books. Curiously, however, Pédech, like Müller, goes on to recommend Herodotos and Ktesias as Eudoxos' chief sources without even noting Lasserre's 1966 study of the question.

---

4 That Hultsch was confident the latter was the correct reading is suggested by his reference (p.947) to 'eine sonst unbekannte Insel Asdynis des Asowschen Meeres'.
5 Müller, Antiken Ethnographie, 1972, p.145.
6 Ibid., p.146: 'Mit Herodot gliederte er die bekannte Ökumene...' and p.147 'ob Eudoxus hier jedoch mehr als Herodot bot, darf, nach dem Erhaltenen zu schliessen, wohl bezweifelt werden' and Gisinger, Erdbeschreibung des Eudoxos, 1921.
7 Ibid., p.146: Gisinger, Eudoxos, 1921, pp.18, 35 and 153. This is evident from the distribution of extant fragments. Books I-III are devoted to Asia, IV-VI to Europe. As the Massagetai and Sauromatai (said to dwell by the Tanais) are subjects of Bk. I and the European Scythians subjects of Bk. IV, it is evident that the Tanais is considered to be the boundary.
8 Pédech, La Géographie des Grèc, 1976, pp.67-68.
fragment by fragment. Those fragments of relevance to the study of the 'eastern Scythians' might now be discussed.

The Eudoxan fragments.

The first fragment which may be considered deals with the Massagetai, Diogenes Laertios (IX.i.83) writing: καὶ Μασσαγέται μὲν, ἐς φησὶ καὶ Εὔδοξος ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ Περιοδοῦ, κοινὰς ἔχουσι τὰς γυναῖκας, Ἐλληνες δ’ οὗ. Gisinger points out the similarity between this passage and Herodotos I.216, but Lassere suggests the similarity may be due to the use of a common source, Hekataios. Strabo preserved a similar piece of information on the Massagetai, and Gisinger believes his source was either Herodotos or Eudoxos. This may well be so, but does not support Gisinger's conclusion that Eudoxos must have followed Herodotos.

A second fragment is to be found in Clement of Alexandria: οὐκοῦσι μὴν πολλοὶ μαλιστα τὸ ἔτος μονὸν πήξαντες ἐπὶθεῦν ὡς 'Αρεί ἔστι θεὸς κυθῶν τὸ τοιοῦτον, καθ’ πέρ ἐὐδοκος ἐν <δ’> Ἡ ἐπιοδοῦ λέγει. The fragment's similarity to Herodotos IV.62 has been taken by Gisinger as further proof of his thesis, but Lasserre has pointed to several differences between the two accounts. Eudoxos is said to write of a simple ceremony with nothing but a sword and Herodotos gave a detailed account of the structure on top of which the sword stands. It would be possible to argue that Eudoxos had simply abridged Herodotos' account were it not that the custom of worshipping the sword alone is well attested of Eurasian nomadic tribes. In the stories Ammianus and Jordanes tell of the Quadi, Halani and Huns there is no

9 Her. I.216: 'Each man marries a wife, but the wives are common to all. The Greeks say this is a Scythian custom; it is not so, but a custom of the Massagetae. There, when a man desires a woman, he hangs his quiver before her waggon, and has intercourse with her, none hindering.' Gisinger, Eudoxos, 1921, p.26.
11 Strabo XI.viii.6: 'Each man marries only one wife, but they use also the wives of one another; not in secret, however, for the man who is to have intercourse with the wife of another hangs up his quiver on the wagon and has intercourse with her openly.' Gisinger, Eudoxos, 1921, p.26.
12 Clement, Exhortation to the Greeks, V.64.5: '...many tribes simply fix their sword in the ground and then offer sacrifice to it as if to Ares. Such is the custom of the Scythians, as Eudoxus says in his second book of Geography...'.
13 Gisinger, Eudoxos, 1921, p.73.
mention of Herodotos' wooden structure in the sword-worshipping ceremony\(^\text{15}\) nor in Pan Ku's account of Ching Lu worship\(^\text{16}\). Eudoxos' account might not, therefore, be an abridgement of Herodotos, but an accurate account of a still more widespread custom derived from another source, perhaps Hekataios. Herodotos may have heard the more elaborate story and seized the opportunity to differ from Hekataios. The two descriptions are not irreconcilable. Herodotos said one structure can be found in every nomos and the worship need not have been confined to this location.

A complication is encountered upon reading that which follows the above Ephorean fragment in Clement's *Exhortation to the Greeks* Ch.5: 'while the Sauromatians, a Scythian tribe, worship a dagger, according to Hicesius in his book on Mysteries\(^\text{17}\). Gabrielsson, the only commentator to notice the fragment, notes that this Hikesios is an obscure writer, but this is all Gabrielsson has to say on the fragment\(^\text{18}\). Unfortunately, as Hikesios, the physician and medical writer of Eratosthenes' school, is unlikely to have written a *Peri mysterion*, the Hikesios of the above fragment must remain an enigma. Though this be so, the fragment itself is informative. The conception of Sauromatai as Scythians has already been seen to belong to a non-Herodotean, possibly Hekataian, tradition. Unless the line was extracted by Hikesios from an earlier work with no consideration at all of contemporary circumstances, it is unlikely that Hikesios was living later than the 4th century B.C., for by the 3rd century B.C. *Sarmatai* had displaced *Skythai* as the generic term and *Sauromatai* as the spelling of the particular tribe. His source was probably either Eudoxos, though in that case the reference to the Sauromatai needs explaining, or Hekataios, who may have originally attributed the custom to the 'Scythian' tribe of Sauromatai. The second possibility is perhaps more probable. Herodotos substituted his own observations on the Basileioi custom, Eudoxos adopted Hekataios' notice, but noted only that part attributing the custom to Scythians, while Hikesios accepted the whole notice without alteration. It is impossible to say whether Hikesios pre- or post-dated Eudoxos, but his notice does seem to enhance Eudoxos' Hekataian complexion.

\(^{15}\) Ammianus, XVII.xii.21 on the Quadi; XXXI.ii.23 on the Halani; Jordanes XXXV.183 on Attila.

\(^{16}\) Though Pan Ku believed the 剃路神祠 were used for sacrifice to the Hsiu ch'u Prince, they were clearly for worshipping the spirit of the Ching Lu sword. See Kao, *The Ching Lu Shen Shrines*, 1960, pp.221-232; and Prusek, *Chinese Statelets...*, 1971, p.133.

\(^{17}\) Σκυθών ὁ Σαυρομάται, ζημίαν ἰκέσιος ἐν τῇ περὶ μοστηρίων, ἀκώκην σέβουσιν.

\(^{18}\) Gabrielsson, *Über die Quellen des Clemens Alexandrinus*, 1906, Pt.1, p.75.
A third Eudoxan fragment, a description of Hyrkanian cliffs, can be found in Strabo XI.vii.5. Gisinger is unable to recommend an identification of the source here beyond suggesting that he may be a contemporary authority familiar with the Greek trading route along the south coast of the Caspian. This suggestion is inadequate for two reasons: firstly, as the belief in the existence of a trade route through that region is, as Tarn convincingly argues, based on misunderstanding in Strabo XI.vii.3 and Pliny VI.xix.52, and secondly, as the description of the cliff can not be reconciled with either the present day or 4th century B.C. nature of the coastline.

The obvious source for Eudoxos' conception and description is, as Lasserre points out, Hekataios, from whose Asias Periegesis Athenaios quotes the following lines: Περί τῆν ὡρκανήν θάλασσαν καλεομένην ὁδρεα ὑπηλα ὅλησεν. A similar description is found in the anonymous Paradoxographos and may, along with Strabo's, go back to Hekataios, a summary of whose account appears in Athenaios. Strabo's conception of the region is complicated by his description in XI.vii.2 of Hyrkania as πολλή καὶ τὸ πλέον πεδίον. The apparent inconsistency can be resolved with the suggestion that Hekataios' original description included references to coastal areas of both plain and mountains. Such a description would then also accommodat Arrian's account of Hyrkania: '...on the one hand it is bounded by high and wooded mountains, but the plain land in it stretches to the Great Sea which lies this way.

20 Tarn, 'Patrokles and the Oxo-Caspian trade route', 1901, and Greeks in Bactria and India, 1938 (1951), pp.488-493, arguing that Patrokles, to whom the story can be traced back, did not speak of an existing trade route, but a possible trade route.
21 Gisinger, Eudoxos, 1921, p.24, attempts to resolve the difficulty by arguing that the sea in antiquity extended south as far as the northern Persian mountain range, but as c, points out, this extension, geologically supportable, did not last past 10,000 B.C.
23 Cod.Par.gr. 1630 saec XIV: 'That in what is known as the Hyrkanian and Kaspian sea, cliffs rise up from the coast, being extremely high and full of caves. The cliffs are separated by a little distance of sometimes half or a third of a stade from the sea, for someone making his way to the coast. From above these cliffs rivers come down, higher mountains bringing down such a flow that in the process of flowing into the sea they cast their water from the top of the cliffs into this sea. The land in the middle lying below, that is, the beach, is left completely dry, so as to be passable and negotiated for those passing through there; a whole army may even, actually being covered by the flow of the river, be dry in passing and protected from overhead. Own translation from the Greek text in Boissonade, Anecdota Graeca e codicibus regiisy 1829-32, (1962), I.96.
24 Arrian, Anabasis, II.xxiii.1.
have considered it, at least in part, to back onto mountains, arouses the suspicion that he was Eudoxos' authority.

The fourth and final fragment which might be considered is Stephanos' entry under Συμμάταιες Συμμάταιοι, οί Σαυρομάται, ὦς εὗδοξος πρῶτος ποταμὸν τοῦ Τανάίδος Συμμάταιος κατοικεῖν. Gisinger believed that Eudoxos must have located the Sauromatai in the same region Herodotos' does in IV.21, 57 and 116, and concluded that Herodotos was Eudoxos' source. Gisinger overlooked, however, the most interesting element in the fragment, the apparent use of Συμμάταιοι and Σαυρομάταιοι as synonyms. The name Syrmatai does not occur in Herodotos, nor in the extant work of Ephoros, Timosthenes, Artemidoros and Strabo, all of whom Gisinger names as writers offering a similar location for the Sauromatai. The only other extant reference to the name is in (Ps) Skylax, and as in the above fragment, the tribe is listed after the Scythians, but before the Tanais, across which are the separately listed Sauromatai. The problem is clearly not simply one of spelling, and deserves further investigation.

Skylax and the Syrmatai.

Herodotos offers the only biography of the supposed author of the above mentioned Periplus, writing in IV.44 that:

'Darius, desiring to know where this Indus issues into the sea, sent ships manned by Scylax, a man of Caryanda, and others in whose word he trusted; and these men, starting at Caspatyrus on the Indus, effectively circumnavigated Asia Minor'.

In 1855 Müller found so many problems with accepting Herodotos' story and language flaws in the text of the Periplus that he preferred to date the Periplus to 338 B.C. and credit an Athenian named Phileos, whose name he believed was corrupted first to Phylax and then to Skylax, with its composition. This late date has had a long life in both Soviet and Western scholarship. Müller passed no comment on the occurrence in the text of the

25 Gisinger, Eudoxos, 1921, p.27.
26 See Ps.Skymnos 860-880; Agatharkhides I.7, Pliny II.246 and Strabo II.v.7 respectively.
27 See Baschmakoff's text, La synthèse des périple pontique, 1948, pp.64-66; (68) Σαυρομάται. Μετά δὲ Σκύθας Συμμάταιες ξένους καὶ ποταμόζ Τάναίς, ἰδὲ ὁ Ρίζες Ἀσίαν καὶ Εὔρυππην. (70) Σαυρομάται. Ἀπὸ Τανάίδος δὲ ποταμὸν ἄρχεται η Ἀσία καὶ πρῶτον ξένους αὐτής ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ Πάντῳ Σαυρομάται. Σαυρομάται δὲ ἐστὶν ξένοις γυναικοκρατούμενοι.
28 Müller, Geographi Graeci Minores I, p.xxxvi of the Latin preface to his edition of the text.
word ᾿Εὐρυμάται, but it was not many years after Müller wrote, that the debate on the identity of this tribe, and the significance of the Skylax passage began.

In 1899 Braun wanted to distinguish the Syrmatai from the Iranian-speaking Sauromatai and identified them upon linguistic and historical grounds with a Finnic speaking group. The theory was soon rejected and fell into disuse. In 1901 the Czech Niederle sought to amend the text by inserting after Syrmatai μετὰ δὲ Σκύθας ᾿Εὐρυμάται, to enforce, or, arguably, to restore, a sense of location between the Scythians and Tanais, and to use the passage as evidence of early Sarmatian crossings of the Don, believing the process a long, gradual one. Minns, in 1913, was however, readier 'to suppose the mention of "Syrmatae" west of the river to be put in by a later hand than that of the compiler of the Periplous. In the second half of the fourth century the Sarmatae are still east of the Don, or just crossing...'. Minns does not explicitly identify the Syrmatai with the Sarmatai, but does do so implicitly, and as he believe the later to be different to the Sauromatai, he probably believed the Syrmatai different to the Sauromatai. In 1922 Rostovtzeff was explicit in claiming that the compiler of the Periplous which goes under the name of Skylax and Eudoxos had heard of the Syrmatai on the Don about 338, Müller's date for the composition of the Periplous, that the tribe was a new arrival, distinct from the long established Sauromatai, and that the resemblance in names (though Syrmatai was the tribe's self-appellation) and the fact that the two peoples amalgamated, led to the transformation of the name ᾿Εὐρυμάται into ᾿Σαρμάται, and to the permanent confusion of two distinct peoples in our historical tradition. Vasmer in 1923 interpreted both Skylax and Eudoxos in the Stephanos fragment as implying a Sarmatian presence west of the Tanais.

Rostovtzeff returned to the problem in 1931 with an attempt to reconstruct Ps.Skylax's trip. In the western Euxine Ps.Skylax names only one river (the Tyris) and two cities.

---

29 Braun, Разыскания в области гото-славянских отношений, 1899, pp.85-87 (cited Liberov, 'Савроматы ли сирматы', 1969, p.28). See also Minns, Scythians and Greeks, 1913, p.188.
31 See Minns, Scythians and Greeks, 1913, p.188; Zgusta, Die Personennamen, 1955, pp.26-27.
32 Minns, ibid., 1913, p.118.
33 Rostovtzeff, Iranians and Greeks, 1922, p.114.
(Nikonion and Ophiousa). He fails to mention those rivers and cities which are of such significance for Herodotos, the Dnieper the Bug and Olbia, but offers a detailed description of the Crimea. Rostovtzeff interprets this as indicating a direct voyage from the mouth of the Danube to the south west coast of the Crimea, and from there via Khersonesos and Pantikapaion to the Tanais at the end of the Azov sea, and back along the Asian coast, around the Sindic peninsular and along the Caucasian coast to the southern Euxine cities. Rostovtzeff interprets this orientation towards the Bosphoros as representing late Athenian interests, and not early Ionian ones, which centered on Olbia, and thus dates the work to the late 4th century. Rostovtzeff further argued that as the epithet γυναικοκρατούμενοι is used by Ps.Skylax and Ephoros (in Ps.Skymnos 70) for the Sauromatai, but not the Syrmatai, the latter were Sarmatians who ought be distinguished from the former.

In 1939 Junge noted Ps.Skylax' and Eudoxos' references to both tribes and followed Rostovtzeff in believing this fourth century evidence for Sarmatian, not Sauromatai, migrations. In 1947 Grakov discussed the Skylax reference to women's rule among the Sauromatai, and to the Syrmatai west of the Don, and, though making no explicit equation between the two tribal-names, nor offering any study of the Periplous' date, believed this evidence for early 5th (sic!) century B.C. Sauromatai crossing of the river. In Gernez's catalogue of lost and extant Periploi, which appeared two years later, the work in hand is dated to 338 - 335 B.C., and believed to have more characteristics of a geographical treatise than a manual of nautical instruction (there being few directions for sailors), even though the author is believed to have made use of such a manual for the second part of his work.

Baschmakoff's book on the same subject seems to have appeared too late for Gernez to learn that by 1948 Müller's date of 338 was under challenge. Baschmakoff argued that the imperfections of language which Müller noted are not grounds enough for denying the work its due antiquity and that, as the Periplous of Hekataios is not essentially different from that we possess under the name of Skylax, the latter may well have been the work of Herodotos' Skylax in about 500 B.C., and that no place name forces a later date upon the

---

36 Ibid., p.27.  
37 Junge, Saka Studien, 1939, pp.73-74.  
40 Baschmakoff, La synthèse des Périples Pontiques, 1948.
work. Baschmakoff's thesis has drawn little support from modern scholars, who have all detected fourth century material in the Periplous. Even Peretti, who in 1979 argued that for its greater part the Periplous reproduces or abridges a much earlier guide, conceded that there is fourth century material in the Periplous. Although Peretti has not succeeded in convincing modern scholars that the greater part of the Periplous is of great antiquity, he has succeeded in refuting the thesis that the Periplous was a unified work, compiled in the 4th century or later by a single diligent geographer and succeeded in turning the discussion from whether the Periplous is 6th century or 4th century, to discussion of how much of the Periplous preserves 6th century material and how much 4th century. Thus, it is not impossible that Syrmatai may have been a word used in a pre-fourth century B.C. guide. Indeed, Stephanos' entry on Syrmatai would seem to suggest that Eudoxos was not, as most have supposed, the first to mention the Syrmatai, but that he sought only to explain a term already in use, by identifying the tribe as Sauromatai. Could Eudoxos' and Skylax's reference to the Syrmatai be further evidence of an early Sauromatai presence west of the Tanais?

Further investigation suggests the above question ought be answered in the affirmative. In 1955 Zgusta noted the existence of the two names in Skylax and Stephanos, but then took the debate one step further by noting also Pliny's reference to Syrmatai on the Oxos. Faced with these inconsistencies, Zgusta concluded that: 'Eine Entscheidung ist unmöglich, da in beiden Richtungen Verwechselungen oder auch Interpolationen des Textes möglich sind.' The Eudoxan fragment itself does not suggest to Zgusta that the Syrmatai are to be found west of the Tanais, but taken with the Skylax passage, he is inclined to believe there was a migration, adding: 'Es ist unmöglich, die Zeit dieser Bewegung genau festzustellen; es wird sich allerdings auch um einen längereren Prozess handeln.' The name Συρμαται he saw, along with Σαμωται and the Avestan 'Sairima' as variants of Σαμομαται.

---

41 Ibid., pp.22-23, 25 & 26-29 respectively. Baschmakoff argues further that Syrmatai is one of sixteen names of high antiquity known only from Skylax, and argued the tribe need not be taken to be the same as the Sarmatians. These arguments are not, however, strong. The name is also found in the Eudoxan fragment and its similarity with the word 'Sarmatai' can not be ignored.

44 Zgusta, Die Personennamen, 1955, p.26; Pliny VI.xviii.48.
45 Ibid.
46 Ibid., pp.264-5.
In ignorance of Baschmakoff's challenge to Müller's date, the Soviet scholars Tret'jakov, Mongajt and K.F.Smimov adopted 338 B.C. as the date of the Periplous' composition and used Skylax's as evidence of the late 4th century Sarmatian crossing of the Don, as Rostovtzeff had done before them. In 1961, however, El'ntsikij approached the problem afresh, considering the periplous the work of the original Skylax and Syrmatai an old form of Sarmatai, in the same way Hekataios' Ixibatai has been argued above to be but an old form of Ephoros' Iazamatai.

Appreciating that this may imply an 'unprecedentedly' early Sauromatai presence west of the Tanais, El'ntsikij notes Pliny's reference to Syrmatae on the Oxos, and unlike Zgusta considers this explicable: the name was transferred to the Don as a result of the confusion between the Central Asian Jaxartes and the Maiotis Tanais, some time during the 4th century B.C. It is this explanation the present writer finds the most satisfactory.

El'ntsikij's contribution to the study in hand does not end here. Having offered many examples of the similarities between Skylax's and Hekataios' work, he notes an apparent contradiction. Skylax names among the Caucasian tribes, the Melagkhlainoi and Gelonoi, while Hekataios names the first of these among the tribes of the European Scythians. The contradiction is, however, as El'ntsikij himself points out, an illusion. In Hekataios' work a tribe may at the one and the same time be in Europe, Scythia and the Caucasus. He speculated that in the earliest tradition, represented in the work of Hekataios, the Melagkhlainoi, Gelonoi and Phtheirotrageoi were all located in the Caucasus, beyond the

47 Tret’jakov & Mongajt, Ocherki istorii SSSR, 1956, p.507; K.F.Smimov, Problema nego sochdeniya, 1957, p.17, and "Ameronk" IV veka do n.e. na Done, 1982, p.128. Smimov explained (Ps.) Skylax' non-identification of Syrmatai and Sauromatai (locating the former to the west of, and the later to the east of the Don) as a result of using different sources. He noticed, p.125, the Eudoxos reference to Syrmatai, but decided it was not possible to tell if Eudoxos believed the tribe dwelt east or west of the Tanais. Though he used (Ps.) Skylax as evidence for a 4th century Sarmatian crossing of the Don, he saw, pp.120-131, the Syrmatai and Boudinoi as Sauromatai groups and even identified the skeletal remains in a tomb on the west bank of the lower Don of women buried in armour, as the remains of a Syrmatai-Sauromatai Amazon. Smimov did not see the difference between Sauromatai and Sarmatian which others did.

48 El'ntsikij, Znaniia, 1961, p.70.

49 Ibid., p.70.

50 Ibid., p.70.

51 El'ntsikij, Znaniia, 1961, p.72. For example the Dandaroi and Tipanissoi in F 161 & 162.
Phasis, but as Phasis was identified with the Tanais, and the Caucasus mountains with the Rhipaians, when the Tanais was later identified with the Don, and the Rhipaians with a range far to the north of Scythia, these tribes were all transplanted in the north-east of Scythia, where Herodotos located them. It is just such a thesis that has been argued in the first four chapters of this work.

Soviet archaeologists were several steps behind the philologists. K.F.Smimov and Petrenko made but passing mention of the Syrmatai, noting no discrepancies between Skylax' and Eudoxos' reference and not noting the Pliny reference. They did, however, interpret the Skylax reference as evidence that a Sauromatai-Sarmatian group had crossed the Don. A.P.Smimov equated Hippokrates' Sauromati with Skylax's Syrmatai, and interpreted this not only as evidence that Sauromatai had begun to penetrate Scythian territory in the 4th (sic) century, but also that the Scythians had crossed to the east of the Don. The former would be a better argument for a 5th century crossing, and the latter, though possible, can not be inferred from the texts.

In 1969 Braun's old theory of the Syrmatai's Finnic identity was revived by Liberov, who argued that Eudoxos showed knowledge of the separate identity of the Syrmatai and Sauromatai (an advance branch of the future Sarmatai), that no ancient reference identifies them, that the tribal-name 'Syrmatai' is best derived from the Finnic 'Syr', that hydronyms and toponyms in the region between the Don and the northern Donetz are from a very ancient Mordavian, and that archaeological evidence testifies to the region being settled in the 4th century by a people other than Herodotos' Sauromatai.

The revival of the old theory was not noticed by Machinskij when in 1971 he offered Müller's date of 338 for the Periplous and Rostovtzeff's date of 370-365 for Eudoxos' work and concluded, as most had before him, that the first Syrmatai-Sarmatai migration can be dated to the first half of the 4th century. The revival of the old theory was...

52 El'nitskij, ibid., p.72. On πελομπραγελως and variants as epithets for the Boudinoi see Chapter 2.
54 Ibid.
57 Machinskij, 'О времени первого актинного вытпления', 1971, p.42.
however, noticed by K.F. Smirnov in 1971 and by Moshkova in 1977, the latter of whom investigated the question in depth. After a lengthy study of literary and archaeological evidence Moshkova concluded:

'that we still have not gained sufficient quantity of archaeological material to completely support, let alone refute, the information of the written sources on the crossing of some part of the Sauromatai tribe already in the 4th century B.C. to the right bank of the Don. There is not at the moment evidence to give up the hypothesis of the identity of the Syrmatai with one of the advanced Sauromatai tribes, and see in them, as P.D.Liberov does, a part of the 'Finnoiazian Boudinoi'.

From the above review of scholarly opinion, the following elements may be extracted. There is little ground for denying Skylax of Karyanda's authorship of the *Periplous* which survives under his name. *Syrmatai* is almost certainly an older form of *Sauromatai* and *Sarmatai*. Eudoxos would seem to have been identifying the tribe known by the older, perhaps Hekataian name, with the one known by the commoner name, *Sauromatai*. Skylax 68 would seem to suggest the Syrmatai dwelt between the Scythians and the Tanais, and that they were the tribe mentioned in the original text, the reference to Sauromatai in 70 being a later addition, perhaps under the influence of Herodotos or Eudoxos. Is it possible that Hekataios was in fact the first to record a 'Sauromatai', in his words, 'Syrmatai' presence west of the Tanais.

**Conclusion.**

It might be concluded that though Eudoxos' work on Scythians is often thought to have been derived from Herodotos' work and included new information, it was probably derived primarily from Hekataios' work. It might be argued, moreover, that though Eudoxos' and Skylax's references to *Syrmatai* have often been taken as recently received information on a Finnic people east of, or a Sarmatian people west of the Don, they more probably evidence a Sauromatai presence west of the Don as early as the late 6th century B.C., when the historical Skylax is said to have made his voyage.

---

CHAPTER 8.

EPHOROS, PS.SKYMNOS AND THE SAUROMATAI.

Introduction.

As has been discussed above, most scholars read classical writing on Scythians superficially and consider Herodotos the source of most of these writings. Their consideration of the writings of Ephoros (c.405-330 B.C.) proves no exception¹. Though Ephoros does appear to have used some Herodotean conceptions, he did not use these exclusively. A close investigation of Ephoran fragments² might offer insights into ethnographic conceptions of Scythians in general and into the historical ethnography of some particular eastern Scythian groups. First, however, some general observations might be made on the nature of Ephoros' geographic work.

Ephoros' geography.

Van Paasen has convincingly argued that the general format of Ephoros' geographic work corresponds more closely to that of Hekataios' work than Herodotos'. Ephoros, having given a complete 'topography of the continents', is reckoned by Strabo among the ranks of such geographers as Hekataios, while Herodotos is not³. Ephoros was the first since Hekataios to offer a geography of the whole world, a task Herodotos never attempted. Ps.Skymnos claims to give a rough topography of Greece, by peoples, in imitation of Ephoros. This approach differs from the national-historical and logographical approach of Herodotos⁴. Ephoros' writing are orientated towards the Greek world and, even when directed abroad, attention is focused primarily on the Greek colonies. This contrasts sharply with Herodotos' writings in which 'the periphery of the known world lies at the

¹ e.g. Rostovtzeff, *Skythien und der Bosporus*, 1931, p.85 and Murray, 'Herodotus and Hellenistic Culture', 1972, p.205.
² Barber, *The Historian Ephorus*, 1935, p.175 has referred to 'The rather thankeless task of reconstructing Ephorus' geography' and cited the collection of fragments made by E.Dopp in his 'Die geographische Studien des Ephoros', *Wissenschaftliche Beitrage zum Jahresberichte des Gymnasiums zum Rostock*, 1900 and 1908.
⁴ Ps.Skymnos 470-478 (=Eph. F 144).
center of his geographical interest\(^5\). Even the digressions in Herodotos fall within a cartographical framework\(^6\).

The best evidence for Ephoros' conception of northern geography is perhaps Strabo I.ii.28 (= Eph. F 30a):

'Ephorus, too, discloses the ancient belief in regard to Ethiopia, for in his treatise *On Europe* he says that if we divide the regions of the heavens and of the earth into four parts, the Indians will occupy that part from which the Notos blows, the Celts the part on the west, and the Scythians the part from which the north wind blows. And he adds that Ethiopia and Scythia are the larger regions; for it is thought, he says, that the nation of the Ethiopians stretches from the winter sunrise to sunset, and Scythia lies directly opposite in the north'.

The same passage survives in Cosmas' Indikopleustes' *Christian Topography* II.79 (= Eph F 30b). Here the author claims to be quoting directly form Bk.IV of Ephoros' *History*, and goes on in II.80 to provide additional information in the form of a sketch of the world Ephoros is said to have produced. From these fragments it is clear that Ephoros believed the the *oikoumene* to be rectangular, the Scythians to live on the long northern side and the Aethiopians on the long southern side. This wide definition of Scythians was clearly non-Herodotean. A more accurate definition of Ephoros' place in the classical literary tradition is only possible through consideration of Ephoros' relationship with writers such as Homer, Hippokrates, Ps.Skymnos and Mela.

Ephoros' 'idealisation'.

The Homeric terminology and idealised conceptions which played so great a part in the course of the early tradition of writing on the northern tribes, but suffered somewhat from later Ionian rationalism, were resuscitated by Ephoros. According to Strabo (VII.iii.9) Ephoros said he would tell:

'only about those who follow "most just" habits, for there are some of the Scythian Nomads who feed only on mare's milk and excel all men in justice; and they are mentioned by the poets: by Homer, when he says that Zeus espies the land "of the Galactophagi and Abii, men most just" and by Hesiod...'.

Further, Ephoros is held to have said:

'since they [the Scythians] are frugal in their ways of living and not money-getting, they not only are orderly towards one another, because they have all things in common, their wives, children, the whole of their kin and everything but also remain invincible and unconquered by outsiders, because they have nothing to be enslaved for. And he cites Choerilus also...And when he calls Anacharsis "wise", Ephoros says that he belongs to this race, and that he was considered also one of Seven Wise men because of his perfect self-control and good sense'.

\(^5\) Van Paassen, *ibid.*, pp.252-255.

\(^6\) See the testimony of Polybios IX.i.4.
As this section survives in an almost identical form in an entry under 'Galakt ophagoi' in Nikolaos of Damaskos (Nikolaos F 104) it is probable that Strabo was here, as he claimed, following Ephoros' work closely.

So marked is Ephoros' 'idealisation' of the tribes, that in 1922 Rostovtzeff even considered him 'the first to idealize the Scythian social system, as an example of communism on a democratic basis'\(^7\), attributing to him the desire 'to substitute for the real Scythians, Scythians idealized according to Stoic theory'\(^8\). It is clear, however, that Ephoros was not the first to idealise the Scythians. Borzsak, Kallistov, Kuklina, Meljukova and Bolton are all correct in observing that the literary tradition of idealisation goes back to the period in which the Homeric poems were composed\(^9\). Meljukova, for example, noticed in 1949 that the sentiments in Ephoros' claim that the Scythians 'remain invincible and unconquered by outsiders, because they have nothing to be enslaved for' can be found in Herodotos\(^10\).

The definition of the nature of Ephoros' idealisation has long been a problem for modern scholars. Several influences have been detected on Ephoros' idealisation. Rostovtzeff called Ephoros' writing 'Stoic idealisation'\(^11\), but this is anachronistic. Cynicism has been proposed as an influence by Trüdinger\(^12\). Pythagoras' influence has been seen by Kallistov and Kuklina in such motifs as Scythian vegetarianism\(^13\). Isokrates has been seen by Riese, Lacqueur, and van Paassen as the chief influence, van Paassen writing: 'Ephoros practises

\(^7\) Rostovtzeff, *Iranians and Greeks*, 1922, p.108.
\(^8\) Ibid.
\(^10\) Strabo VII.iii.9, Cf.Nikolaos F 104. Herodotos IV.46: 'I praise not the Scythians in all respects, but in this greatest matter they have so devised that none who attacks them can escape, and none can catch them if they desire not to be caught. For when men have no established cities or fortresses, but all are house-bearers and mounted archers, living not by tilling the soil but by cattle-rearing and carrying their dwellings on waggons, how should these not be invincible and unapproachable (διαίσχοι τε και δ' ήρων)'. Meljukova, 'Античная литературная', 1949, p.105.
\(^12\) Trüdinger, *Studien zu Geschichte der griechisch-römischen Ethnographie*, 1918, p.140: 'Auf welchem Wege aber auch immer Ephoros diese Idealisierung der Skythen zugeflossen sein mag: kynisch ist sie weit wahrscheinlicher als Platonisch'.
his geography as a good pupil of Isocrates, that is, as a rhetorician and teacher, with a moral aim\textsuperscript{14}. This last suggestion deserves further attention.

Neither the passage on Scythians in the \textit{Panegyrikos} nor in \textit{Panathenaikos} would seem to provide materials for 'idealising' the Scythians\textsuperscript{15}. If Isokrates was influential in the development of an idealising tradition it could not have been through any sympathies for the Scythians. It could have been in one of two other ways. Firstly, in his condemnation of the Scythians Isokrates worked with a very broad definition of the tribe, even associating them with the Amazons, and such a definition may have encouraged Ephoros' liberal usage of the the ethnonymn. Secondly, Isokrates' readiness to moralise and employ rhetorical techniques may have encouraged Ephoros to do likewise, though where Isokrates did so against the Scythians Ephoros did so in favour of the Scythians\textsuperscript{16}.

There remains one further possible influence upon Ephoros, Plato\textsuperscript{17}. Plato has already been suspected of having had an influence on how Xenophon conceived of the Scythians. It is highly probable that though Plato was the rival of Ephoros' own master, Isokrates, his theories on ideal communities and the relationship between climate and character (an extension of Hippokratic thought) had an influence upon Ephoros\textsuperscript{18}. As it is impossible to estimate with any certainty the relative influence of Cynic, Pythagorean, Isokratean and Platonic images, techniques and thoughts upon Ephoros' 'idealisation', the above discussion of the possible influences might suffice.

In all the above discussion it has been assumed that 'Idealisation' is the most appropriate word to describe the character of, and technique behind, Ephoros' work on the Scythians?


\textsuperscript{15} \textit{Panegyrikos} 67 where the Scythians are counted with the Thracians and Persians among those races 'which have the strongest instinct for domination and the greatest power of aggression', all having been at war with Athens. Later, in the \textit{Panathenaikos} 193, the story of the Scythians' war with Athens is given in terms of the Amazon legend.

\textsuperscript{16} This influence is detected by Schwartz, 'Ephoros', 1909, p.3 and Kallistov, \textit{Античная литература}, 1945, p.193.

\textsuperscript{17} Fornara, \textit{The Nature of History in Ancient Greece and Rome}, 1983, pp.42 & 109-110, though not positing a strong Platonic influence in Ephoros' work does question the traditional view that Ephoros was intellectually dependent on Isokrates'.

\textsuperscript{18} For the relevant passages of Plato see Chapter 5.
Yet idealisation involves the falsification of reality. Ephoros does not do this. Moralising rhetoric need only involve perverse selecting and judging of evidence and a close inspection of Strabo VII.i.9 suggests it is this which Ephoros does. Thus, although Strabo reports Ephoros as saying:

'...There are some of the Scythian Nomads who feed only on mare's milk, and excel all men in justice; and they are mentioned by the poets', and that some 'abstain from eating any living creature whatever',

it is clear that he is referring only to some of the Scythians, being prepared to describe others as 'so cruel that they even eat human beings'. Strabo explained Ephoros' position as follows:

'Now the other writers, he says, tell only about their savagery because they know that the terrible and marvellous are startling, but one should tell the opposite facts too and make them patterns of conduct.'

Here then the two-fold nature of Ephoros' conception is evident. On the one hand there was the 'realistic' conception derived from Herodotos and first hand reports. On the other hand there was the 'moralistic' conception, derived from Homeric and early Ionian material and moulded under the influence of Isokratic rhetoric and Platonic idealism.

No sooner had the 'realistic' and 'moralistic/idealistic' traditions met in Ephoros' work than they parted. The former was perpetuated by Eratosthenes and Apollodoros and the latter was perpetuated by Poseidonios and Strabo. There is but one work in which elements of both conceptions seem to survive. An extensive quotation from the polymath Klearkhos (c. 340- c.250 B.C.) by Athenaios (XII. 524 c-f) begins:

'The Scythian nation alone adopted at first impartial laws: afterwards, however, they became the most wretched of mortals through their insolence',

and goes on to refer to the loss of 'the felicity their lives once knew'. The 'insolence' is said to take the form of luxurious dress and way of life, and outraging other peoples. Of particular interest is Klearkhos' description of the nature of the Scythian overlordship:

'With such arrogance did the Scythians lord it over everybody that no service rendered them by their slaves was free from tears, but rather caused the meaning of "the phrase derived from Scythians" to be known only too well among posterity!'

---

19 Reise noted the moralisation when he wrote in his *Die Idealisierung*, 1875, p.141: 'die Quelle, der beide ihren moralischen Horizont entnehmen (wenn man einmal eine solch annnehmen will), ist "das volle Reservoir wasseriger isokratischer Moralweisheit"'. Van Paassen too, *The Classical Tradition*, 1957, p.259, favours labelling the trait 'moralisation' and not 'idealisation'.

20 A better translation of την άνδρα Ξυρθην θηραν would be 'the Scythian line'.
Herodotos was clearly the source of many of the 'barbaric' elements in Klearkhos' description, as confused as their transmission may have been\textsuperscript{21}, and the elements of 'idealisation' have much in common with those in the early Ionian and Ephoran writings. Klearkhos, however, differs from Ephoros in one respect. Ephoros believed the 'ideal' and 'gruesome' Scythians were different groups living side by side. Klearkhos believed they were successive generations. Moreover, where Ephoros stressed the ideal side of the conception, Klearkhos stressed the gruesome. For both the Scythians were simply a weapon of moral instruction.

Ephoros would seem to be responsible for Strabo's generous interpretation of the Scythian mode of overlordship in VII.iv.6:

'\textquote{they turn over their land to any people who wish to till it, and are satisfied if they receive in return for the land the tribute they have assessed, which is a moderate one, assessed with a view, not to an abundance, but only to daily necessities of life; but if the tenants do not pay, the Nomads go to war with them}',

Although Strabo then offers the example of how Asander, tyrant of the Bosporos from 47/6 B.C., refused such payment, the lines preceding the above passage refer back to a still earlier discussion of justice, for which Ephoros is the cited source, and the line immediately following, mentions the Galaktophagoi, a people prominent in the Homeric tradition in which Ephoros was writing. Though Ephoros appears to have been responsible for the above description of the 'just nomadic rule', it is unclear where he found the material for his account of the overlord system. Herodotos gives no account of the system of assessing and collecting tribute.

That the 'idealised' tradition, for which Ephoros had greatest sympathy, and not Herodotos' 'realistic' one, was in fact the major tradition in classical times is clear from Strabo VII.iii.9:

'...I wish to make my point clear that there actually was a common report, which was believed by the men of both early and of later times, that a part of the Nomads, I mean those who had settled the farthest away from the rest of mankind, were "galaktophagoi", "Abioi", and "most just", and that they were not an invention of Homer'.

\textbf{Ps. Skymnos.}

An examination of Ephoros' relationship with Ps.Skymnos brings discussion closer to problems of particular relevance to the changing conceptions of eastern Scythians. The

short Periegesis in unpoetic iambic verse under the name of Skymnos has been unanimously denounced by modern scholars as a work of little ingenuity and thus little value. It is, however, precisely this lack of ingenuity which makes the work very useful for reconstructing the concepts of such scholars as Ephoros.

Though the Periegesis is dedicated to Nikomedes, King of Bithynia, probably the third monarch of that name, reigning from 91 to 76 B.C. and though the author of this work could not have been the Skymnos of Khios cited by Stephanos and the scholiast on Apollonios Rhodios IV.285 (his work having been shown to be incompatible with verse text extant under the name Skymnos) the author appears to make exclusive and uncritical use of much earlier writers, and in particular, of Ephoros. Though the entire work is not extant, the sections dealing with the Euxine and a translation of the 'Scythian' section (839-885) might read as follows:

'(839) North of these places is barbarian Scythia, adjoining the uninhabited land, and unknown to all the Greeks. (842) Ephoros said, the first by the Istros are the Karpidai, then the Aroteres further on, and the Neuroi until again a waste land because of ice. (845) Coming across the Borysthenes towards the east are the Scythians inhabiting so-called Hybla, and Georgoi next to these northwards, then again desert for a great way, beyond this, the tribe of Androphagoi Scythians and beyond there is again desert adjacent. (850) As you cross Pantikapes there is the tribe of the Limnaioi, and many others not having been given separate names; being called nomadic and extremely pious, not one of whom would ever maltreat a living thing, carrying their homes, as he has said, and being nourished by milk acquired by milking Scythian mares. They live having declared their whole community common to all. And he says the wise Anakharsis (860) came from among the Nomads, the most pious of men. ...and coming into Asia there dwell certain people, whom they call Sakai. He says the most remarkable are the Sauromatai, Geloni and (865) thirdly, the so-called tribe of the Agathyrosi. Next there lies Lake Maiotis, taking its name from the Maiotai, into which the Tanais, (870) taking its waters from the Araxes, flows, as Hekataios of [Mile?]tos said, and as Ephoros has written in his history, coming out of a certain lake, the far side of which is unknown. Having two mouths the flow goes into both the so-called Maiotis and into the Kimmerian Bosporos. (875) Asia. First the Sarmatai inhabit the Tanais, which is the border of Asia, cutting either continent apart and stretching for 200 stades. Then the tribe of the Maiotai, being called the (880) Iazamatai, as Demetrius has said, but according to Ephoros, it is the race of the Sauromatai. They say the Amazons are mixed with the Sauromatai, after having come from a battle.

22 Müller, Geographi Graeci Minores, I.lxxiv ff.; As early as 1883 Bunbury, A History of Ancient Geography, II, p.69, said Ps.Skymnos' Periegesis 'has received in modern times far more attention than it deserves'. There is a similar lack of sympathy in Thompson, History of Ancient Geography, 1948 (1965), p.210 and Diller, The Tradition of the Minor Greek Geographers, 1952, pp.165 & 189.


24 Bunbury, ibid., p.69-70.
which had been fought about the Thermodon; on account of these things they got
the name 'Gynaikokratoumenoi'.

Ephoros is cited four times in the above catalogue of northern tribes (vv.843, 860, 871 &
880). Demetrios of Kallatis is, however, also cited. This otherwise unknown writer is
perhaps the same as the Demetrios mentioned by Agatharkhides 'as one of the writers who
had given the best accounts of the northern regions of the earth'25. How much then of the
above material was drawn from Ephoros, and how much from Demetrios?

In 1887 Bunbury argued that Demetrios was responsible for the material related to the
Euxine shores, and the highly trustworthy notices on the many Ionian colonies and their
foundations, but that the account of the Scythian tribes 'is taken exclusively from
Ephoros'26. Gisinger too stressed the use of Ephoros, but did not attempt to evaluate
Demetrios' contribution27. Jacoby doubted that Ephoros was used directly by Skymnos
and postulates an intermediary, though one younger than Demetrios28. Rostovtzeff alone
has investigated Demetrios' contribution, arguing that the description of the Istros' mouth
(773f.) corresponds almost word for word with Eratosthenes in the Scholia on Apollonios
IV.310, where the cited source is Demetrios, and that the information on such Pontic towns
as Dionysopolis (751-757), the Thracians and Bastarnai (797) must go back to Demetrios,
and that on the Crimea (823-835) and Pantikapaion (835-837) and the 'barbaric' nomad
Tauroi (822-826) must have been derived from a source other than Ephoros29. Rostovtzeff
further argues that the descriptions of the rivers Tyras, Hypanis and Borysthenes (799-
820), Scythians (841-865) and Sauromatai (880-885), are definitely Ephoran, thus coming
to the same conclusion to which Bunbury had come. Ephoros was more interested in the
northern tribes than Pontic cities, and only those things in Ps.Skymnos which seems to
come from a Periegesis and not a Periplous, figured in Ephoros' work30.

25 Agatharkhides 64; Demetrios, FGrHist. 85; Bunbury, A History of Ancient Geography ,
II, 1883, p.72.
27 Gisinger, 'Skymnos', 1927.
28 Jacoby, Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker, II,C, 1961, pp.34ff. Cf. the
29 Rostovtzeff, Skythien und der Bosporus, 1931, pp.28ff. For example, from Damaskos
F 119 it would seem Ephoros idealised the Tauroi, but Skymnos vv.823-825 says
'they pursue a mountain and nomadic life, in their savagery barbarous and murderous;
appeasing their gods with their impious acts'. This account, though not Ephorean, is
not necessarily derived from the 'realistic' tradition or first hand familiarity. It is
doubtlessly an allusion to the Iphegenia legend.
Skymnos has been interpreted not only as using Ephoros, but as demonstrating Ephoros' use of Herodotos\textsuperscript{31}. So closely does Ephoros seem to be following Herodotos in Skymnos 843-852, that he even refers to the same unidentifiable Pantikapes river as does Herodotos in IV.17-19. Despite these similarities, however, Skymnos' Ephoran passages differ significantly from Herodotos' work at one point.

Where Skymnos (v.864) had Ephoros locate the Agathyrsoi beyond the Sauromatai in the far north-east, Herodotos (IV.17-18, 100, 125) located the Agathyrsoi north of the Danube in the Carpathian Basin, neighbouring the Neuroi. Observing this 'divergence' Borzsak suggested that the process of idealisation of the Agathyrsos, evidently underway in Herodotos' day, had reached the point where the tribe was transferred to the 'mythical north'\textsuperscript{32}, adding that: 'Von nun an finden wir sie öfter erwähnt, bald hier, bald dort, aber immer zwischen den mythischen oder halbmythischen skythischen Völkern'\textsuperscript{33}. Though Borzsak is correct to identify a strong tendency to idealise this particular tribe and to associate the phenomenon with the development of a tradition locating the tribe in imaginary tribal and geographical contexts, the reason Ephoros located them in the north-east may not have been idealisation. He was probably neither using nor misusing Herodotos. In the story on the origin of the Scythians which Herodotos attributed to the Pontic Greeks (IV.10) the names of Herakles' sons were Agathyrsos, Gelonos and Skythes. The association of Agathyrsos and Gelonoi may have predated not only Ephoros, but also Herodotos. The association of the ethnonyms Gelonoi and Skythai with the 7th century Caucasian history has been argued in Chapters 1 and 2. It is possible that the ethnonym Agathyrsos had similar associations in the earliest Ionian \textit{Periploi}, though this is in no way demonstrable\textsuperscript{34}. Though Herodotos broke the association of the Gelonoi and Agathyrsos by locating the former nearer the Don and the latter nearer the Danube, Ephoros preserves the earlier link between the ethnonyms by locating both on the Don.

That Skymnos' catalogue here differs from Strabo's and Mela's proves to be more informative than frustrating. Unlike Herodotos, Ephoros would seem to have believed it

\textsuperscript{31} Bunbury, \textit{A History of Ancient Geography}, 1883, I, p.185.

\textsuperscript{32} Borzsak, \textit{Die Kenntnisse}, 1936, p.42: 'Zu dieser Zeit scheint sich ihre Umwandlung in ein fabelhaftes Volk vollzogen zu haben, im hohen Norden gedacht'.

\textsuperscript{33} Borzsak, \textit{ibid.}, 1936, pp.44-46. Cf. Mela II.i.10; Pliny IV.88; Dionysios \textit{Periegetes} 318; Juvenal XV.124ff.; Ptolemy III.v.22; Ammianus XXII.xviii.31 & XXXI.i.14; Vibius Sequester (Müller, \textit{Geogr.Lat.Min.} 157.17); Avienus 441ff; Priscianus, \textit{Periegesis} 302.

\textsuperscript{34} Harmatta, \textit{Quellenstudien zu den Skythika des Herodot}, 1941, pp.51-52, suggests the ethnonyms may have been closely associated with each other in the work of Hekataios.
possible to call the Boudinoi 'Gelonoi', the Gelonoi, Agathyrsi, Iazygians and others 'Sauromatai', and the Sauromatai 'Skythai'. Thus, Skymnos' list (vv.864-6) of Sauromatai, Gelonoi and Agathyrsi, is in no way incompatible with Strabo's and Mela's versions. Strabo and Mela adopted Ephoros' generic usage of 'Sauromatai' and went on to name the more distant Ephoran tribes which fell outside Skymnos' interest. Though Rostovtzeff sees Ephoros' description of the Sauromatai and Tauroi as evidence that Ephoros used Herodotos for his Scythian ethnography\(^{35}\), this need not be the case. The association of the Sauromatai with the Amazons, and the Tauroi with human sacrifice, predated Herodotos\(^{36}\).

Ps.Skymnos 860-964 is perhaps the most interesting Ephoran fragment. It would seem to be a faithful summary of a section of Ephoros' work which survived in a fuller form in Strabo VII.iii.9\(^{37}\). Similarly, both Ps.Skymnos and Strabo suggested Ephoros located the Sauromatai in Europe\(^{38}\). This suspicion would seem to be confirmed by a consideration of Mela's work.

Mela's source.

In his *De Chorographia* (dating to the 40's A.D.) Mela gives an extensive catalogue of the northern tribes. Though this catalogue resembles in some ways Herodotos' catalogues, a closer investigation suggests Herodotos was not, as Rostovtzeff and others have believed, Mela's original source\(^ {39}\). Mela's catalogue diverges markedly from Herodotos' at several points. Mela used the name Scythian for several people Herodotos clearly considered non-Scythian. Although in II.i.2 the first people listed are said to be Scythians, and others such as the Essedones, Agathyrsi and Sauromatae are mentioned separately, an echo of the Hekataean usage of 'Scythian' is evident when the Arimaspai and even Hyperboreans are


\(^{36}\) See Chapter 2 and Euripides', *Iphigenia in Taurica*.

\(^{37}\) 'And he cites Choerilus also, who, in his *The Crossing of the Pontoon-Bridge* which was constructed by Dareius, says, "the sheep tending Sacae, of Scythian stock: but they used to live in wheat-producing Asia; however, they were colonists of the Nomads, lawabiding people". And when he calls Anacharsis "wise" Ephoros says that he belongs to this race...'. See also Harmatta, *Quellenstudien*, 1941, p.51.

\(^{38}\) Ps.Skymnos v.864; Strabo VII.iii.9; Harmatta, *Quellenstudien*, 1941, p.51.

called Scythians\textsuperscript{40}. Although both Herodotos and Mela mention the Tanais, the former does not speculate upon its source, while the latter located its source in the Rhipheans\textsuperscript{41}. Mela's ethnography of the lands east of the Nomad Scythians correspond, moreover, much more closely to Damastes' record than Herodotos':

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sauromatai</td>
<td>Sauromatae</td>
<td>Sauromatai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boudinoi</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thyssagetai</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iyrkai</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detached Scythians</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argippaioi</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issedones</td>
<td>Issedones</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arimaspai</td>
<td>Arimaspoi</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griffons</td>
<td>Rhipeans</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyperborii (II.36)</td>
<td>Hyperboroi</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean</td>
<td>Ocean</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 1941 Harmatta, seeking to explain such differences as those above, argued that Mela was following Ephoros, who in turn was following Hekataios. In 1957 his arguments were crystalized by van Paassen. They might be summarised as follows.

Firstly, the reference to \textit{laxamatae} in Mela I.114 might well have been drawn from Ephoros (cf. \textit{\'Ianomat\'ai} in Ps.Skymnos 874-5) who drew in turn upon Hekataios (cf. \textit{\'Ianbatai} in Stephanos) while the reference to: \textit{Primi Maeotides Gynaecocratumenoe regna Amazonum} in Mela I.116 resembles Ephoros' expression, as entangled in Ps.Skymnos vv.880-885.

Secondly, references to the \textit{Maeotidae} and \textit{Budini} follow the description of the Sauromatae as \textit{una gens aliquot populi et aliquot nomina}. It appears Mela's source conceived of the Sauromatae as embracing the Maeotidae and Budini. Such a conception was not Herodotean, and Harmatta concludes it must have been post-Herodotean\textsuperscript{42}. In search of the identity of this post-Herodotean source, Harmatta noted the close correspondence between Mela's usage and that of Pliny, who mentioned in his tribal list among others \textit{Sauromatae Gynaecocratumenae, Thussagetae, Tyrcae and Arimphaei} \textsuperscript{43}. Though the two writers differ

\textsuperscript{40} Mela II.i.2, III.36, 37; Harmatta, \textit{Quellenstudien}, 1941, pp.47-48 noted that 'Dieser Gebrauch des Namens "Skythen" ist für die alte geographische Literatur charakteristisch', and sees it as a Hekataian characteristic.

\textsuperscript{41} Harmatta, \textit{Quellenstudien}, 1941, p.38.

\textsuperscript{42} \textit{Ibid.}, p.41.

\textsuperscript{43} \textit{Ibid.}, p.44. Pliny VI.19.
in their conception of the relationship between the Sauromatai and Sarmatians, Mela clearly seeing the two as different people\(^{44}\) and Pliny seeing the former as a subgroup of the latter\(^{45}\), their conceptions seem to share a common origin. As Harmatta has argued, they were 'Zusammenarbeiten von mehreren aus verschiedenen Zeiten stammenden Quellen' so that the tribe appears twice, once under the old name Sauromatae on the Tanais, and once under the new name Sarmatae on the Weichsel\(^{46}\). Though Müllenhoff thought Pliny took his passage from Mela\(^{47}\), it is more likely, as Harmatta suggested, that he used Mela's source in combination with a more recent work\(^{48}\). The common source may have been Hekataios or Hellanikos, perhaps indirectly through Ephoros. Mela and Pliny also correspond in their references to Arimphaei, Mons Rhipaeus, and the Sauromatae and Issedoni 'above' the Maeotis, and east of the Bucies, west of the Tanais, in Europe, and not Asia\(^{49}\). In Mela then, the Sauromatai stretched westward from the Tanais as far as the river Bucies. Harmatta's explanation for this exceptional, as he saw it, location of the tribe was that an intermediary between Mela and his original source, perhaps Hekataios, transferred to the west of the Tanais, not only the migrating Sauromatai, but the whole Hekataian catalogue, including the Issedonians and Arimaspians\(^{50}\). The intermediary may well have been Ephoros, in whose day the Sauromatai were migrating across the river.

Thirdly, though Mela mentioned both the Boudinoi and Gelonoi, on whom Herodotos wrote at length, Herodotos need not have been Mela's source, for he was not the only ancient Ionian to write on these tribes. As Herodotos himself wrote in IV.109, after discussing the relationship between the two peoples, 'Yet the Greeks call the Budini too Geloni; but this is wrong'. Harmatta sees Hekataios as one of these 'Greeks'\(^{51}\). It is indeed more than a coincidence that Ps.Skymnos in vv.860ff., citing Ephoros, actually omitted mention of Boudini and located the Gelonoi next to the Sauromatai. This suggests that Ephoros' source was in fact one of the Greeks whom Herodotos said erroneously called

\(^{44}\) Contrary to Kretschmer's claim, the former in I.116 dwelling east of the Tanais, the latter in I.19 and III.33 to the west of it, as far as the Vistula.

\(^{45}\) Pliny IV.97, all tribes between the Tanais and 'Vistla', including the Sauromatae, are called Sarmatae.

\(^{46}\) Harmatta, *Quellenstudien*, 1941, p.44.

\(^{47}\) Müllenhoff, 'Der Ursprung der Germanen', 1892, p.60.

\(^{48}\) Harmatta, *Quellenstudien*, 1941, pp.44-45.

\(^{49}\) *Ibid.*, p.46. Harmatta qualified the similarity on p.47 by suggesting that Pliny's description is 'so unklar und undurchsichtig, dass es kaum möglich ist, ihr auf der Landkarte zu folgen'.

\(^{50}\) *Ibid.*, p.49.

the Boudinoi Gelonoi. Though Harmatta named only Hekataios, Hellanikos might be an equally appropriate candidate.

Fourthly, where Herodotos' Ἠὗρκαι and Ἀργυρόπολιν might have been expected, Mela I.116 has Turcae and Aremphaei, much closer to Pliny's Turcae and Zenobios' ὀργυρεύματοι/ ὀργυρεύματι. It is unlikely then that Mela's forms were simply poor renderings of Herodotos', particularly when similar forms may arguably be found in Hellanikos' work.

Fifthly, Mela in II.2 links the Sauromatae, Agathyrsi and Gelonoi in much the same way as Ps.Skymnos does in vv.862ff., where Ephoros is the cited source. It is unnecessary to suppose, as Kalina supposed in 1872, that Skynnos had either misunderstood or supplemented Ephoros when he placed the Sauromatai and Gelonoi together and on the west bank of the Tanais.

Despite the similarities, it ought be pointed out that the generic conception of the Sauromatai evident in Ps.Skymnos' and Stephanos' work, is not immediately evident in Mela's. That Mela's description of the Maetae as Gunaecocratumenoe regna Amazonum and the Ixamatae as on the Maeotis, near the Tanais (I.114), resembles Ps.Skymnos' description of the Sauromatai, may, however, be explained as a doubling up in Mela's work. As Harmatta concludes, Mela's work at this point probably goes back to two different sources. One was probably Ephoros and the other probably Demetrios of Kallatis. Ps.Skymnos actually records Demetrios as varying from Ephoros in not seeing the Ixomatai as Sauromatai, but Maiotai.

Ephoros would seem then to have located the Sauromatai on the west bank of the Tanais, and transferred in their trail the whole Hekataian catalogue which they headed. The gap which appeared on the east of the Tanais was filled, by either Mela or the same source who returned the Sauromatai to a narrower conception, with, as van Paassen argues in summarising Harmatta, 'the peoples which Herodotus added to the knowledge of these

---

52 Pliny VI.19 and Zenobios v.25; Harmatta, Quellenstudien, 1941, p.37 and 41 respectively.
53 See Chapter 3.
54 Kalina, De fontibus apud veteres scriptores, 1872, pp.45ff (cited Harmatta, Quellenstudien, 1941, n.39).
55 Harmatta, ibid., p.54.
regions, namely Thyssagetae and Jyrcans, for these people had not been located and fixed within the series Sauromatae-Ocean\textsuperscript{56}.

But why did Ephoros locate the Sauromatai west of the Don? Harmatta's answer was that besides the idealised descriptions of the Scythians Ephoros used new information on the Sauromatai\textsuperscript{57}. Contemporary reports of the rapidly growing Sauromatai presence west of the river must certainly have encouraged Ephoros to place the Sauromatai west of the Don. The literary precedents for placing the Sauromatai west of the Don, discussed in Chapters 2-5 and 7 above, may, however, also have encouraged Ephoros to do so.

Conclusion.

It might be concluded that though Ephoros' work on Scythians is often thought to be derived from Herodotos alone, it is possible to detect in Ephoros' work material drawn, in all probability, from Hekataios, and the influence of such older contemporaries as Isokrates and Plato. With an increasing Sauromatai presence west of the Don and literary precedents for placing the Sauromatai west of the Don, Ephoros transferred the whole Hekataian catalogue to the west of the Don and filled the gaps left east of the Don with Herodotean tribes. Ephoros' work was then followed closely by Ps.Skymnos and Mela.

\textsuperscript{56} Van Paassen, \textit{The Classical Tradition}, 1957, ch.III, n.78; Harmatta, \textit{Quellenstudien}, 1941, p.55. For a discussion of how the tribes Thyssagetae and Jyrcans came to be in Herodotos' account, but absent from Hekataios', see Harmatta, \textit{Quellenstudien}, 1941, pp.56-60.

\textsuperscript{57} Harmatta, \textit{ibid.}, 1941, p.52.
CHAPTER 9.

THE PERIPATETICS, SCYTHIANS AND SAUROMATAI.

Introduction.

The contribution of Aristotle and his students Herakleides and Theophrastos to the body of literature concerned with eastern Scythian geography and ethnography was considerable. Though the works in which these scholars dealt with these subjects are no longer extant, it is possible to reconstruct with some confidence the conceptions which would have been implicit in these works and to trace through earlier and later literature the influences in, and of, these works.

Aristotle's geography.

Before turning to a study of Aristotle's concept of eastern Scythian ethnography, several aspects of Aristotle's geography of the north and east need to be examined.

The first aspect of Aristotle's geographical conception which might be investigated is his concept of the northern mountains. Aristotle wrote in his Meteorologika Lxiii (350 b 4-11):

'Most of the remaining European rivers flow northward from the Arkynian mountains which are the largest both in height and extent in that region',

and goes on to write that:

'Beneath the Bear itself beyond the farthest part of Scythia is a range of mountains called the Rhipae: the stories told of their size are too fanciful for credence, but they say that from them the greatest number and, after the Istrus, the largest of other European rivers flow.'

The Arkynian and Rhipaian mountains may have been even more closely associated in ancient tradition than Aristotle's discussion suggests. Stephanos wrote s.v. Τάρκυνα: 'The Arkynaioi are a tribe of Hyperboreans, among whom the griffons guard the gold, according to Hierokles in the Philistore'.

It is possible, as Bolton suggests, that Hierokles, Stephanos' cited source, found the name Tarkynaioi in the same work in which Aristotle found the Arkynia mountains- a Hyperborean ethnography. Thus, though Bunbury sees Aristotle's Arkynian range as 'an exaggerated notion of the Herkynian forest in Germany' to which Caesar, Strabo and Ptolemy refer, Aristotle probably did not himself see the range as such. Aristotle may

2 Bunbury, Ancient Geography, I, 1879, p.400.
simply have been drawing upon an early 'Hyperborean' ethnography, possibly written by Hellenikos\(^3\), and the later writers represented by Caesar and Strabo may have drawn on this same tradition when they applied a Hyperborean name, probably originally associated with the eastern Europe, to the western European forest.

Aristotle's conception of lands further east included a mountain range he called the Kaukasos and a mountain he called the Paropamisos\(^4\), for as he wrote in his *Meteorologika* I.xiii (350 a 18-30):

'We find that most of the rivers in Asia and the largest of them flow from the mountain range called Parnassus, which is commonly regarded as the highest mountain towards the winter dawn. For when you have crossed it the outer ocean, whose farther limit is unknown to the inhabitants of our part of the world, is already in sight. There flow from this mountain among other rivers the Bactrus, the Choaspes, and the Araxes, from the last of which the Tanais branches off and flows into Lake Maenotis. From it also flows the Indus, the greatest of all rivers. From the Caucasus there flow many rivers, extraordinary both in number and in size, among them the Phasis. The Caucasus is the largest mountain range, both in extent and height, towards the summer sunrise...'.

As Lee noted, though Aristotle is not 'setting out to give an account of the geography of the known world; he is using geography to illustrate the theme that the largest rivers come from the highest mountains', he would seem to have had a map of the world, if not before him, then at least in mind\(^4\). Heidel considered the Winter dawn too far south for the Parnassus, or Hindu Kush mountains and recommended a change of the text to read 'equinoctial' or 'summer dawn', there is little doubt that such was the conception of Aristotle, balancing the Caucasus in the north with the Parnassos in the south\(^5\).

The second aspect of Aristotle's geographic conception which might be investigated is his concept of the northern river and lake system. The concept of an 'Araxes' river, rising in the Parnassos mountains and sending one arm into the Caspian and one, called the Tanais, into the Maenotis, appears for the first time in extant literature in the above passage of the *Meteorologica*. This concept would seem to be very important in the transition from a Don horizon to a Syr-Darya one, from the Hekataian and Aiskylion concept of a Tanais-Phasis flowing from the Rhipaian-Caucasus to the Eratosthenian concept of a Iaxartes-Tanais

\(^3\) See Chapter 3.

\(^4\) Lee, Aristotle, *Meteorologica*, (Loeb) 1952, p.102. Aristotle's geographical survey of the world in *Meteorologica* I.xiii (350) in fact begins by calling the reader's attention to 'the maps of the earth which have been drawn up by their authors from their own first-hand knowledge or, when this failed, from inquiries made from others' For an attempted reconstruction of this map see Lee, *ibid.*, pp.102-3.

flowing from the Pamir end of the great Caucasian-Taurus mountain range, and out into
the Caspian and Maiotis. Some elements within the concept were not, however, entirely new. A Tanais beginning in Central Asia had been Ktesias' clear conception and an inland Caspian had been Herodotos'. Indeed, Aristotle's conception of the northern lake system is, as Bunbury points out, an instance of how 'his adherence to the old ideas, generally received in his time, preserved him from an error, which obtained general acceptance among the Greek geographers for the next three centuries'. In II.i (354 a 1-6) of his Meteorologika, Aristotle wrote:

'Besides, there are many seas that have no connection with each other at any point; for instance the Red Sea communicates with the ocean outside the straits by only a narrow channel, and the Hyrcanian and Caspian have no connection with the outer ocean and are inhabited all round, and so their sources would have been observed if they had any anywhere.'

How is this passage to be interpreted? Aristotle clearly considered the Caspian a lake, and not simply an inlet of the encircling ocean, but did he appreciate the separate identity of the Caspian and Aral seas?

The use of the plural particle κεχωρισμένα, 'having no connection', and περιοικόμενα, 'being inhabited all around', after the mention of the Υρκανία και Κασπία led Tarn to believe Aristotle considered these two seas to be separate. 'Υρκανία might refer to the Caspian and Κασπία to the Aral. This, Tarn further believed, might explain the numerous references to the Oxos and Tanais flowing into the

---

6 Bunbury, Ancient Geography, I, 1879, p.401.
7 For interpretation of Aristotle's concept of an 'encircling ocean' (346 b 37; 347 a 6) as a circularly flowing stream, and an argument that in this Aristotle was following the early Ionians, see Shimova, Представление об океане и античных авторов, 1982, pp.114-125.
Kaanifa9, and Polykleitos' description of the Kaanifa as infested with snakes10. That Pharasmanes, who undoubtedly appreciated the existence of two inland seas, may have been the source for Polykleitos information, as Tarn suggests, is improbable11. Indeed, it is improbable that Polykleitos actually accompanied Alexander.

The most compelling evidence for the hypothesis that Aristotle conceived of but one sea, even if with two different parts, is to be found in a section of Aristotle's *Meteorologika* I.xiii (351 a 8-13) referred to by Bolchert in 1908 but overlooked by all the above scholars: 'But there is the lake beneath the Caucasus, which the inhabitants call a sea: for this is fed by many great rivers, and having no obvious outlet runs out beneath the earth in the district of the Coraxi and comes up somewhere about the so-called deeps of Pontus'12

This passage does not admit the possibility of two separate seas. The sea described lies beneath the Caucasus and adjacent to the Pontus, clearly an allusion to the Caspian, while receiving 'many great rivers', clearly an allusion to the Aral receiving the Oxos and Iaxartes. A single sea thus combined the characteristics of the Caspian and the Aral.

Hamilton is probably nearer the mark when he writes:

'The conclusion that "Hyrcania" and "Caspian" are alternative names for the Caspian is inescapable. It is, therefore, perfectly possible that Aristotle was...

---

9 Strabo, XI.vii.4 and Diodoros XVII.lxxxv.3. Tarn, *ibid.*, p.7. Herrmann, *Alter Geographie des unteren Oxusgebiets*, 1914, and 'Gibt es noch ein Oxusproblem?', 1930, pp.286-7 sought to explain these reference with the suggestion that in antiquity the Oxos did actually flow into the Caspian. Tarn had pointed to several weaknesses in this thesis as early as 1901 in his 'Patrokl es and the Oxo-Caspian trade route', pp.10-12, and returned to the issue in his *Greeks in Bactria and India*, 1938 (1951), App.15 'The Oxus question today'.

10 Curtius VI.iv.18 and Diodoros XVII.lxxxv.3. Polykleitos may have heard this description from Pharasmanes, king of Khorasmia, a kingdom to which the Aral was adjacent. As Prof. Bivar has pointed out to the present author, this story belongs to an easily recognised local Iranian tradition. Zoroastrian literature refers to a mythical serpent Azi Dahaka, 'The serpent of the Dahai' and a later Arabic historian al-Mas'udi (Muruj al Dhahab) says the Caspian Sea harbours the tannin, or Great Sea-Serpent. One possible inspiration for tales may have been the giant sturgeon, which when basking on the surface can be mistaken for a huge serpent, and which can even upset fishing boats. The Kaanifa is, moreover, said to be νοηχυκυ defined in Athenaios XVI, 625a as τὸ μὴ γλυκὸ μὲν ἔγγυς δὲ τοῦτον λέγομεν υπογλυκογυ, (i.e. nearly sweet) and this could only apply to the Aral, and in particular, that part nearest the mouths of the Oxos and Iaxartes. See Tarn, *Alexander*, II, 1948 (1979), p.8.

11 Tarn, *ibid*. For a refutation of Tarn's interpretation see Daffina, 'Aral, Caspian, Tanais', 1968, pp.370-377, where it is argued that there is no evidence that ancient writers conceived of two separate lakes until the 5th century A.D.

misinterpreting earlier writers who had written "Hyrcanian" and "Caspian" indiscriminately."\(^{13}\)

Perhaps still nearer the mark was Bolchert when he suggested, in 1908, that Aristotle had read of the Hyrkanian Sea in Hekataios' work and the Caspian in Herodotos' and saw no difficulty in identifying them with different parts of the same sea, just as Herodotos had seen no difficulty in identifying the Red Sea and Atlantic with different parts of the ocean."\(^{14}\)

Aristotle's conception of the Central Asian river system is, as has already been noted, closely associated with his conception of the mountain and lake system. Compared with Herodotos' hazy notion of the Iaxartes river, the 'Araxes' as he called it,"\(^{15}\) Aristotle's description of the rivers which flowed from the Hindu Kush is detailed in the extreme."\(^{16}\) It is the bifurcation of the Araxes, one branch of which flowed into the Caspian and the other, called the Tanais, which flowed into the Maiotis, which forms the conceptual centre-piece of the system. This was an attractive concept if the notion that the Caspian was a gulf of the ocean is set aside."\(^{17}\)

The third aspect of Aristotle's geographical conception of relevance to the study in hand is his conception of continental boundaries. That Aristotle conceived of three distinct continents, Asia, Europe and Libya, is clear from the manner in which he deals with the rivers of Asia, Europe and Libya in turn in Meteorologika I.xiii (350 ab).

That Aristotle conceived of the animals of each continent as having different characteristics is clear from History of Animals VIII.28 and of the inhabitants of each continent having different characteristics is clear from Politics VII.vi.1 (1327 b 23-8):

'The nations inhabiting the cold places and those of Europe are full of spirit but somewhat deficient in intelligence and skill, so that they continue comparatively free, but lacking in political organization and capacity to rule their neighbours. The peoples of Asia on the other hand are intelligent and skilful in temperament, but lack spirit, so that they are in continuous subjection and slavery'.


\(^{14}\) Bolchert, Aristoteles Erdkunde, 1908, p.9. See Hekataios F 291 (=Athenaios II 70A) and Herodotos I.202-3.


\(^{16}\) Meteorologika I.xiii. (350 a 18-30), quoted above.

\(^{17}\) Cf. Bolchert, Aristoteles Erdkunde, 1908, p.41.
In the division of the world into three continents Aristotle was keeping within the tradition which has its most discernible origins in the work of Hekataios. In his distinctive characterisation of each continent's creatures Aristotle was influenced by the work of Hippokratic scholars. One aspect of the Aristotelian concept remains, however, unexplained. How did Aristotle define the continents?

No indisputably genuine Aristotelian work offers a definition of the boundary between Europe and Asia. In the spurious Περὶ Κόσμου III.23-32, such a definition is, however, offered:

'Europe is the area which is bounded in a circle by the Pillars of Heracles and the inner parts of the Pontus and the Hyrcanian Sea, where a very narrow isthmus passes between it and the Pontus; but some have said the river Tanais, instead of this isthmus. Asia is the region from this isthmus of the Pontus and the Hyrcanian Sea to another isthmus, which lies between the Arabian Gulf and the Mediterranean; it is surrounded by the Mediterranean and the encircling stream of the Ocean; but some say that Asia stretches from the mouths of the Nile.'

The work from which this passage is purportedly drawn was an open letter to Alexander, probably the 'Great'. It was, however, probably written shortly after the appearance of the works on meteorology produced by Poseidonios and his pupil Asklepiodoros, that is, after 50 B.C. Though spurious, the work was probably, as Furley suggests, not simply ascribed to Aristotle by later scholars, but actually produced in imitation of Aristotle. Though the author of the treatise was clearly eclectic, many elements of the work's theology and cosmology may well have been borrowed from the Peripatetics. What element, if any, of the above geographical description might have been borrowed from the Peripatetics, and Aristotle in particular?

The division of the continents at the Hyrkanian Sea was common to both Eratosthenes and Poseidonios. It was, however, probably only Patrokles' report that the Hyrkanian Sea was an inlet of the Ocean that made this conception possible. Though Hekataios and Aristotle shared the belief that the Caucasian isthmus was narrow and possibly also that the

18 Bolchert, ibid., pp.6-7. See Hippokrates' Airs, Water and Places, XII: 'I hold that Asia differs very widely from Europe in the nature of all its inhabitants and of all its vegetation. For everything in Asia grows to far greater beauty and size; the one region is less wild than the other, the character of the inhabitants is milder and more gentle.' Hippokrates goes on to explain the difference in terms of Asia being warm and Europe cold. 'Courage, endurance, industry and high spirit could not arise in such conditions [as the mild Asian climate].'


20 Ibid.

21 Cf. Strabo I.iv.7. See Chapter 12.
Hyrkanian and Pontos/Maiotis were in some way connected, for Hekataios the Hyrkanian/Caspian was a gulf of the Ocean and for Aristotle it was not. Could Aristotle have conceived of the Caspian to be both an inland sea and a continental boundary? The answer is almost certainly that he could have. Aristotle may have conceived of the Caspian as but one section of the continental boundary that ran from the Maiotis to the Caspian along the line of the Kaukasos, and from the Caspian to the Paropamisos along the line of the Araxes branch which flowed into the Caspian, and the Araxes itself. Thus, though it is possible that Aristotle's continental boundary was the Tanais-Araxes and that the reference in the treatise *On the Cosmos* III.23-32 to a Kaukasos-Caspian boundary was inspired by post-Patroklean literature, it is possible that Aristotle's continental boundary was a Kaukasos-Caspian-Araxes one.

**Influence in Aristotle's geography.**

The date of the *Meteorologika* has been the subject of some debate. Most commentators believe it was published before Alexander set out on his eastern expedition. The very rough conception of the Hindu Kush mountains and the rivers that flow from them would seem to support this position. The description is, however, more detailed than any other extant work from before Alexander's time, so if Aristotle did not learn of these mountain and river names from those accompanying Alexander, then from whom did he learn of them? Ephoros, who similarly believed the Tanais had two mouths, may well have been one influence. A still greater influence may have been Ktesias. The arguments in favour of Ktesias, advanced by Bolchert in 1908, are essentially as follows. Firstly, Aristotle cited Ktesias three times and would seem to have used Ktesias extensively on the

---


23 Cf. Ps.Skynnos vv.867-874.


fauna and rivers in Asia and India\textsuperscript{26}. Secondly, Aristotle's concept of the Kaukasos as the largest and highest mountain in the north-west and the Parnassos as the largest and highest mountain in the south-east, is far from Herodotos' concept (I.203) of the Kaucasos as the largest and highest mountain in the world, but must have been based on information from before Alexander's time\textsuperscript{27}. Thirdly, Aristotle, in a discussion of the question of the spontaneous generation of fish in Asian rivers in his \textit{History of Animals} VI.15 (569 a.20), mentions Knidos. The Knidian Ktesias may have been Aristotle's source at this point\textsuperscript{28}.

Jacoby believed that Neumann and Bolchert overestimated Ktesias' influence on Aristotle, that Aristotle used Ktesias for no more than a few references to Indian fauna, that the Ktesian concept of an Asia bound by the Nile and the Tanais was not Aristotelian, and that Aristotle's source of geographical information was probably the Eudoxos or one of the pre-Eudoxian revisions of Hekataios' \textit{Periodos} \textsuperscript{29}. Jacoby's case against a major Ktesian influence in Aristotle is not, however, fully sustainable. Bolchert has pointed to more parallels between Aristotle's and Ktesias' description of Indian, Arachosian and Baktrian fauna than those few implied by direct citation, and Aristotle's concept of the Caspian and Tanais corresponds very closely with Ktesias'.

\textbf{Aristotle's ethnography.}

In the undoubtedly genuine, \textit{Generation of Animals}, Aristotle three times referred to Scythians and once to Sauromatai. In II.\textit{viii} (748 a 25-7) Aristotle wrote on asses:

'Further, the animal is a cold subject; and as it is by nature so sensitive to cold, it is not readily produced in wintry regions, such as Scythia and the neighbouring parts, or the Keltic country beyond Iberia, which is also a cold quarter'.

The expression \textit{περὶ ἔκυθας καὶ τὴν δύμορον κύρων} suggests that the notion of 'Scythians' is not here so generic that the reference to 'neighbouring lands' is irrelevant. Perhaps one of these neighbouring peoples is the Thracians who are mentioned in the V.\textit{iii}. (782 b 30):

'Animals that contain a great deal of fluid have straight hair, because in their hair the fluid advances in a continuous stream and not drop by drop. That is why the Scythians by the Black Sea and the Thracians have straight hair: both their constitution and the environing are fluid (moist)'.

One other neighbour is mentioned in V.\textit{iii}. 35(782 b 30):

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{27} \textit{Ibid.}, pp.40-41.
\item \textsuperscript{28} \textit{Ibid.}, pp.41-42.
\item \textsuperscript{29} Jacoby, 'Ktesias', 1922, pp.2072-3.
\end{itemize}
'In cold climates sheep and human beings exhibit opposite "conditions" from each other: thus the Scythians have soft hair, but Sauromatian sheep have hard hair...'.

The context makes it clear that Scythians' and Sauromatai flocks are to be found in the same climactic region. It has been noted above that for scientific Greek writing, including Aristotle, climactic regions corresponded with the continents, and that the cold region corresponded with Europe. In this treatise the Scythians and Sauromatai were clearly both believed to dwell in Europe. This passage and its implicit suggestion that both Scythians and Sauromatai dwelt in Europe was noted by El'nitskij who argued that, as the Tanais separated the Scythians from the Sauromatai, Aristotle could not have considered the Scythians the boundary of Europe and Asia. Though Aristotle might not have considered the Tanais the continental boundary, this passage offers no supporting evidence. The above argument is based on the assumption that the Scythians and Sauromatai dwelt on opposite sides of the Tanais-Don. As has been noted, in Chapters 2-5 and 7-8, the Sauromatai had been crossing of the Don nearly continually from the 6th to the 4th century B.C.

To further investigate Aristotle's conception of northern ethnography it is necessary to investigate that material which would seem to go back to an Aristotelian work entitled Nomima Barbarika. In 1931 Rostovtzeff drew attention to a papyrus fragment which gave part of the text of Didymus' commentary on Demosthenes:

'Aristotle in the third book of his Nomima, which is on the customs of the Scythians, says...small [cattle]...are called by the Barbarians...'

In his commentary on the papyrus, Mahaffy writes:

The texts are too mutilated to let us know more than the general fact, that the first piece was a description of the manners and customs of barbarous nations, such as

---

30 The Loeb translation, which here mistranslates τὸ Σαυροματικὰ as 'Sarmatian', has here been corrected to Sauromatian. Peck's note to the Loeb tr. of 1953, p. 519 (b) 'Sarmatia is the territory between the Vistula and the Don, part of modern Poland and Russia' is, therefore, not only anachronistic, but is entirely unnecessary.


32 Rostovtzeff, Skythien und der Bosporus, 1,1931, p.79 n.4. Didymus, On Demosthenes X.iv.14:

Α' Αριστοτε[ἔλης έν τιῇ τριτη[ι τῶν Νομι[]
[μαν ἢ περί Σκυθῶν ἐὰν ἔστι, φησιν...
...ρον μείκρα[ ] ] ιαδε' [ ...]υ[...
...το προσογορ[ε]πεθὴναί ὑνό τίθαν βα[ρp]
[βαρων]

The fragment is included in neither Rose (ed.), Aristotelis qui ferbantur librorum Fragmenta, 1886 (1967), nor in Ross, Aristotelis Fragmenta Selecta, 1964.
were frequently composed by the Peripatetic school in imitation of the  

Barbarikà νόμιμα of Aristotle33.

Rostovtzeff, on the other hand, believes the fragment has much in common with the 'Εβνύν Συναγωγή of Nikolaos of Damaskos34. The merit in both suggestions might be preserved in the proposition that both Aristotle and Nikolaos drew heavily upon Ephoros35.

Though no other cited fragments from book III of Aristotle's Nomima are extant, Aelian, On the Characteristics of Animals, XVI.33, would seem to be drawing upon an Aristotelian Skythika when he wrote:

'A'Again, Aristotle says that among the Neuri the horns and ears of the cattle spring from the same source and are knitted together. And the same writer says that in a certain place in Libya the goats have their teats attached to the chest. Let me add the following statement also from the son of Nicomachus: he says that among the Budini who live on the banks of the Cariscus (ἐν τοῖς τῶν Καρύσκων Βουδίνων οἴκουσιν) a white sheep does not occur, they are all black'.

As these statements can be found in no extant Aristotelian work36, it is possible that they were drawn from Aristotle’s lost Barbarikà Nomima, and the statements about the Neuroi and Boudinoi drawn from the Skythika section of the work.

Who might Aristotle's source, however indirect, have been for the above statements? The resemblance with Herodotos’ notice IV.107 on the town Gelonos is striking, but more striking still are the dissimilarities. Aristotle called the town Καρύσκος. Though Scholfield in the translation above clearly believed this to be the name of a river, Minns is probably closer to the appropriate the understanding when he invokes Tomaschek’s comparison of the word with the Permian "karysok", 'little fortress', and takes the word to be the name of a town37. If this name does represent some first-hand acquaintance with the region, was this acquaintance most likely to have been that of an early writer such as Hekataios or Hellanikos, or a late 4th century contemporary? A contemporary source might

33 Mahaffy, 'Flinders Petrie Papyrus', I.ix, p.29.
34 Rostovtzeff, Skythien und der Bosporus, 1931, p.79 n.4. Cf. FGrHist. 90F 103-124.
35 The only scholar so far to raise the possibility of relationship between the work of these three writers is Jacoby, who, in his commentary on Ephoros F 103-124 (II c p.256), states simply that '...das Verhältnis zwischen ihm (Ephoros) und Aristoteles unbekannt ist.' Too little is known about Aristotle’s Barbarikà nomima to conclude, as Peters, Harvest of Hellenism, 1972, p.111 does, that this work 'was a descriptive beginning of what might have been designed as a more general sociology'.
36 The closest statements to this effect can be found in Aristotle, History of Animals, III.ix (517 a 28), for cattle, and II.i (500 a 15), for goats.
37 Minns, Scythians and Greeks, 1913, p.105.
be favoured. In *Meterologika* I.xiv. (29) Aristotle says the Maiotis is no longer navigable for vessels the same size as those for which it had been navigable 60 years earlier. This suggests Aristotle may have questioned traders from the Pontos. Aristotle had, moreover, heard something of the fauna in Scythian parts. Thus, in *On Marvellous Things heard* *(θαυμασταὶ οἱ κουσάτων)* 832b 30 the following passage is found:

'Among the Scythians called Geloni they say that there is a beast, excessively rare, which is called "tarandos"; they say that it changes the colour of its hair according to the place it is in. For this reason it is difficult to catch; for it becomes the same colour as the trees and the ground, and generally of the place in which it is. But the changing of the colour of the hair is most remarkable; other creatures change their skin like the chameleon and polypus. But this animal is the size of an ox. But its head is the same kind as a deer.'

Though Aristotle's authorship of this work is sometimes questioned, the probability that it here more or less preserves some original Aristotelian material is great considering Stephanos offers a similar material under Aristotle's name in his entry under Ἔλαυνα:'Gelonos, city of Sarmatians in Europe, from Gelonos son of Herakleos, the brother of Agathyros. The inhabitants speak the same language. It is accented on the last syllable. The city is made of wood, lying among the Boudinoi, a great people, as Herodotos says. Among these there is a wonderful animal which is called the Tarandos, and it changes the colour of its skin depending on its place. On account of this changeability it is hard to catch. It is a marvel. For the octopus and the chameleon change colour. It is the size of an ox, with a face like a deer, as Aristotle writes in the 5th book of his *On Marvellous Things heard*.39

Herakleides Pontikos.

Herakleides Pontikos, Aristotle's younger contemporary, was born in the Pontic city of Heraklea and came to Athens sometime before 364. He was probably the pupil of Speusippos at the Academy, but whether he also attended lectures by Pythagoreans or was simply said to in order to explain certain of his literary interests, and whether he was also a pupil of Aristotle or simply a fellow-student of Aristotle's under Plato, is unclear.40 It is abundantly clear, however, that his wide range of interests included scientific, political, historical, literary, eschatological and cataleptic matters. Sometime after 338, perhaps after

---


39 Own translation. This 'Tarandos' may be the reindeer or elk.

40 Diogenes Laertios, *Herakleides* 86: 'At Athens he first attached himself to Speusippus. He also attended the lectures of the Pythagoreans and admired the writings of Plato. Last of all he became a pupil of Aristotle, as Sotion says in his *Successions of Philosophers*. The Pythagoreans were represented in Athens at the time by Aristoxenos, a pupil of Xenophilos. The *Aetios* III.ii.5 has Herakleides a pupil of Aristotle. Bolton, *Aristeas of Proconnesus*, 1962, pp.172-3. See also Wehrli, *Herakleides*, commentary to Frag. 1-21, pp.59-64.
failing to win the headship of the Academy in succession to Speusippos, he returned to Herakleia and set up his own school. The accounts of his death seem to reflect something of the reputation he had gained in life for stories about oracles, divine honours and punishment and human deception or forgeries.41

No stories would have substantiated such a reputation more than those associated with the 'mystics' Empedokles, Zoroaster, Empedotimios, Abaris and Aristeas, all of whom Herakleides appears to record as having experienced some form of cataleptic trance or reincarnation and as being associated with Pythagoras.42 In recording such stories, Herakleides would seem to be drawing on a preexisting set of associations, hinted at in Herodotos' stories of Aristeas, Abaris and Zalmoxis, perhaps cultivated by the Pythagorian school, and supplemented with Plato's theory of ideas. Hekataios' elaborations upon preexisting stories, and in particular his reworking of the Abaris and Aristeas story, were in turn drawn upon heavily by later philosophers.

The account of the Avars in the Souda shows that the ethnographic tradition which went back to Aristeas, was perpetuated through revisers and imitator, and manifested itself even in the work of historians of the 7th (?) century A.D.:

The Avars were utterly wiped out by the Bulgars. These Avars drove out the Sabinores, having themselves been compelled to emigrate by tribes inhabiting the shores of the Ocean but driven out of their country by a fog bred of the Ocean overflowing and by the appearance of a multitude of griffons, about which there was a saying that they would not stop until they had devoured the entire human race. Under pressure from these terrors they assaulted their neighbours, who, proving weaker than the invaders, had to emigrate.'

The account of tribes inhabiting the shores of the Ocean, being driven from their homeland by griffons, and forcing their neighbours then from theirs, is clearly an adaptation of Aristeas' story of Hyperboreans by the sea, gold-guarding griffons, and a dominoing of tribes. Herakleides may well have been responsible for such an adaptation. The Souda has

41 Diogenes Laeretios, Heracleides 89-91, offered two stories. The first is that he tried to have a snake substituted for his body on the bier, so it would seem he had joined the gods. The second is that he bribed Pythian envoys to forge an oracle recommending he be crowned and honoured as a hero in death, but that in an attack of apoplexy he revealed the fraud. As Bolton suggests, Aristeas of Proconnesus, 1962, p.173: 'It looks as if Heraklides' own propensities...have been turned against him: the fiction has been built up out of hints gleaned from his own work, even as he himself had built up such fictions out of hints gleaned from the work of others'.

42 For full discussions of Herakleides' work on these subjects see Corssen, 'Der Abaris des Herakleides Ponticus', 1912, pp.20-47. Bolton, Aristeas of Proconnesus, 1962, pp.142-175.
the Ocean flooding and Herakleides knew about Atlantic tides and coastal flooding\textsuperscript{43}. The \textit{Souda} could only be including this story of Avars migrating under the title "\textit{Αβαρίς}" by identifying the envoy "\textit{Αβαρίς}" with the migrating Avars (the two having similar names and coming from a distant land) and by identifying "\textit{Αβαρίς}" with the Aristean people who dwelt in the neighbourhood of griffons near the ocean.

Though Herakleides would not, of course, have been responsible for linking Abaris with the Avars, he may well have been responsible for linking Abaris with the Aristean tribal migration. He is known to have written at length on Abaris the Hyperborean who rode on an arrow and Herakleides appears to have reworked the \textit{Arimaspea} in such a way that Aristeas became a mystic\textsuperscript{44}. As the plague of griffons might have proved an impetus not only for the Aristean tribal-dominoing, but also Abaris' mission of salvation, Herakleides may have linked the two. Herakleides may have turned Abaris' wanderings from an innocent ascetic matter into a world-saving mission.

Though Abaris and Aristeas are relevant to the study of ancient conceptions of Scythians, of still greater relevance is Herakleides' apparent reference to a Sauromatian/Sarmatian Sea. Three testimonies to such a reference survive in fragmentary form. The earliest is to be found in the work of Antigonos of Karystos, who lived in Athens in the mid-3rd century, and later worked under Attalus I of Pergamum: 'Kallimachos says that Herakleides wrote on a sea in Sarmatia'\textsuperscript{45}. This is the very earliest extant mention of 'Sarmatia'. The two other fragments would, however, suggest, that this was not the word Herakleides himself used. Isigonus of Niceae, a paradoxographer of the first century B.C. or A.D., wrote: 'Herakleides says that not one bird flies across the sea in the land of the Sauromatai, but drawing near, it dies from the odour'\textsuperscript{46} and Sotion, perhaps the first century A.D. Peripatetic, wrote:

'Herakleides of Pontos says that in the country of the Sauromatai there is a lake, into which birds flying across it fall'\textsuperscript{47}

\textsuperscript{43} Herakleides (Wehrli) F 117. Herakleides was probably also the source for the reference to 'the inroads of the sea' (\textit{άναχυσείς θαλάσσης}) in Maximus Tyrius' \textit{Philosophoumena}, XXXVIII.3 c-f.

\textsuperscript{44} Bolton, \textit{Ariteas of Proconnesus}, 1962, pp.171-2.

\textsuperscript{45} Wehrli, \textit{Herakleides Pontikos} F 128b 'Antigonus Historiae mirabiles' CLII.

\textsuperscript{46} Wehrli, \textit{Herakleides Pontikos} F 128a 'Paradoxographus Vaticanus Rohdii' XIV.

\textsuperscript{47} Machinskij, \textit{О времени первого активного выступления сарматов}, 1971, p.45, dates Sotion's writing to the 1st century B.C.
Before tackling the question of whether Herakleides himself mentioned Sauromatai or Sarmatai, several points raised by Machinskij ought be noted. Machinskij claims that Herakleides or his source must have had the Sivash [sic.] gulf in mind, a gulf foul smelling today, and upon the evidence of Strabo, who calls it Lake Sapra (i.e. Putrid), it was no better in ancient times\textsuperscript{48}. As this gulf is off to the west of the Maiotis, defining the Tauric isthmus, to designate it Sarmatian or Sauromatian suggests a Sarmatian /Sauromatian presence on the western coast of the Maiotis and west of the Don. Secondly, as the original source for the statement was probably a Greek trader, and as Aristotle seems to have had a similar source for his statement on the Maiotis' navigability, it may be thought that Herakleides drew this item from Aristotle\textsuperscript{49}. This is, however, improbable, as it is improbable that Aristotle refered to the Maiotis as the Sauromatian or Sarmatian lake. It is more probable that Herakleides picked up the term himself, either when in Herakleia, or later from a trader. But did Herakleides himself write Sauromatai or Sarmatai?

Given that Isigonus and Sotion both have 'Sauromatai' and that no earlier or contemporary use of 'Sarmatai' can be found, the latter form could easily be explained away as an interpolation. The occurrence of this term is not, however, so easily accounted for, firstly because a case can be made in favour of believing a younger contemporary and peripatetic, Theophrastos, used the word 'Sarmatai' (to be discussed). Machinskij may conclude with some justification that:

'Kallimachos and Antigonus trusted in Herakleides and repeated his information, even though it was not completely bound up with the old sacred tradition of the Herodotean and Hekataian ethnic map of the Black sea\textsuperscript{50}.

Theophrastos.

No Peripatetic scholar could claim to have had a closer relationship with Aristotle than Theophrastos of Eresos (c.370 -288/5 B.C.). So close was the relationship that it is possible to see in Theophrastos' Characters, not only the type casting prevalent in rhetorical studies and the New Attic Comedy of his day, but also the Aristotelian technique which Peters describes as:

\textsuperscript{48} Machinskij, \textit{ibid.} Strabo VII.iv.1. See also references to this lake/marsh by Mela II.2, Pliny IV.84 and Ptolemy, \textit{Geography}, III.v.2-3, the latter two calling it \textit{Buces}.

\textsuperscript{49} Machinskij, \textit{ibid}.

\textsuperscript{50} \textit{Ibid.}, p.46.
'empirical ethics, the collection of a great deal of material with moral coloring from which one could generalize the bios of both individuals and larger social groups'\textsuperscript{51}. It is no surprise to discover that Theophrastos drew many of his botanic and biological examples from an area which had so interested his teacher- Scythia\textsuperscript{52}. It is, however, surprising to find Theophrastos cited as referring to Sarmatians. The following fragment of Theophrastos otherwise non-extant work, \textit{pērī τῶν μεταβαλλόντων τὰς χρωσές}, survives in Photios' \textit{Bibliotheka}, 'Theophrastos', 278: 

'We read in the writings of Theophrastus, 'On the animals who change colour'; "The animals which change their colour and become the same as the vegetation, the land and the stones which surround them, are the octopus, chameleon and the animal called the 'Tarandos' which they say lives in the country of the Scythians or Sarmatians'\textsuperscript{53}

As this work was composed in the late 4th century B.C. it may have been an appreciation of the domination new groups had only recently won over the old Basileioi Skythai that precipitated Theophrastos' uncertainty as to the name by which he ought refer to the tribes west of the Maiotis. How this uncertainty could produce the word 'Sarmatia' is, however, far from certain. Machinskij says:

'It is possible that Theophrastos and Herakleides, contemporaries and students of Aristotle, learned of the new name, in ancient literature 'Sarmatai', from a certain source'\textsuperscript{54}

If Theophrastos were to have written 'Sauromatai', it is possible to imagine that he borrowed the image of a land of Sauromatai from the writings of the Hippokratic school, but if we take the passage as it stands and further note the use of 'Sarmatians' as an alternative for 'Scythians', it would seem reasonable to suppose that Theophrastos picked up a current pronunciation of the old 'Sauromatai', 'Sarmatai', and a current usage for a confederation which had taken over the old Scythian lands.

The Peripatetics' response to the 'Sauromatai' displacement of the old Scythians may even be detected in a statement attributed by Clement of Alexandria to a certain Nymphodoros,
who may well be the same as the Syracusan Greek who from Athenaios VI.265 c appears to have written an 'Αγιας περίπλους:

'Why need I instance Sauromatians, whom Nymphodorus in Barbarian Customs reports as worshipping fire...'

Composition of a Νομίμοι βαρβαρικοί falls easily within the character of a Peripatetic. The attribution of fire worship to Sauromatians is not, however, to be found in any extant Ionian or plainly Peripatetic work. In the work of the Ionian writers it was usual to find reference to Scythian sword worship. No such ready formular is evident from the work of the Peripatetics, so it is possible that one of their number had heard that such was the custom of those tribes at the time overrunning the Basileioi Scythian kingdom.

Conclusion.

It might be concluded that Aristotle's geographical concept of the north and east included an Arkynian, Rhipaian, Kaukasos and Paropamisos mountain range, a single inland 'Hyrkanian-Caspian' Sea, an 'Araxes' flowing from the Paropamisos and sending one branch into a two part single inland Sea, and another, called the Tanais, into the Maiotis, and a continental boundary defined by the Kaukasos, Caspian and Araxes. In the development of all but the last conception, Ktesias' geographical work was probably a major influence. Ephoros' work was probably a minor influence. Aristotle may also have written on the Scythians, Sauromatai, Gelonoi, Boudinoi and others in an ethnographical work, a Skythika, based on Ephoros' or someone else's reworking of Hekataios' ethnography. Allusions by Herakleides of Pontikos and Theophrastos to Sauromatai/Sarmatai west of the Maiotis, suggest that the Peripatetic scholars, as well as drawing information from earlier literary works, may have drawn on contemporary knowledge of the situation on the north Pontic coast. These allusions also suggest that the Sarmatian displacement of Scythians from the Ukraine may have occurred much earlier than those scholars surveyed in Chapter 4 believed.

55 Clement, Exhortation to the Greeks, ch.V.56.
CHAPTER 10.

THE EARLY ALEXANDER HISTORIANS AND THE CENTRAL ASIAN SKYTHIANS.

Introduction.

The campaigns of Alexander the Great in north east Iran brought the Greek world into its first direct contact with the nomads of Central Asia. In the spring of 329 B.C. Alexander led his army over the Hindu Kush and into Baktria where the Persian 'rebel' Bessos was captured and killed. Alexander marched on into Sogdiana, secured the capital Marakanda, the modern day Samarkand, and eventually faced the Scythian nomads across the Iaxartes. After making a show of strength on the northern side of the river, Alexander set about preparing for the construction of an Alexandria on the southern bank of the river. While he was engaged in these preparations, the Sogdians revolted. Their initial revolt was cruelly crushed, but under the energetic leadership of a nobleman Spitamenes and with the intermittent help of neighbouring nomadic tribes the Sogdians revolted again, destroyed the expeditionary force of Polytimetos and laid siege to Marakanda. Alexander hurried back from the Iaxartes, raised the siege and forced Spitamenes to withdraw to the steppes. After a winter spent in Baktra receiving emissaries from different neighbouring peoples, Alexander again faced Sogdian and nomad unrest. In 328 Spitamenes recaptured Marakanda and defeated another expeditionary force before being forced to flee again to the land of his nomad allies. This time, however, fearing that Alexander planned to invade their land in pursuit of Spitamenes, the nomads betrayed the Sogdian leader. They sent Spitamenes' head to Alexander and offered their submission. In 327 Alexander ended the Sogdian revolt by capturing the last outpost of Sogdian resistance and marrying Roxana, the daughter of a leading Sogdian nobleman.

Though it took Alexander nearly as long to subjugate Sogdiana as it had taken him to win the Persian throne, the Sogdian campaign has received scant attention from modern western scholars. It is not, however, the present writer's intention to offer a detailed reconstruction of this campaign. Detailed and less Hellenocentric reconstructions of the "Struggle of the nations of Central Asia against the Greco-Macedonian invaders" have been offered by
several Soviet scholars. It is the present writer's intention to explore the conceptions of Central Asian history, geography and ethnography implicit in the work of the earliest Alexander historians, Aristoboulos, Polykleitos, Ptolemy and Kleitarkhos, and to deduce from what can be inferred about their writings the concepts with which Alexander himself may have worked. The concepts of mountains, lakes, rivers, the isthmus, the continental boundary, ethnography and history will now be investigated in turn.

The mountains.

While Aristotle would seem to have conceived of some distance between the Caucasus (Kaukasos) and the Hindu Kush (Parnassos), the early Alexander historians appear to link the Caucasus and Hindu Kush. Calling the Hindu Kush the 'Kaukasos' was common to all Alexander historians. Arrian (III.xxviii.4ff.) indicated that such was Aristoboulos' customary usage, and Diodoros (VII.83) and Curtius (VII.iii.19ff.) indicate that such was the 'Vulgate' tradition, for which Kleitarkhos was probably chiefly responsible. Strabo (XI.v.5) believed that these early historians had fabricated this geography to flatter Alexander:

'the glory of the mountain, and its name, and the belief that Jason and his followers had accomplished the longest of all expeditions, reaching as far as the neighbourhood of the Caucasus, the tradition that Prometheus was bound at the ends of the earth on the Caucasus, led writers to suppose that they would be doing the King a favour if they transferred the name Caucasus to India.'

Strabo probably took this criticism of the early Alexander historians from Eratosthenes. Though there was doubtlessly an element of flattery in these earliest records and though at least one modern scholar is satisfied that the desire to flatter was the creative force behind


their conception⁴, the judgement of Eratosthenes and Strabo is too severe. This judgement assumes the earliest writers knew the truth of the matter. As may be seen from the discussion to follow, this misconception was only one of several. Together the misconceptions form a system which could not have been generated purely out of flattery.

The lakes.

The debate over whether the Caspian Sea was a gulf of the Ocean or a lake, seen in the previous chapter to have occupied scholars from Hekataios down to Aristotle, would seem to have continued in Alexander's camp. According to Plutarch (Alex. XL.1-2), who confidently believed the Caspian to be an inlet of the ocean, Alexander, when in Hyrkania, was not sure that it was an ocean inlet for he:

'could get no clear information about it, but conjectured that in all probability it was a stagnant overflow from the Palus Maeotis'.

The 'Gazetteer's' list of satrapies, believed by Tarn upon strong grounds to have been compiled about 324/3 B.C. and preserved in Diodoros XVIII.v.2-vi.3 (either by direct copying or use of Hieronymos of Kardia)⁵ would seem to have held the sea to have been inland:

'...and next to these are Aria, Parthia, and Hyrcania, by which the Hyrcanian Sea, a detached body of water, is surrounded'

Arrian records how, after his return from India, Alexander tried to gain some information on the matter by sending off Herakleides to explore the sea⁶. It is possible that Alexander

⁴ Heidel, The Frame of the Ancient Greek Maps, 1937 (1976), p.33: 'The emphasis laid by them, the historians, on the fact that Alexander crossed this chain [the Caucasus] is clearly due to a desire to represent him as a conqueror of the entire oikumene, whose northern limits he here reached, just as in India he reached the eastern limits and, by conquering Egypt and penetrating the borders of Ethiopia, he reached the limits of the south. He had only to follow the same lines westward to complete the conquest of the entire world to the Greeks'. Brunt, Arrian, Anabasis, I, (Loeb, 1976), pp.523-4, believes such an explanation makes little sense and prefers to see "genuine misunderstanding" behind the conception.


⁶ Arrian VII.xvi.1: 'After this Alexander sent Heracleides the son of Argeaeus to Hyrcania with shipwrights, bidding him cut wood from the Hyrcanian forests and build warships, some decked, some open, in the Greek fashion. For he had conceived a desire to explore this Caspian Sea (also called Hyrcanian) as well, to see with what other sea it unites; whether with the Euxine Sea, or whether on the east side, towards India, the great sea circling round pours into the Hyrcanian Gulf, just as he discovered the Persian Gulf, called by some the Red Sea, to be only a gulf of the ocean. For no one had yet discovered the springs of the Caspian Sea, though many tribes dwell round it and navigable rivers flow into it...'.

had initially believed the Caspian to be a lake, probably an inheritance of Aristotle's instruction, but had had doubts put into his head with the discovery of the Persian Gulf.

The isthmus.

One other conception which would seem to have been shared by Aristotle, Alexander, Polykleitos and Kleitarkhos was the linking of the Caspian and Euxine/Maiotis across a very narrow isthmus. Strabo XI.vii.4, argued that to flatter Alexander by implying that he had nearly returned to Europe in his circuit of conquest, the Alexander historians:

'united Lake Maeotis, which receives the Tanais, with the Caspian Sea, calling this too a lake and asserting that both were connected with one another by an underground passage and that each was part of the other. Polykleitos goes on to adduce proofs in connection with his belief that the sea is lake (for instance, he says that it produces serpents, and that its water is sweetish); and that it is no other than Maeotis he judges from the fact that the Tanais empties into it'.

Polykleitos, who Tam believes may have accompanied Alexander's expedition and written about 295-285 B.C.\(^7\), appears to have been the chief proponent of this conception and to have passed on his 'proofs' to the 'Vulgate' tradition\(^8\). Thus Strabo XI.i.5 reads:

'...those writers who have reduced the width of the isthmus as much as Kleitarchos has, who says that it is subject to inundation from either sea, should not be considered even worthy of mention.'

Kleitarkhos may have been Curtius' source when, in his description of Baktria in VII.iv.27, Curtius wrote:

'when the winds blow from the Pontic sea, they sweep together whatever sand lies on the plains...'

Tam wanted to deduce from this that Kleitarchos was never with Alexander in Hyrkania:

'for the humblest soldier in the army knew at least one thing, that since leaving Asia Minor his feet marched a very long way indeed\(^9\)

Kleitarkhos may not have been in Hyrkania, but this is not proof of it. Knowing that you have marched a long way is not the same as knowing where you are\(^10\). Even if they were inspired by a desire to flatter, it is clear that many of Alexander's contemporaries shared the conceptions with which Kleitarkhos worked. Two stories which would seem to illustrate clearly the Macedonians underestimation of the distance between the two seas, the Euxine and the Caspian, are the story of the visit by the Amazon Queen and the story of the Khorasmian King's offer of assistance.

\(^8\) Diodoros XVII.lxxv.3; Curtius VI.iv.18.
\(^10\) Diodoros XVII.lxxv.3; Curtius VI.iv.18.
The story of the Amazon's visit is alluded to in Plutarch, *Alexander*, 46:

'Here (ἐν θεία) the queen of the Amazons came to see him, as most writers say, among whom are Cleitarchus, Polycleitus, Onesicritus, Antigenes, and Ister; but Aristobulus, Chares the royal usher, Ptolemy, Anticleides, Philo the Theban, and Philip of Theangela, besides Hecataeus of Eretria, Philip of Chalcidian, and Duris of Samos, say that this is fiction.'

As ch.45 ends with an account of Alexander's victory over, and pursuit of, the Scythians on the north side of the Tanais, many scholars and perhaps most notably Tarn, have interpreted Plutarch as locating the legendary meeting between the Macedonian king and Amazon queen on the Iaxartes. This localisation is not, however, supported by all the relevant ancient literature. Strabo (citing Kleitarkhos), Diodoros, Curtius and Justin all, located the meeting in Hyrkania. It is probable that Kleitarkhos, drawing on either Onesikritos or Polykleitos, was the source of the story not only for Strabo, but also for Diodoros, Curtius, Justin (indirectly) and even Plutarch. A more appropriate interpretation of the Plutarch passage might then be that of Welles, who believed Plutarch's account followed Alexander's route closely, but that the raid into Scythia mentioned in ch.45 was simply an aside to illustrate Alexander's indifference to physical discomfort and the ἐν θεία with which ch.46 began refers back to the 'Parthia of ch.45 or, as Ziegler suggested, the εἰς ἱρκανίαν of ch.44.

Even if Plutarch was fully aware that Kleitarkhos placed the Amazon episode in Hyrkania or Parthia, it is possible that the story may have been inspired by the arrival of a 'European' Scythian embassy and their offer of a Scythian King's daughter in marriage, as Mederer and Tarn have suggested. Arrian (IV.xv.1-3) said Alexander received this embassy while wintering in Baktra, and gives the following account of the reception:

Now a second time envoys came to Alexander from the European Scyths, together with the envoys whom he himself had sent to Scythia. For the king of the

---

12 Strabo XI.v.4; Diodoros XVII.xxxvii.; Curtius VI.v.24-32 and Justin XII.iii.5-7.
13 Plutarch mentioned both as writers who believed the story, and even said: 'That many years afterwards Onesicritus was reading aloud to Lysimachus who was now king, the fourth book of his history, in which was the tale of the Amazon, at which Lysimachus smiled gently and said: "And where was I at the time?"' Though an unlikely story, Pearson, attached himself to the court of Lysimachus and lived long enough to see him assume the title of king. Tarn, *Alexander II*, p.328, believed Polykleitos or Onesikritos formulated the essential tale, which was then adopted by Kleitarchos.
Scythians at the time when these had been sent by Alexander had died; and his brother was now King. The purpose of the embassy was to express the readiness of the Scythians to do whatsoever Alexander commanded; and they brought gifts for Alexander from the King of Scythia such as are greatly accounted of in Scythia; and they said also that the King wished to give to Alexander his daughter to wife, to confirm his friendship and alliance with Alexander. If, however, Alexander should not care to marry the Scythian princess, yet he was desirous to give the daughters of the governors of the Scythian territory and of the chief personages in Scythia to the most trusty of Alexander's followers; he added also that he would come to visit Alexander, should he be summoned, to receive Alexander's commands in person. ...Alexander therefore replied courteously to the Scythian envoys, and suitably to the occasion. He had, he said, no need of an alliance by marriage with Scythia'.

This episode, said by Curtius (VIII.1.7) to have taken place in Marakanda, may easily have been the seed from which the Amazon story grew. The shifting of the episode from a Bactrian or Sogdian context to a Hyrkanian or Parthian one, and the transformation of the princess from a Scythian one to an Amazon one, can both be explained in terms of the Greek and Macedonian underestimation of the distance from Sogdia to the Black Sea.

Consideration of the account Arrian (IV.xv.4-5) gives of the visit of a Khorasmian embassy at the same time as the visit of the Scythian embassy, not only reinforces the suspicion that Alexander's contemporaries greatly underestimated the distance from the Oxos to the Black Sea, but also that it was this underestimation which had resulted in the Scythian princess being called an Amazon. Arrian's account of the visit is as follows:

'There came also to Alexander at the same time also Pharasmanes the King of the Chorasmians with fifteen hundred horsemen. Pharasmanes said that he lived on the borders of the Colchians and of the Amazon women; and should Alexander desire to invade Colchis and the territory of the Amazons and subdue all the races in this direction which dwelt near the Euxine Sea, he promised to act as guide and to provide all necessities for the expeditionary force. (After Alexander had replied to the Scythians...) he then thanked Pharasmanes and made friendship and alliance with him, but said that it was not just then convenient to make an expedition to Pontus... when he was master of Asia he would return to Greece; and thence in the direction of the Hellespont and the Propontis would make an expedition into Pontus with all his forces, navy and infantry alike; Pharasmanes must therefore reserve his promise which he now made to that future time'.

This extraordinary juxtapositioning of the Khorasmian king's land with the Pontic lands of the Kolkhians and Amazons is better explained in terms of Greek and Macedonian confusion than in terms of a large Khorasmian Empire16.

---

16 Zeimal, Политическая история древней трансицианы', 1978, p.196, translated as 'The Political history of Tranoxiana', 1983, p.258, notes that the juxtaposition has prompted some modern scholars to suppose that the Khorasmian kingdom at the time of Alexander's campaign stretched all the way around the north coast of the Caspian.
It is clear that Amazons and Kolkhians would have played no part in a Khorasmian speech. Arrian's source at this point appears to have had a far freer imagination than Curtius'. Curtius (VIII.i.7-10) offered a brief account of how Alexander, when in Marakanda after the final subjugation of Sogdiana, received embassies from the Scythians, who offered Alexander their King's daughter in marriage, and from the Khorasmians, for:

'Phrataphernes also, satrap of the Chorasmii, a neighbour to the Massagetae and Dahae, had sent messengers to promise his obedience. ...Both deputations were courteously heard...'.

Though it is customary to think of Arrian's sources as more sober than Curtius', this was clearly not the case with respect the accounts of these embassies. Curtius did not call the Khorasmian neighbours Amazons and Kolkhians, but Massagetai and Dahai. A Khorasmian approach for an alliance against nomads who had perpetually caused Khorasmia trouble and had recently, in their support of the Sogdian Spitamenes, been causing the Macedonians trouble, is far more conceivable than an approach for an alliance against a distant Pontic people. Given the Greek and Macedonian underestimation of the distance across Eurasia, it is not, however, difficult to see how an Alexander historian may have imagined the reference. The notion of a narrow isthmus and passage between the Black Sea and the Caspian may have been encouraged by the much older Hekataian notion of a 'Phasis' strait17, by the overestimation of the size of the Maiotis18, and by the belief that the Maiotis is fresher than the Euxine because it received the Caspian19.

Whoever of the Alexander historians was responsible for the transformation of the Khorasmian neighbours into Amazons may also have been responsible for the transformation of the Scythian princess into an Amazon. Which of the historians this was, and whether the conception of the Khorasmian neighbours as Amazons was shared by any contemporary of Alexander is, however, difficult to say.

The rivers.

Curtius and Arrian consistently call the river which Alexander crossed in 329 B.C., the modern day Syr Darya, the 'Tanais'. That this may have been Alexander's own usage is

---

17 See Chapter I.
18 As Hamilton notes in his 'Alexander and the Aral', p.110, Herodotos IV.86 called the Maiotis 'not much smaller than the Black Sea', Ps.Skylax, *Periplus*, 68, makes it half as large, and Polybius IV.xxxxix.1 and Strabo II.v.23 and VII.iv.5 make it more than a third as large. It is really only about one twelfth the size.
19 Polybios IV.xlii.1 correctly noted that the Maiotis was fresher.
suggested by Diodoros XVIII.v.4, a probable fragment of the 'Gazetteer' which, as was discussed above, was probably written while Alexander lived:

'The satrapies likewise are divided, some sloping towards the north, the others towards the south. The first of those that face the north lie along the Tanais River: Sogdiane and Bactriane...'

Though the use of 'Tanais' to designate both the Don and the Syr-Darya has been explained in terms of an Iranian word sounding like 'Tanais' and meaning 'water', and though such an Iranian word did no doubt exist, Brunt is undoubtedly correct when he argues that the use of 'Tanais' for the Iaxartes:

'was not founded on a local name resembling Tanais, and IV.v.6 shows how the Macedonians could impose their own names on rivers.'

The question Brunt does not, however, address, is why 'Tanais' was in fact the Macedonians' own name'. The answer to this question might be that the Macedonians employed the Ktesian and Aristotelian conceptions of northern hydrology. It is possible that the scholars and scientist accompanying Alexander had brought works of Ktesias and Aristotle with them.

The continental boundary.

The Alexander historians, as far as Strabo (XI.vii.4) was concerned, conceived of the Iaxartes-Tanais as the boundary between Europe and Asia, because the Don-Tanais was indisputably such a boundary, and to flatter Alexander, they linked the Don and the Iaxartes:

'for, since it was agreed by all that the [Don-] Tanais separated Asia from Europe, and that the region between the sea and the Tanais, being a considerable part of Asia, had not fallen under the power of the Macedonians, it was resolved to manipulate the account of Alexander's expedition so that in fame at least he might be credited with having conquered those parts of Asia too... From the Indian mountains, where the Ochus and the Oxus and several other rivers rise, flows also the Iaxartes, which like those rivers, empties into the Caspian and is the most northerly of them all. This river, accordingly, they named Tanais; and in addition to so naming it they gave as proof that it was the Tanais mentioned by Polycleitus that the country on the far side of the river produces the fir-tree and that the Scythians in that region use arrows made of fir-wood; and they say that this is also evidence that the country on the far side belongs to Europe and not to Asia, for, they add, Upper and Eastern Asia does not produce the fir-tree.'

20 This argument has been cited by Hamilton, 'Alexander and the Aral', 1971, p.110 n.5. See also Herrmann, 'Tanais', 1932, p.2162.
21 The modern river names 'Danube', 'Don' and 'Dniepr' preserve the T/D-n stem. MacDonald, 'The treaty of Apamea', 1967, pp.3-4 even argues that Livy (XXXVIII.xxxviii.4) even gave the name 'Tanais' to the upper reaches of the Kalykadnos river. See Hamilton, 'Alexander and the Aral', 1971, p.110.
Aristoboulos would seem to have known of fir trees in India\textsuperscript{23}, and might therefore not have been ready to accept Polykleitos' theory that the Scythians across the Iaxartes were European because their arrows were made of fir-wood. This does not, however, mean that Aristoboulos could not have called the lands or people across the Iaxartes European. Eratosthenes knew also of fir-trees in India, but conceived of the lands the other side of the Iaxartes as European\textsuperscript{24}.

The conception of the 'upper-Tanais' as a continental boundary, may have, in part, been the logical consequence of the concept of an extended Tanais (whether this was an invention to flatter or 'genuine' misconception), but it may also have been, in part, the reflection of a pre-existing Aristotelian conception. As has been discussed in the previous chapter, Aristotle not only conceived of an extended Tanais, but conceived of the upper course of this river at least as forming a continental boundary.

The Scythians.

The above geographical conceptions had a profound effect on the way Alexander's contemporaries and historians conceived of Central Asian ethnography. Though Curtius was chiefly following Kleitarkhos and Arrian chiefly Aristoboulos and Ptolemy, and though Curtius was capable of referring generally to any lands north of Parthia and Baktria as 'Scythia'\textsuperscript{25}, Curtius' and Arrian's conceptions of nomad ethnography, as far as they are discernible, largely agree. Both writers would seem to conceive of about five groups of nomads.

The first is a people usually called the Dahai. These served in the armies of Dareios\textsuperscript{26} and, after his death, in the small army with which Bessos tried to forstall Alexander's entry into Baktria\textsuperscript{27}, and, after Bessos' death, in the force with which Spitamenes harassed the Macedonians in Sogdiana\textsuperscript{28}. After Spitamenes' death they made peace with Alexander and

\textsuperscript{23} Strabo XI.vii.2: 'According to Aristobulus, Hyrcania, which is a wooded country, has the oak, but does not produce the torch-pine or fir, or stone-pine, though India abounds in these trees'.
\textsuperscript{24} Strabo XI.vii.4: 'But Eratosthenes says that the fir-tree grows also in India and that Alexander built his fleet out of fir-wood from there'.
\textsuperscript{25} Curtius IV.xii.11, VII.iii.9, VIII.ii.14.
\textsuperscript{26} Curtius IV.xi.7 and IV.xv.2, Arrian III.xi.3.
\textsuperscript{27} Arrian III.xxviii.8-10.
\textsuperscript{28} Curtius VII.vii.32, VIII.i.6, VIII.ii.1.
served under him in India. Their homeland is never precisely described. Though Curtius said they dwelt south of, or on, the Tanais, suggesting they may have dwelt between the lower Oxos and the lower Iaxartes, they are more commonly said to be neighbours of the Hyrkanians and Parthians, suggesting that they may have dwelt between the Caspian and the lower Oxos. The 'Derbikes', said by Curtius to have been brigaded in Dareios' army between the Hyrkanians and troops from the Caspian Sea, may have been this same people. As Curtius made extensive use of Kleitarkhos, Kleitarkhos made use of Ktesias, and as Ktesias is known to have mentioned Derbikes in such a context, it is possible that the use of the term 'Derbikes' for those elsewhere called 'Dahai' represents a Ktesian influence in the composition.

The second group of nomads is one usually called the Massagetai. Like the Dahai this group is recorded as serving in Dareios' army, and as latter being a strong ally of Spitamenes. Unlike the Dahai they are never mentioned in a west Oxos context, and their homeland seems to be between the lower Oxos and the lower Iaxartes. For the duration of the struggle against the Macedonians in Sogdiana they emerge from and disappear back into a desert. From contexts this desert could only be the Kyzl Kum. The people whom Arrian referred to as 'Scythians' or 'nomadic Scythians' in the context of Spitamenes' resistance to Alexander were probably these same people.

The third group of nomads is one called the Sakai. Though 'Sakai' was used by Greeks to translate the Persian 'Saka', a term which could be applied to any northern nomads in much the same way the Greeks applied 'Scythian', it also seems to have been used by the Alexander Historians to designate a people as identifiable as the Dahai and Massagetai, who dwelt south east of the upper Iaxartes, perhaps in the Pamirs. Before entering Hyrkania Alexander is said to have countered the Sakai, along with the Dahai and Massagetai, among the peoples he had not yet conquered. Bessos is said to have planned to withdraw to

29 Arrian VIII.iii.16, VIII.xiv.5, IX.ii.24-5.
30 Arrian III.xxviii.8-10. Rolfe, Quintus Curtius, History, 1962, I, p.271, has no grounds for suggesting that the Dahae dwelt 'beyond the Caspian Sea'.
31 Curtius III.ii.7.
32 See Chapter 6.
33 Curtius IV.xi.7, xiv.2.
34 Curtius VII.i.3-8, Arrian IV.xvi.4, IV.xvii.1-7.
35 Arrian IV.v.4-vi.1.
36 Curtius V.x.5.
37 Curtius VI.iii.9, VII.iv.6, VII.ix.17, VIII.iv.20.
38 Curtius VI.iii.9.
Sogdiana and to have counted the Sakai among the people (Khorasmians, Massagetai, Dahai and Scythians from beyond the Iaxartes) who would come to his aid\(^{39}\). After Alexander made a show of strength against the Scythians across the Iaxartes it is said that he received envoys not only from these Scythians but also from the 'Sakai' promising their submission and that he sent a Macedonian favourite back with the Saka envoys\(^{40}\). Later, when back in Sogdiana proper Alexander is said to have sent a force to the land of the Sakai\(^{41}\). By the time Alexander reached India he is said to have conquered the people and to have had them serving in his army\(^{42}\).

The Alexander historians' conception of the above three groups seems to have been quiet clear. They were three readily distinguishable groups dwelling in Asia. The Alexander historians' conception of two remaining groups, founded in and confounded by the geographical conceptions discussed above, was not, however, as clear.

The fourth group of nomads was one usually called 'the Scythians beyond the Tanais'. This group are never mentioned as serving in Dareios' army, but Bessos is said to have planned to use them in his defence of Baktria and Sogdia, and there was alarm in Alexander's camp when it was rumoured that they were on their way to help Bessos\(^{43}\). It was, however, only after Bessos' capture and death, and Alexander's crossing of the Iaxartes, that the Macedonians met with these Scythians. Curtius' and Arrian's lengthy accounts of Alexander's dealings with this group have two features in common. Firstly, the group is conceived of as being European, consistent with the conception of the Tanais as the boundary of Asia and Europe. Secondly, the group is conceived of as being either directly adjacent to, or even identifiable with, the Scythians of the West Black Sea littoral, consistent with the underestimation of the distance across Eurasia\(^{44}\). Thus Curtius wrote in VII.vii.1-6 that when Alexander was on the Iaxartes:

'...the king of the Scythians, whose rule at that time extended beyond the Tanais, thinking that this city which the Macedonians had founded on the bank of the river was a yoke upon their necks, sent his brother, Carthasis by name, with a large force of cavalry to demolish it and drive off the Macedonian forces away from the river. The Tanais separates the Bactriani from the so-called European Scythians, and is also the boundary between Asia and Europe. But the Scythian race which is

\(^{39}\) Curtius VII.iv.6.
\(^{40}\) Curtius VII.ix.17-19.
\(^{41}\) Curtius VIII.iv.20.
\(^{42}\) Arrian VII.x.5. The 'Scytha'e whom Curtius VIII.xiv.5 and IX.ii.24-25 has in Alexander's army in India may have been this same group.
\(^{43}\) Curtius VI.vi.13, VII.iv.6, VII.iv.32.
\(^{44}\) E.g. Curtius VII.vii.1-16, Arrian IV.iv.1-6, xv.1-3.
situated not far from Thrace extends from the east towards the north, and is not a neighbour of the Sarmatians, as some have believed, but a part of them. Then keeping straight on, it inhabits the forest lying beyond the Danube, and borders the extremity of Asia at Bactra...'.

Though it is probable that the vague concept of a single Scythian people stretching from the Danube to the Iaxartes was common among the early Alexander historians, Curtius has here clearly interpolated such post-Alexander conceptions as the notion of the Scythians as part of the Sarmatians. In VII.viii.8-30 Curtius goes beyond simply describing a single Scythian people, and writes in terms of a single Scythian state. Here the Scythians who sent envoys in an attempt to forstall Alexander's crossing of the Iaxartes are not simply identified with those of the Black Sea coast, they are described in exactly the same idealised terms as those of the Black Sea coast. Clearly alluding to such Hyperborean-cum-Scythian sages as Anacharsis and Abaris, Curtius wrote with respect to the Scythians who sent the envoys:

'...the comprehension of the Scythians is not so rude and untrained as that of the rest of the barbarians; in fact, some of them are even said to be capable of philosophy...'.

Curtius invoked the same 'Scythian' slogan often attributed to the Pontic Scythians when he has the envoys claim: 'We cannot obey any man, nor do we desire to rule any'. Curtius alludes to the same story Herodotos (IV.5) tells of the Basileioi Scythians when he wrote:

'...the comprehension of the Scythians is not so rude and untrained as that of the rest of the barbarians; in fact, some of them are even said to be capable of philosophy...'.

Herodotos' and Ktesias' history of the Pontic Scythians is given when Curtius wrote:

'It is thus that we have conquered the king of Syria and later those of the Persians and the Medes, and that a way opened for us even into Egypt'

and the well-worn image of the Pontic Scythians as invincible because they are poor was exercised when Curtius wrote:

'Only cross the Tanais; you will learn how far the Scythians extend, yet you will never overtake them. Our poverty will be swifter than your army, which carries the pillage of so many nations. Again when you believe us afar off, you will see us in your camp. For we both pursue and flee with the same swiftness. I hear that the solitudes of the Scythians are made fun of even in Greek proverbs, but we seek after places that are desert and free from human cultivation rather than cities and rich fields'.

The equation with the Pontic Scythians was completed when Curtius wrote:

'Moreover in us you will have guardians of both Asia and Europe; we touch upon Bactra, except that the Tanais is between us. Beyond the Tanais we inhabit lands extending to Thrace, and report says that the Macedonians border upon Thrace. Consider whether you wish enemies or friends to be neighbours to your empire'.

Arrian does not give the same account of a Scythian speech as Curtius, but does refer to the Macedonians, while on the Tanais, being addressed at least twice by Scythians. In IV.i.1 Arrian refers to Alexander receiving envoys from the Abian Scythians:
of whom Homer spoke highly in his epic, calling them "justest of men"; they dwell in Asia, independent, chiefly through their poverty and their sense of justice'.

Here, as in Curtius' speech, the Scythians are described as poor and just, with a relationship between the two qualities being suggested. Though these Scythians were described as Asian, it is possible that this description was anomalous (to be discussed later in this chapter) and their visit may indeed have been an echo of that same visit to which Curtius alluded. A better candidate is, however, another group mentioned in IV.i.1:

'Envoys came too from the European Scythians, who are the greatest nation dwelling in Europe'.

Here, as in Curtius' speech, the Scythians are described as numerous and powerful. The speech made by these Scythians is not given by Arrian, but Arrian does attribute to Alexander a concept of the Scythians which matches closely with the concept of the Scythian people Curtius has the Scythians themselves present. Thus, Arrian wrote in IV.i.1-3 of how, when the Scythians were about to return, he:

'sent some of the Companions with them, pretending it was an embassy to conclude a friendly agreement; but the idea of the mission was rather to spy out the nature of the Scythian's land, their numbers, their customs and the arms they use on their warlike expeditions. He was himself planning to found a city on the Tanais, and to give it his own name. For in his view the site was suitable for the city to rise to greatness, and it would be well placed for any eventual invasion of Scythia and as a defence bastion of the country against the raids of the barbarians dwelling on the other side of the river'.

There is yet a third occasion when Scythians addressed Alexander on the Tanais. In IV.iv.1 Arrian wrote of how the Scythians on the north bank of the 'Tanais' taunted the Macedonians preparing their city on the south bank:

'to the effect that Alexander would not dare to touch the Scythians, or if he did, would learn what was the difference between Scythians and the barbarians of Asia'.

Here, as in Curtius' speech, the Scythians are described, by implication, as fierce fighters.

Arrian would seem to have shared Curtius' very idealised notion of a Scythian state stretching from the Danube to the Iaxartes under the sovereignty of one King, but does admit the possibility that not all the Scythians obeyed this king. Thus, in IV.v.1, Arrian wrote that soon after the Scythians taunting of the Macedonians across the Tanais (which Curtius presents as being at the direction of the Scythian King and under the supervision of the King's brother), the Macedonians crossing the river and the Scythian flight:

'envoys reached Alexander from the king of the Scythians; they had been sent to express regret for what had occurred, on the ground that it had not been any united action of the Scythian state, but only that of raiders and freebooters'.

Arrian does suggest, however, that Alexander was not entirely convinced that the Scythian King had not been responsible, for when the envoys went on to say:

'the king himself, moreover, was desirous to perform what was laid upon him. Alexander gave a polite answer, since it seemed dishonourable not to continue the
expedition, if he distrusted the king, and yet it was not exactly the best moment to
make the expedition.'

The above references might then all offer an insight into the Alexander historians' concept
of a fourth group of nomads.

The fifth group of nomads would seem to be one which was conceived of a dwelling
'above the Bosporos', but not in Europe. Thus, Curtius refered in VII.vi.12 to two
adjacent groups of Scythians:

'Alexander sent one of his friends, Derdas, to those Scythians who dwell in
Europe; he was to command them not to cross the Tanais river without the king's
order. He charged the same messangers to reconnoitre the country and to visit those
Scythians also who dwell above the Bosphoros (super Bosphororum)'

and in VIII.i.7, when Alexander was in Marakanda:

'...Derdas, whom he had sent to the Scythians dwelling east of the Bosphorus
(super Bosphororum)45, met him with the envoys of that people'.

But how could Curtius or an early Alexander historian have conceived of a Scythian group
'above the Bosporos', but not in Europe and distinct from that group that stretched from
the Danube to the Iaxartes? The answer is clear. 'Above the Bosporos' meant the lands not
on the west of the Sea of Azov and the Don, as might be supposed by reference to a
modern map, but to the east of the Sea of Azov and the Don. As the Don was believed to be
but the lower course of a Tanais which stretched from the Hindu-Kush to the Sea of Azov,
to conceive of a people to the east of the Sea of Azov was to conceive of them as dwelling
south of that part of the Tanais which flowed around behind the Caspian Sea. Thus envoys
were believed to be able to cross from Sogdiana into the land of the European Scythians,
travel westward beyond the Caspian and cross the Tanais back into Asia just above the
Asiatic side of the Bosporos. Curtius made it clear that such was his conception in VI.ii.13,
when he wrote that the Scythians:

'have homes both in Europe and in Asia; those who dwell above the Bosphorus are
assigned to Asia, but those who are in Europe extend from the left side of Thrace to
the Borysthenes and from there in a direct course to the Tanais'.46

It is possible that Arrian preserved allusions to this same group of Asian Scythians when he
wrote in IV.iii.6, that when Alexander was on the Tanais:

'...envoys came to Alexander from the Abian Scythians, as they are called, of
whom Homer spoke highly in his epic, calling them "justest of men"; they dwell in
Asia, independent, chiefly through their poverty and their sense of justice.'

45 It is curious that Rolfe here translates 'super Bosphororum' as 'east of the Bosphorus'
when in VI.ii.13 he translated it 'beyond the Bosphorus'. The latter translation is the
more faithful to the word, the former to the concept.
46 Curtius employed a similar conception when, in VI.ii.13, he wrote that the Scythians
came into Parthia 'not from the Bosphoros but from the region of Europe'.
It is also possible, however, that the designation of these Scythians as Asia does not fit into the above model of five Scythian groups. Indeed, Arrian wrote in IV.iii.6 that: ‘Meanwhile an army of the Asian Scythians arrived on the banks of the river Tanais; most of these had heard that some of the natives on the far side of the river had revolted from Alexander and had the intention, would any important rising occur, to join themselves also in attacking the Macedonians’.

It is difficult to see how, in the model constructed above, Scythians dwelling across the Tanais could be classed as Asian. This anomaly is even recognised by scholars who have not been attempting to reconstruct the Alexander historians’ ethnographic conceptions. Thus it would seem impossible to account for every ethnographic conception implicit in the references made by Curtius and Arrian to Scythians.

The early Alexander historians’ concept of five separate nomad groups, deduced through an investigation of the histories of Curtius and Arrian, may have been shared by Alexander himself. One of these groups may have corresponded in some way with the Scythians whom Alexander’s father had fought on the Danube, and whom he too must have heard of when later campaigning in the same region against the Getai.

Central Asian History.

One other aspect of Alexander’s Central Asian campaign which demands some attention is the terms in which Alexander, his contemporaries and historians, conceived of the historical significance of the campaign. Alexander, in the minds of his contemporaries and historians was often identified with, or at least compared with, Herakles and Dionysios. The significance of Alexander’s eastern campaigns is, however, measured most often and most explicitly by comparison with the campaigns of the first Persian king Kyros, and the Assyrian queen Semiramis. Thus, Alexander is said to have awarded the Ariaspians of Drangiana special privileges for the aid they had given Kyros on his eastern campaign, to have founded a city on the Iaxartes not far from where Kyros had founded a city.

47 Brunt, Arrian, Anabasis, Loeb, 1976, vol. I, p.345, note to IV.iii.6, "Asia"; there is a muddle here. On any view Alexander was in Asia, but if the 'Tanais' was the frontier between Europe and Asia, Scythians across the river were in Europe'.


50 Curtius, VII.iii.1-3.

51 Curtius, VII.vi.16-20.
at first decided not to destroy Kyros' city, though its inhabitants had revolted\(^{52}\), to have invaded India, which neither Semiramis nor Kyros had conquered\(^{53}\), and to have insisted in crossing the Gedrosian desert simply because Semiramis and Kyros had crossed it\(^{54}\). In numerous other ways too Semiramis and Kyros are brought into the Alexander histories. Curtius indeed wrote in VII.vi.20 that:

'...there was no other of those nations whom he admired more than that king [Kyros] and Semiramis, who he believed had far excelled all others in the greatness of their courage and the glory of their deed.'

and in IX.vi.23, has Alexander encourage his troops in India with the words:

'I pray you, think that you have come to lands in which the name of a woman is renowned because of her valour. What cities did Semiramis build! What nations did she reduce to submission! What great works did she accomplish! We have not yet equalled a woman in glory, and has satiety of renown already seized us?'

Semiramis and Kyros were clearly important in Alexander's evaluation of his own historical significance, but did Alexander think in terms of Semiramis and Kyros simply because the Iranians thought in these terms? This is improbable. Is is more probable that Alexander and those scholars with him were led to conceive of eastern Iranian history in these terms by the works of such Greeks as Ktesias.

Though the Macedonian conquests in Central Asia may have been compared by Alexander and his contemporaries with the 'achievements' of Semiramis and Kyros, the Macedonian grip on Central Asia was never as firm as Alexander may wish to have believed. Thus, though Arrian (VII.x.6) has Alexander count Khorasmia and Baktria among the lands he had conquered, it is clear that the Khorasmian king's visit had constituted no more than a temporary alliance of the Chorasmians with the Macedonian\(^{55}\) and that no sooner had

\(^{52}\)Ibid.

\(^{53}\)Arrian, *Indika*, V.7 and IX.10.

\(^{54}\)Arrian, VI.xxiv..2 and Strabo XV.ii.5.

\(^{55}\)Zeimal, 'The Political History of Transoxiana', 1983, p.258, took Strabo's reference in XI.viii.8 to the Khorasmians as the people to whom Spitamenes had fled and as a people belonging to the Massagetai, as evidence that the Khorasmians were not, following Pharasmenes' visit, subjects of the Macedonians. This is slender evidence. Though Arrian dated the Khorasmian visit before Spitamenes' flight, Curtius dated it after. Though Strabo said Spitamenes fled to the Khorasmians and that these were a Massagetai people, Arrian and Curtius both suggest that the Khorasmians were distinct from the Massagetai, to whom Spitamenes had fled. Curtius even has the Khorasmians proposing a war against the Massagetai. It can not, however, be argued that the Khorasmians were ever subjects of the Macedonians.
Alexander left Baktria than disputes among the Greeks led to an open Baktrian revolt\textsuperscript{56}. Indeed, Alexander's campaigns in Sogdiana and on the Tanais, seem to have done little to reduce nomad pressure on the region. That the nomad pressure on the region had been building up prior to Alexander's campaign is suggested by Curtius' allusion in VII.vii.1 to the activity of Scythians from north of the Tanais in Sogdiana:

'But the king of the Scythians, whose rule at that time extended beyond the Tanais (ultra Tanaim), thinking that this city which the Macedonians had founded on the bank of the river was a yoke upon their necks, sent his brother, Carthasis by name, with a large force of cavalry to demolish it and drive off the Macedonian forces away from the river'.

That nomad pressure was not reduced after Alexander's campaign is suggested by the fact that Seleukos, perhaps as early as 290 B.C., had found it necessary to send an army to recapture the north east, and refound cities in Margiana and Sogdian\textsuperscript{57}. Nevertheless, Alexander's campaigns did bring Central Asia within the Greek political and geographic horizon and Greek civilisation within the strategic and cultural horizon of the Central Asian nomads. The tensions produced by these changed circumstances will be explored in Chapters 12-14.

Conclusion.

It might then be concluded that though Alexander's campaigns brought the Greek world into direct contact with Central Asian tribes, the geography, ethnography and history of the lands between the Black Sea and the Pamirs were conceived by Alexander himself and described by Aristoboulos, Ptolemy, Kleitarkhos and Polykleitos in Hekataian, Ktesian and Aristotelian terms. The preconceptions investigated in the preceding chapters proved to have such great momentum that they continued on a firm course through the minds of Alexander, his contemporaries and historians, even after their collision with the world they so poorly described.

\textsuperscript{56} See Curtius IX.vii.1-2: 'While this was going on in India, the Greek soldiers who had laterly been established by the king in colonies round about Bactra, since disagreement had arisen among them, had revolted, not so much through hostility to Alexander, as from fear of punishment. For the stronger faction, having killed some of their countrymen, began to think of armed action, and after having seized the citadel of Bactra, which through belief in its safety had been carelessly guarded, they had forced the barbarians also to join in their revolt'. Curtius went on in IX.viii.3-11 to give a detailed account of the disturbances. Cf. Diodoros XVIII.7.

\textsuperscript{57} See the section on Demodamos in Chapter 12.
CHAPTER 11.

PONTIC HISTORIANS AND THE SIRAKOI.

Introduction.

Alexander of Macedon died at Babylonia in 323 B.C. The struggle for succession began almost immediately. Twelve years later, in 311, after some 38 years as King of the Bosporan Kingdom, and after witnessing Alexander's entire career, Parysades I died. His throne was no less eagerly, nor immediately contested. Parysades' eldest son, Satyros (II), supported by his youngest son, Prytanis, contended with the third son, Eumelos. From Diodoros' detailed account of this fratricidal war, XX.22-26, it is apparent that this was above all a war between barbarian allies. According to Diodoros, besides 2,000 Greek mercenaries and an equal number of Thracians, Satyros had enrolled in his army 20,000 horse and 22,000 foot. Events unfolded on a stage stretching from the territory of the Sirakan king, Aripharnes, near the Thates river in the east Kuban, where Satyros was fatally wounded, to the territory of the Scythian King, Agaros, to whom Satyros' only surviving son, Parysades, fled when Eumelos defeated Prytanis, occupied Pantikapion and started massacring Satyros' and Prytanis' family and friends. Diodoros' story thus offers an opportunity to investigate the nature of late 4th and early 3rd century historiography on Scythian and Sarmatian peoples.

There are two questions which might be addressed to the above text: the historiographical one, who was Diodoros' source, and who was his sources' source, and the historical one, what does the text tell us about Bosporan-tribal relations. These may now be discussed in turn.

Diodoros' source on the Bosporan civil-war.

The little research there has been into Diodoros' source at this point in his geography has presented two candidates for identification as the source. In 1981 Hornblower saw a link between Diodoros' Eumelos story and Diodoros account in XIX.73 of Lysimakhos' siege.

1 Diodoros, XX.xxii.3. On the importance of mercenaries in Bosporan armed forces in the 4th - 3rd centuries B.C. see Sokol'skij, 'К вопросу о наемниках на боспоре в IV-III вв. до н.э.', 1958, pp.298-397.
of Kallantia in 305 B.C. The link is that Eumelos is said to have settled 1,000 Kallantian refugees. As Diodoros' source on Lysimakhos was probably the great historian and administrator Hieronymous (c.350-c.265 B.C.), Hornblower suggests Diodoros' source on Eumelos might also have been Hieronymos, the Eumelos story presumably being extracted from Hieronymous' writings on Lysimakhos. Hieronymous, moreover, being a native of Kardia and being in the services of Kings interested in Pontic affairs, might himself have been interested in the affairs of the Bosporan Kingdom. Struve on the other hand, has seen a link between the style of, and Hellenocentric attitudes in Diodoros' Eumelos story, and the style of and attitudes in Diodoros' account (XIX-XXI) of the Sicilian tyrant Agathokles. As Eumelos was a contemporary of Agathokles, as Diodoros offered his Eumelos story in the middle of his Agathokles one, as Diodoros clearly used Douris (c.340-c.260) on Agathokles, he may have been using Douris, perhaps his 'Istoriai', on Satyros and Eumelos.

Though it is impossible to demonstrate conclusively that Diodoros' source at this point was Hieronymos, Douris or indeed some other writer, there is one further question which might with caution be considered. Who was the source's source?

Most scholars have detected in the story a eulogising of Eumelos, and believed Diodoros' ultimate source to be an historian patronized by Eumelos or one of his descendants. Only one Soviet scholar, Struve, has not detected any panegyric tone in the story. On the contrary, Struve noted that Satyros and Prytanis continually emerge as rightful rulers and

---

3 Struve, 'Личность автора древнейшего труда по истории СССР', 1967, p.12. For example, Diodoros labels the Carthaginian custom of prostration in XX.xxx.2 as ἑπαραξιάς, and Satyros' placing of himself in the middle of the phalanx in XX.xx.4 as καθανέρ ἔστι Σάρεας νόμιμον. For a discussion of Douris' biographical details see Kebric, 'In the Shadow of Macedon, Duris of Samos', 1977, pp.1-18. Peters has seen Douris as 'an almost perfect examplification of the Peripatetic interest in history', and seen his work as betraying 'both the strengths and weakness of Peripatetic historiography: a catholic view of history which embraces social and ethnographic investigation, accompanied by a vulgarisation of tone and style'. Peters, *Harvest of Hellenism*, 1972, p.113.
battle-heroes⁶, that Eumelos, until seated on the throne, is overshadowed by the nomad king Aripharnes⁷, and that the final apology for Eumelos is not so glorious.

Struve was doubtlessly correct in arguing that the original author was not one patronised by Eumelos or his successors. In fact he may not have even been a Bosporan citizen. Struve has also noted that Diodoros repeatedly called the Spartokid rulers "basileioi". As has been pointed out the Bosporan rulers called themselves 'king of the Maiotians', but always 'Arkhon of Bosporos and Theodosia'. Though it is hazardous to infer features of an original story from extant reworkings, the use of the title, Basileus in Diodoros' Eumelos story suggest a non-Bosporan source, just as the use of the title 'Tyrant' in Polyainos' Tirgatao story might suggest an non-Bosporan source⁸. It was though perhaps uncautious of Struve to go so far as to identify the original source as a Khersonesian Metic of Samian origin known personally to Douris⁹. A Khersonesian source has perhaps appealed to Soviet historians, as it implies that as early as the 4th century B.C. there were historians working on modern day Soviet soil. However, as we have noted in connection with Polyainos' Tirgatao story, the Khersonesians were not the only people who might have called the Spartokids 'Tyrants' or 'Kings'.

If these terms were indeed in the original account, a Herakleian source also a possibility. Indeed, a Herakleian source might be more probable than a Khersonesian given that the original narrator seems to put a considerable distance between himself and the Bosporans. We might note in particular the reference to Satyros taking his place in the middle of the phalanx καθ’ περ έστι Σκύθαις νόμιμον (XX.xxii.4) and the statement that prophecies of Eumelos' death were ridiculous but accepted by τοις ἐγχώριοις (XX.xxvi.1).

Sirakoi expansion.

---

⁶ e.g. XX.xx.2,5-6, xxiii.7 and xxiv.2.
⁷ e.g. XX.xxiii.3.
⁸ See Chapter 5.
The second question which might be addressed to Diodoros' story is an historical one. What does the account tell us about Bosporan-tribal relations? To answer this question, some consideration needs to be given to the problem of identity of the Sirakoi.

Such pioneering historians of northern tribes as Tomaschek, Täubler and Minns conceived of the Sirakoi as a Sarmatian tribe closely related to the Aorsoi, dwelling between the Kuban and the Caspian. This conception is based upon references to the tribe in Pliny IV.xii.83 and Strabo XI.ii.1, where they are mentioned together with the Aorsoi, and Appian, *Mithridatic Wars*, 52 and *IOSPE* II.423, where they are mentioned as a tribe Sauromates II conquered. These scholars do not mention the Diodoros passage. The reason for this is doubtlessly the absence of Ἐἰρακῶν from the manuscripts, which offer only Ἐπαρκῶν. This is clearly a copyist's error, and was corrected to Ἐπάρκεῶν by Boeckh, believing them to be the Θατεοί of the Bosporan inscriptions and Mela 1.114. Müller and Fischer restored the text with Ἐἰρακῶν and were followed in this by Latyshev in 1909. Curiously, Minns, who must have been aware of Müller's conjecture and Latyshev's adoption of it, notes only Boeckh's restoration.

Rostovtzeff followed Müller and concluded further that the Scythians were forced from the Kuban by Sarmatian tribes, of whom:

'The Sircians were probably the first tribe to arrive, and it was probably they who expelled the Scythians'.

In the fortified capital of Aripharnes on the banks of the Thates, described by Diodoros, Rostovtzeff saw Uspe, the capital city of the Sirakian king, Zorsines, besieged by the Roman general Aquila in 49 A.D., and described by Tacitus. It is probable that the surrounding district in Aripharnes', as in Zorsines' day, was largely inhabited by a subject

---

15 Rostovtzeff, *ibid.*, p.164; Tacitus, *Annals* XII.16. Uspe 'stood on high ground, and had the defence of walls and fosses; only the walls, not being of stone, but of hurdles and wicker-work with earth between, were too weak to resist an assault.'
population. But when did the Sirakoi arrive in the region? If Rostovtzeff meant to suggest they had but recently arrived and expelled the Scythians, he overlooks the absence of any reference to Scythians in the region during 4th century Bosporan control, and leaves little time for the establishment of Sirakanian power and cities. If he meant to suggest an early 5th century Sirakoi arrival and confrontation with the Scythians, he needed to explain the absence of any 4th century Bosporan references to Sirakoi. If Diodoros was writing of Sirakoi, it would be more appropriate to dispense with the thesis that they were expelled by the Scythians and to conceive of them as being 4th century Iranian arrivals who subjugated the indigenous population.

Gajdukevic’s objection to Rostovtzeff’s thesis was more basic than those raised above. Diodoros, he believes, had mentioned Thatoi and not Sirakaoi, and Stabo’s account of the location of the Sirakoi, and Tacitus’ description of Zorsines’ town, differ considerably from Diodoros’ account of the Aripharnes’ tribe. As weighty as the evidence is in favour of believing Diodoros was referring to a tribe called the ‘Thatoi’ or ‘Thatai’ (mentioned in the inscriptions), dwelling on the Thates river (mentioned in Diodoros’ story), many more circumstances suggest Diodoros was in fact referring to a tribe called the ‘Sirakoi’.

Firstly, Aripharnes is clearly an Iranian name, as are the names attributed to the later Sirakoi Kings, Abeakos and Zorsines, and his position in the middle of his battle line, a custom which Diodoros says was a Scythian custom, is known to have been a custom common among Iranians.

Secondly, Aripharnes’ army not only had more horse, but had a greater proportion of horse to foot, than Satyros’ Scythian allies. It is hard to conceive of such a force of cavalry being drawn from an exclusively sedentary people who were subjects of the Bosporan Kingdom but a few decades earlier.

Thirdly, θαξανάν is more likely to have been a perversion of ειξανάν, than of θαξανάν. The tribal name Thatai was clearly derived from the name of the river Thates, and the tribe Diodoros refers to clearly dwelt on the Thates, but this does not mean that

---

16 See Zorsines’ offer of 10,000 slaves in return for the lives of the free population. Tacitus, Annals, XII.xii.17.
17 Gajdukevic, Das bosporanische Reich, 1949, pp.85-86, n.67.
18 Diodoros XX.xx.4-5. Cf. Xenophon, Anabasis, I.viii.21 Kyros knew ‘that the King held the centre of the Persian army’. Cf. also Arrian II.viii.11 and III.xi.5 on Dareios positioning himself at the centre of the battle line at Issos and Gaugamela.
Diodoros or his source must have originally written *Thatai*. Not all Thatai dwellers had to be called *Thatai* any more than all Maiotian coast dwellers had to be called *Maioi*.

Fourthly, though the Sirakoi feature in Tacitus' (XII.xii.17) account of Aquila's campaigns in the Kuban region in 48 A.D., undoubtedly based on Aquila's report, and though variants of the name are to be found in the epigraphic record of such Greek towns as Tanais and Olbia¹⁹, the name *Sirakoi* was probably current at a much earlier date. Strabo's detailed information on the Sirakoi (XI.v.8), embodying references to Pharmakes, king of the Bosporos, may be drawn from a source of the 1st century B.C., such as Theophanes of Mytilene, Metrodoros of Skepsis or Hypsikrates (all cited in XI.v.1), but may also preserve elements of Eratosthenes' researches from the late 3rd century B.C.

If Diodoros did use the name *Sirakoi*, and if Hieronymos, or, as is more probable, Douris, were the source of Diodoros' reference to the *Sirakoi*, one question remains to be answered. How is Diodoros' and other's use of the term *Sirakoi* to designate a tribe in the north Caucasus and Kuban region to be reconciled with Polyainos' use of the name *Sirakes* in VII.xi.12 for a late 6th century Saka horse-keeper in Central Asia²⁰ to be explained? Clearly the concept behind *Sirakoi* demands still closer attention. The few extant localisations of the Sirakoi might now be examined.

Mela 1.19 and Ptolemy V.viii.12, both place the Sirakoi immediately to the south of the Iaxamatai, who are located on the lower Tanais. This may suggest the Sirakoi share a common origin with the Iaxamatai, not only in coming from the Volga Sarmatian group, but also as coming into the Greek consciousness at the same time. No scholar, however, has failed to notice the Sirakoi in the toponym *Sirakene*, used by Ptolemy (VI.ix.5, xii.4). This toponym is not, however, associated with the Volga area. In Ptolemy VI.ix.5 the name is associated with a region stretching across both sides of the Oxos, on the eastern border of Margiana, where even today on the border of Chorasm there is a fort named Serachs²¹. In Ptolemy V.xii.4 the name is associated with a region called *Sakasene*, between the Kyros and Araxes river.

---


²⁰ Polyainos VII.xi.12. According to the Teubner edition, ed. Melber, 1887, p.324 the manuscript readings are Σιρακο and Σιράκο, so it is by no means clear how Shepherd, the author of the only published English translation of the Stratagems, 1793 (1974) came to transliterate the name as *Risaces*.

²¹ Kretcher, Σιράκος, 1927, p.282.
Two other localisations are offered by Strabo XI.v.2. Strabo located the Sirakoi on the Akhardeos river when he wrote:

'...the Aorsi live along the Tanais, but the Sirakes live along the Achardeüs (Ἀχαρδέους), which flows from the Caucasus and empties into Lake Maeotis',

and located the Sirakene, clearly a region inhabited by Sirakoi, on the Mermodas river when he wrote that the Mermodas:

'dashes down from the mountains through the country of the Amazons and through Siracene and the intervening desert and then empties into Lake Maeotis'.

To understand where Strabo believed the Sirakoi dwelt and the Sirakene was, it is necessary to investigate the hydrological concepts used in the above passages.

Various identifications of the rivers Akhardeos and Mermodas have been offered by modern scholars. Kamenetskij favoured identifying both the Mermodas and the Akhardeos with the Kuban, and the Mermodalis, which Strabo (XI.v.1) cited Theophanes of Mytilene as having said flowed between the Albanians and Amazons, with the Thermodon.22 Vinogradov favoured identifying both the Mermodas of XI.v.2 and the Mermadalis of XI.v.1 with the Terek, flowing down from the Caucasus into the Caspian, and the Akhardeos and the Ocharius of Pliny VI.vi.22 with the Manych-Egorlyk.23 The obvious objections to Vinogradov's identifications are that Strabo says both the Mermodalis and the Akhardeos flow from the Caucasus into the Maiotis. The Terek flows into the Caspian, and the Akhardeos flows into the Don. Vinogradov's identification of the Mermodas with the Terek is difficult to support. Kamenetskij's identification of the river with the Kuban might be a more attractive identification but Vinogradov correctly points out that the Manych flows into the Don 60 km from the Don's mouth, so might easily be conceived of as flowing into the Maiotis. Though the presence of Sirakoi on the Akhardia and a Sirakene on the Mermodas might suggest the identity of these rivers, it need in fact suggest no more than a broad Sirakoi domain stretching down the Manych to the upper Kuban. Vinogradov recommends a similar broadening of the Sirakoi domain to accomodate the reference to the Sirakene, but believed the Sirakene to lie on the Terek, not on the upper Kuban.

The above references to Sirakoi offer scope for some interpretation. The most cryptic of all references to the Sirakoi is that in Strabo XI.v.8:

22 Kamenetskij, Ἀχαρδεῖ καὶ σιρακι', 1964, p.99. The Akhardeos was also identified with the Kuban by Gagloev, Ἀλάνν καὶ σκιζο-σαρματικά πλημένα σενεριγνο πριχερνομορί, 1962, pp.155-6.

'The next peoples to which one comes between Lake Maiotis and the Caspian Sea are nomads, the Nabiani and the Panxani, and then next the tribes of the Siraces and Aorsi. The Aorsi and the Siraces are thought to be fugitives from the upper (ἀνωτέρω) tribes of those names and the Aorsi are more to the north than the Siraces'.

There are two possible ways of interpreting this passage. The first is as meaning the Sirakoi were fugitives from southern tribes, i.e. tribes in the Caucasus, and were thus migrating in a northerly direction away from the Caucasus. The second is as meaning they were fugitives from tribes in the north and were migrating south towards the Caucasus.

This second interpretation has been used to support a theory, that the various contexts in which the variants of Sirakoi are to be found may be explained in terms of a Sirakoi migration. Thus Kretschmer and Kothe, both seem ready to postulate a Sirakoi migration from the Oxos region in the 7th century B.C. (the tribal-name surviving in the region, and being used in Polyainos' Sirakes story) through Hyrkania, into Assyria with the other Scythian nomads, then north over the Caucasus.

There is, however, one major problem with this migration explanation. It can not be supported by the archaeological record. Soviet scholars have paid much attention to the archaeological record of tribal movements in the north Caucasian region in the 5th-3rd centuries B.C. and are unanimous in identifying the culture of the Kuban-north Caucasian nomad people whom Diodoros, Strabo and Tacitus called Sirakoi, as a culture carried from...

25 As suggested by Kretschmer, ΕΠΙΚΕΙΣ, 1927, p.283.
26 Kretschmer, ibid., pp.282-3 and Kothe, 'Skythenbegriff', 1969, p.16, a map entitled 'De Westwanderung der Skythen (Siraken) im 7. Jahrhundert v.u.Z.'. These scholars nowhere outline a migration in the stages suggested here, but their work would imply they conceived of such a Sirakoi migration.
the Volga region in the 5th century B.C., a culture usually called 'Sarmatian'. The Sirakoi group's expansion is mapped out as being from the Manych lake region in the 4th century to the north Caucasus in the 3rd century, not one from south of the Caucasus to north, let alone from the Oxos to the north of the Caucasus. The archaeological record suggests that the Sirakoi may have made several incursions still deeper into the Caucasus in the second half of the 3rd century. Apollodoros of Rhodes may have been alluding to these incursions when writing of the war between King Aites and the Sauromatai. Diodoros' Sirakoi, like Polyainos' Iaxomatai, dealt with in Chapter 6, may have been led by one of those people who, in the first half of the 4th century, migrated from the lower Volga to the Kuban region, and whom modern scholars most commonly call 'Sarmatians'. The occurrence of names similar to Sirakoi in non-Volga-Kuban contexts cannot be explained in terms of an historical migration from the Oxos to Armenia to the north Caucasus to the Kuban.

A better explanation for the variance in the contexts in which names like 'Sirakoi' appear, might be one framed in terms of an historiographical migration. The term Sirakoi may have originally been used in the context of north Caucasian ethnography, and been taken from this context for use in the context of Dareios' war with the Central Asian Saka. The name might simply have migrated through Greek literature. That Diodoros, when writing of the Sirakoi , and Polyainos, when writing of Sirakes, may have both been using a common source, Douris, suggests a recycling of names from the Kuban to the Central Asian context is a distinct possibility. The recycling may have been facilitated by the fact that Sirakoi/Sirakes was a common Iranian name. Despite Trubachev's attempt to argue a pre-Iranian origin for Sirakes (and many other names from North Euxine contexts) and to link


28 Apollodoros, Argonautica, III.351-363.
Sirakes with the old Indian sirā, 'river', the name was clearly Iranian. Two epigraphic occurrences of the name Siranos have been found in the town of Tanais, at the mouth of the Don, and in each case it is the patronym of an individual with a very Iranian name.

The Bosporan expansion.

From the identity of Diodoros' 'Sirakoi' discussion might now turn to the geographical orientation of the events Diodoros records. It might be noted that Eumelos had set up a base in the city of the Sirakoi king, Aripharnes, above a river called the Thates, and Satyros and Prytanis set up their base in a town called Gargaza, en route from Pantiakapaion to the Sirakoi town. Locating these towns has proved difficult. Most scholars, have identified the Thates river with a tributary of the Kuban, Aripharnes' fortress with a fortress to the south of the Kuban, Satyros' town of Gargaza with a town further down the Kuban river, and Bosporan expansion in the later part of the 4th century B.C. as being an expansion inland, up the Kuban river.

To support this hypothesis Shilov refers to Strabo's list of Maiotian peoples. The list includes people such as the Dandaroi, and Doskoi, but does not include the Psessoi and Thatoi. Shilov believed Strabo omitted these two people, known from inscriptive evidence, because for Strabo 'Maeotian' meant dwelling on the Azov coast, and the Psessoi and Thatoi were inland people, on the middle Kuban.

The argument that the Bosporans expanded inland up the Kuban river, that it was there the Thatoi and Doskoi dwelt and there Satryos fought Eumelos does not, however, satisfy well all the demands of the written records. The reasons are several. Firstly, though Psessoi and Thatoi were not named by Strabo as Maiotian, Strabo made it clear that he was naming only some of the Maiotian people. Secondly, the Psessoi were named in the inscriptions as subjects of Leukon, but went unnamed by Pairisades because he used the term Maiotian to

31 Minns, Scythians and Greeks, 1913, p.579 and Shilov, Οι расселения мотских племен, 1971, pp.120-1.
32 Shilov, ibid., pp.121-3.
include them\textsuperscript{34}. Thirdly, the Thatoi were said by Mela (I.114) to live on the Maiotian coast and that Pairisades does not include Thatoi under the term 'Maiotian' may only indicate that Pairisades conquered the Thatoi some time after 'Maiotian' had come to be synonymous for the Bosporans with Toretoi, Dandaroi and Psessoi (and indeed, in one inscription of Pairisades (\textit{IosPE} II.347) the Doskoi are separate from the Maiotians, but Strabo (XI.ii.11) counts the Doskoi among the Maiotian peoples). Fourthly, Ptolemy located a town called Gerousa (V.viii.2) and a river Psathis (V.ix.27), possibly Diodoros' Gargaza and Thates, on the east Maiotian coast, not near the Kaban river\textsuperscript{35}

The significance of the above to our understanding of Bosporan-tribal relations is highlighted when, in Diodoros' story, Eumelos is said to have sent envoys to Satyros at Gargaza to discuss the partition of the kingdom. Partitions had been so common in the 4th century, that it is possible Eumelos had assumed that he was going to share power with his brother after their father's death. That Eumelos had a sizable army to support his claim suggests, however, that he may have been stationed, even active in the north-east Maiotian region at the time of his father's death. It is even possible that he had been busy conquering those peoples that appeared on inscriptions as his father's subjects, or reconquering that tribe which had revolted and been erased from one inscription\textsuperscript{36}. As Eumelos had the solid support of the Sirakoi King, Aripharnes, it is possible that Pairisades and his sons had been using Sarmatian tribes to conquer the east, just as they had been using Scythians, when relations were good enough, to secure their power in the Crimea?\textsuperscript{37} No doubt the newly arrived Sarmatians found that they could profit by hiring themselves as mercenaries to various Bosporan dynasts.

Echoes of how the Bosporans used one Sarmatian group against another, and how the Sarmatians let themselves be used by one Bosporan dynast against another, have even been detected in the Nart legends of the Ossetians. These legends have long been known to have

\textsuperscript{34} See Chapter 5.

\textsuperscript{35} These identifications were first proposed by Wesseling and Ortelins, cited by Minns, \textit{Scythians and Greeks}, 1913, p.579.

\textsuperscript{36} \textit{IosPE} II.8. Cf. Chapter 5.

\textsuperscript{37} The close relationship between the Bosporan Kingdom and the Crimean Scythians, though a subject beyond the scope of this paper, has received much attention from Soviet scholars. e.g. Solomonik, 'О северного причерноморья', 1952, pp.103-128. In the above Diodoros passage alone there are numerous indications of this close relation. Satyros used 20,000 Scythian soldiers, he fought in the centre of his force 'as was the Scythian practice', and his son Parysades, his only son to survive the massacre, fled to Agaros, the Scythian King.
their origins in Sarmatian-Alan oral tradition\textsuperscript{38}, just as the Ossetian language has its origin in a Sarmatian-Alan Iranian dialect, but it was not till 1958 that Abaev astutely noted that the city of the Käfty-sär, Xujandon-älder, the Great Fisherman, ruler of the straits, was an allusion to Pantikapion, the seat of the Bosporan rulers, and that the Nartes of the stories connected with the Käfty-sär were the Sarmatians with whom the Bosporans had dealings\textsuperscript{39}. Whether the war between two Nart groups, the war into which the Käfty-sär intervened, is an echo of the war between the Scythians and the Sarmatians or the Sirakoi and Aorsoi is, however, unclear\textsuperscript{40}.

Conclusion.

It might then be concluded that though Diodoros' account of the war between the Bosporan princes Satyros and Eumelos has usually been thought to be of Bosporan origin, it was possibly derived from a Chersonesian record, and though Eumelos' allies are usually thought to be tribesmen indigenous to the Thates river, they probably consisted mainly of the newly arrived 'Sarmatian' peoples, known to the Greeks as the 'Sirakoi'. It might also be argued that just as the Spartokid dynasts appear, in the early and mid-4th century, to have used their intermittently good relationship with the Scythians in the Crimea and phil-Hellenic groups in the Sindika to gradually incorporate into their Kingdom most of the east Azov coastal tribes, so they appear to have done in the late 4th century, and just as the expansion of the early and mid-4th century brought the Bosporans into contact with a recently Sarmatianised 'Sauromatian' confederacy headed by a tribe Polyainos names the Iaxomatai, so the expansion in the late 4th century brought the Bosporans into contact with a confederation headed by the Sarmatian tribe Diodoros names the Sirakoi\textsuperscript{41}.


\textsuperscript{39} Abaev, Сармато-боспорские отношения в отражении нартовских сказаний', 1958, pp.54-61.

\textsuperscript{40} The former interpretation is favoured by Abaev, Сармато-боспорские отношения', 1958, p.60 and the latter by Vinogradov, 'Сиракский союз племен на северном Кавказе', 1965, p.116.

\textsuperscript{41} See Chapter 5.
CHAPTER 12.

SELEUKID GENERALS AND PTOLEMAIC SCHOLARS.

Seleukid Expansion.

The reign of the Bosporan dynast Eumelos (310/9-304/3) corresponded with the period in which Seleukos Nikator consolidated his rule of 'Upper Asia'. Seleukos' kingdom included Baktriana, Sogdiana and part of the Hindu Kush region, to which were added, after the defeat of Antigonos in 301, Syria and most of Asia Minor. The stages by which these conquests were achieved is unclear. Seleukos' eastern campaigns, including a crossing of the Indus into Chandra-gupta's newly established empire, must have come shortly after Antigonos eased the pressure on Babylonia in 308 B.C. They were clearly not as successful as Seleukos may have hoped, for he was obliged by a subsequent treaty to yield parts of Arakhosia and the districts near the Hindu Kush to the Indian dynast. The subsequent stability of the eastern frontier was ensured by such well known diplomatic exchanges as Megasthenes' to the court of Chandragupta and Deimakhos' to the court of his successor, Amitragrades. Both ambassadors furnished reports of their experiences, and though neither is extant in full, fragments and testimonies have led modern scholars to consider Megasthenes' report the more credible and worthy of the two. There was, however, one other report of this period, which mentioned India and which Eratosthenes considered even more trustworthy than Megasthenes' report, that of Patrokles.

Patrokles.

Patrokles is not known to have visited India. In what connection then did Patrokles mention India? It was clearly in connection with a sea passage from India to the Caucasus. Thus we read in Pliny VI.xxi.58 of how numerous India's races and cities were:

4  Strabo II.i.4-5.
admiral of the fleet Patrocles having sailed round even into the Hyrcanian and Caspian Sea...'.

Similarly Pliny II.liv.167-8:
'.the whole quarter under the same star stretching from the Indian Ocean to the Caspian Sea was navigated throughout by the Macedonian forces in the reign of Seleucus and Antiochus, who desired that it should be called both Seleucis and Antiochis after themselves. And many coasts of Ocean round the Caspian have been explored, and very nearly the whole of the North has been completely traversed from one side to the other by galleys...'

That Pliny, or his source (a reworking of Eratosthenes?) mistook Patrokles' speculation on the possibility of sailing from India to the Caspian for an accomplishment is clear from Strabo XI.xi.6:
'It is not generally agreed that persons have sailed around from India to Hyrcania, but Patrocles states that it is possible'.

Yet it is in terms of accomplishment not possibilities that Strabo wrote in XI.vii.3 (= FGrH 139 F 20) of the easy shipping of goods from India to the Euxine via a series of rivers:
'Aristobulus declares that the Oxus is the largest of the rivers he has seen in Asia, except those in India. And he further says that it is navigable (both he and Eratosthenes taking this statement from Patrocles) and that large quantities of Indian wares are brought down on it to the Hyrcanian Sea, and thence on that sea are transported to Albania [in the Caucasus] and brought down of the Cyrus River and through the region that comes next after it to the Euxine.'

Similarly in Strabo II.i.15 it is reported that:
'the River Oxus, which divides Bactriana from Sogdiana, is so easily navigable, they say, that the Indian merchandise packed over the mountains to it is easily brought down to the Hyrcanian Sea, and thence, on the rivers, to the successive regions beyond as far as the Pontus'.

Such a river passage is, however, as impossible as the Ocean passage. Soviet and western scientists agree that at various times one branch of the Oxos flowed west via the Sarikamish depression into the Caspian. These same scientists, however, calculate that the flow to the Caspian ceased during the first half of the first millenium and resumed but temporarily in the 4th-6th and 14th-15th centuries A.D. Though it would be possible to amend this geographical model to admit the possibility that Patrokles' did actually sight the mouth of the Oxos, there is no question of amending it to admit the possibility that Patrokles' did, as he seems to have claimed, see the mouth of the Jaxartes and an inlet of the Ocean. As Patrokles' was clearly incorrect in these two identifications and as the second half of the first millenium is currently believed to be one period in which the Oxos did not send a branch into the Caspian, the possibility that Patrokles' was mistaken in his identification of


6 Ibid.
the Oxos mouth must be taken seriously. It is indeed clear that though Aristoboulos may have been interested and well informed on matters of trade and geography, his description of the Oxos as being navigable from India to the Hyrcanian Sea can not be regarded as an independent verification of this. Strabo suggested Aristoboulos took this description from Patrokles. If, however, neither the ocean nor the Oxos ever communicated with the Caspian Sea, how could the admiral Patrokles come to be reported that they did and how could so many later writers have faith in his report?

That Patrokles took a fleet to explore the Caspian is clear. The date and the exact nature of Patrokles' commission are not clear. The terminus post quem for the expedition must be 312, when Patrokles was Seleukos' General in Babylonia, and the terminus ante quem, 280, when he perished with his army in Bithynia. The expedition would at any rate seem to have been conducted during Seleukos' and Antiokhos' joint rule (293-281 B.C.). It is possible that Seleukos sent Patrokles to explore the feasibility of communicating with the Caspian from the Euxine, Ocean or Oxos, with an eye to northern security and tapping eastern trade. Yet, to return to the question posed above, if Patrokles' did receive such a commission and carry it out, how could he go down in history as suggesting such communication was possible?

Scholars have provided numerous answers to the above question. Patrokles may have taken the Atrek river's mouth, the Balkan Bay, and the Kara-bogaz-gol, to have been the mouth of the Oxos, the mouth of the Iaxartes and the opening leading to the encircling ocean, and gone no further. He may have taken the eastern bend in the Caspian and the presence of seals as indicating that the Sea was opening out into the ocean, and gone no further. He may have heard from locals on the east coast of the Caspian of a great body of water to the north east (the Aral), and believed they were referring to the ocean of which the Caspian was gulf, and gone no further. Yet none of these explanations is entirely satisfactory. Even had he sailed past possible river mouths, into a possible ocean passage and heard of another nearby body of water, there is only one reason why he could have wanted to interpret this as evidence that the Oxos and Iaxartes flowed into the Caspian and

7 Diodoros XIX.c.5.
8 Photios 227B, from Memnon of Heraklea who called him the general of Antiokhos. See Gisinger, 'Patrokles', 1949, 2264.
9 See Pliny VI.xxi.58.
that the Caspian was a Gulf rather than a large, two part inland sea. The reason was that such was Patrokles' preconception.

The Greeks had always underestimated the distance between the Euxine-Maiotis and the Caspian, never recognised the Aral as separate from the Caspian, and always underestimated the distance, between the Caspian and the Ocean. The early Ionians had indeed seen the body of water beyond the Caucasus as part of the mythical encircling Ocean, to which it was possible to communicate via the Phasis-Araxes (Tanais). As the horizon was pushed back the possibility of communicating with the ocean was dispensed with by Herodotos and Aristotile, both of whom saw the Caspian as an inland sea, but persisted in the writings of Hekataios, Hellanikos, Damastes and Ephoros. The Alexander historians seem generally to have opted for the model in which the Caspian was a closed Sea into which the Iaxartes sent one branch, while the main river flowed around the back of the sea and discharged into the Maiotis- that is, linked with the Don-Tanais. Alexander may have shared this conception till Nearkhos' 'discovery' of the Erythraian Sea, a gulf of the Ocean, lead him to wonder if the Caspian were not also a gulf of the Ocean. Indeed, it was only just before his death (i.e. after Nearkhos' voyage), not while in Hyrkania, that Alexander commissioned Herakleides to explore the Caspian11.

Patrokles' report concluded that the Oxos communicated with the Caspian and the Caspian with the Ocean, and that it would be possible to sail into the Caspian Sea from India via either the Oxos or the northern ocean. His report included also, however, a series of measurements and several tribal catalogues, and it is these which offer the best clues as to how he arrived at his conclusions.

Patrokles, upon whose work Eratosthenes was so dependant that he drew Hipparkhos' censure, was clearly the source of Eratosthenes' description of the Caspian's coast, recorded in Strabo XI.vi.1:

11 Arrian VII.16.1: 'After this Alexander sent Herakleides the son of Argaeus to Hyrcania with shipwrights, bidding him cut wood from the Hyrcanian forests and build warships, some decked, some open, in the Greek fashion. For he had conceived a desire to explore this Caspian Sea (also called Hyrcanian) as well, to see with what other sea it unites; whether with the Euxine Sea, or whether on the east side, towards India, the great sea circling round pours into the Hyrcanian Gulf, just as he discovered the Persian Gulf, called by some the Red Sea, to be ony a gulf of the ocean. For no one had yet discovered the springs of the Caspian Sea, though many tribes dwell round it and navigable rivers flow into it...'.

'Eratosthenes says that the circuit of this sea was known to the Greek; that the part along the coast of the Albanians and the Cadusians is five thousand four hundred stadia; and that the part along the coast of the Anariaci and Mardi and Hyrcani to the mouth of the Oxus River is four thousand eight hundred, and thence to the Iaxartes, two thousand four hundred...'

and in Pliny VI.36:

'Eratosthenes also gives its dimensions on the south-east side along the coast of Cadusia and Albania as 725 miles, form there through the territories of the Atiaci, Amarbi and Hycrani to the mouth of the river Zonus 600 miles, and form there to the mouth of the Syr Daria [Tanais] 300 miles, making a total of 1575 miles.'

On the basis of these fragments, Tarn reconstructed a voyage starting in the south west corner of the Caspian, probably a region of good ship building timber. Patrokles may have sailed first up the Caucasian coast past the Cadusians and Albanians, but no further. He records no tribes further north than the Albanians. He may then have sailed either across the open sea and down the lower eastern coast, or back around the southern coast and lower eastern coast- in any case he did not go further north than the Krasnovodskij Zal or Kara-bogaz-gol, for the tribes he enumerated on this side, the Hyrkanoi, Mardoi and Anariakoi, did not extend far around the coast.

Patrokles is also reported in Strabo XI.xi.5-6 as giving the distance from the mouth of the Oxos to the mouth of the Iaxartes as about eighty parasangs. Scholars have found two problems with this distance. The first is that even though a parasang might vary from being the equivalent of two and a half to three and a half miles, 80 parasangs is in any case an overestimate of the distance between the two river mouths. Accordingly Neumann suggested that Patrokles was using the figure which either Alexander or Demodamos left as the distance they covered on his march from the upper Oxos to the Iaxartes. This introduces the second problem. Why did Patrokles use the Persian 'parasang' and not the Greek 'stadion' for this measurement. Tarn has suggested that Patrokles may have picked up the parasang measurement from inhabitants of the Caspian coast, but how locals came to

---

14 'The Iaxartes, however, from beginning to end, is a different river from the Oxus, and although it ends in the same sea, the mouths of the two, according to Patrocles, are about eighty parasangs distant from one another. The Persian parasang, according to some, is sixty stadia, but according to others thirty or froutry.'
15 On the length of a parasang see Strabo XI.xi.5 & XVII.i.24 and Bunbury, History of Geography, 1883 (1950), I, pp.359-361.
provide the visiting Greek with an overestimation, in Persian units, of the distance between
two river mouths on the coast of another sea, is equally unclear. It is more probable that
Alexander's or Demodamas' march from the Oxos to the Iaxartes had been recorded by one
of their contemporaries in parasangs, the Persian unit being used by Greeks from as early
as Xenophon's day\textsuperscript{17}, and Patrokles borrowed both the figure and the unit of
measurement.

Patrokles' report is clearly best viewed in its historical and literary context. There was a
long tradition of conceiving of the Oxos as communicating with the Caspian and the
Caspian with the Sea. Though this conception had lost favour in the early years of
Alexander’s life, it attracted renewed interest after Nearkhos' Erythraian voyage. Seleukos
would have liked to think the water systems were so arranged, as it would offer him the
chance to win the growing Indian trade from the Ptolemies. Patrokles obliged by
establishing that the water system was so arranged, and being an official explorer his report
was accepted.

Patrokles' influence can be seen in many areas. Polykleitos appears to have had no
knowledge of Patrokles' expedition, but he was probably one of the first Alexander
historians. Aristoboulos, though known to have accompanied Alexander in the capacity of
a technician is said not to have began his history till the age of 84\textsuperscript{18}, and thus it is no
surprise that he appears to have subscribed to Patrokles' conception. The conception was
adopted in turn by the founders of modern geography, Eratosthenes and Hipparkhos, and,
as Bunbury astutely observes, Patrokles' concept of the Caspian as a gulf effectively made
the conquests of Alexander the means of retarding, instead of promoting, the progress of
geographical knowledge\textsuperscript{19}. Arrian took the concept from Aristoboulos. In III.xxix.2 he
wrote that 'The Oxus flows, however, into the Great Sea which is in Hyrcania' and in
V.xxvi.1 even put the concept of a gulf back into the mouth of Alexander, whom he had
refer to the eastern Sea as follows:

\begin{quote}
This sea, I assure you, you will find that the Hyrcanian Sea joins; for the great sea
of ocean circles round the entire earth. Yes, and I shall moreover make clear to
Macedonians and allies alike that the Indian gulf forms but one stretch of water with
the Persian gulf and Hyrcanian Sea with the Indian Gulf.
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{17} E.g. Xenophon, \textit{Anabasis}, V.52-3.
\textsuperscript{18} Neumann, 'Die Fahrt des Patrokles', 1884, p.185.
\textsuperscript{19} Bunbury, \textit{History of Ancient Geography}, 1883 (1950), I, p.574. See also El'nitskij,
\textit{Древнейшие океанские плавания}, 1962, p.75.
The most wonderful products of the Patroklian conception were, however, without doubt, Strabo's account of an Oxos to Euxine trade route, and Pliny's account of the easy sail from India to the Caspian—mentioned earlier.

Though Ptolemy in the 2nd century A.D. returned to the concept of the Caspian as an inland sea, he still had the Oxos and Iaxartes flowing into it, and thus underestimated the distance across Eurasia and was not able to put an end to the use of Patroklian concepts. Pliny's story was cited in Elizabethan times as evidence for the feasibility of a north-east passage to China\textsuperscript{20}, and some modern scholars have even been so credulous as to trace the trade route to which Strabo referred and search for the ancient Caspian mouth of a branch of the Oxos\textsuperscript{21}.

The difference that a Caspian gulf and a Caspian sea make to the ethnography of Scythia is significant. If the Caspian is a sea, the Iaxartes can flow around behind it and join with the Don, both then being called the Tanais and constituting a continuous continental boundary. Tribes on the far bank of the Ixartes would be as European as their 'neighbours' to the north of the Black Sea. It may even be appropriate to use names from earlier literature dealing with European Scythians, for these Central Asian people. If the Caspian is a gulf, then the Don continental boundary can not continue to the east of the Caspian, and all the tribes to the east of the Caspian, on both sides of the Iaxartes must be Asian, and could not be related to the those north of the Pontos.

Demodamos.

\textsuperscript{20} Thomson, \textit{History of Ancient Geography}, 1948, pp.127-9. Taylor, 'The Northern Passages', 1932 (1970), p.214. As the Spanish Ambassador to England at the time of the preparations for the Willoughby-Chancellor venture, Jehan Scheyfre, wrote to the Bishop of Arras on the 10th April, 1553, '...they will follow a northerly course, and navigate the Frozen Sea towards the country of the great Cham China, or the neighbouring countries. The English opine that the ancients passed by that sea and joined the Ocean, as Pliny and others wrote, and they believe the route to be a short one...'

Among Patrokles' contemporaries was Demodamas, son of Aristides of Miletos. Demodamas had been responsible for the decree of Antiokhos I, the decree for Apama in 299/8, and, in part, for setting up Apama's statue, but sometime during Seleukid's and Antiokhos' joint rule, 293-281, during which time Antiokhos was governor of the east, he was the strategos in Baktria and Sogdiana. From Stephanos' entry under "Aνιονα it is clear that Demodamas' writings included, as Patrokles', Megasthenes' and Dikaiarkhos' had done, a study of India, but from Pliny VI.49 it is clear that Demodamas' writing also included an account of the north-eastern frontier. Pliny's detailed account of the tribes and towns in the region from the Caspian sea to the Hindu Kush ended with a reference to the Tanais:

'But this river was crossed by Demodamas, the general of King Seleukos and King Antiokhos, whom we are chiefly following in this part of our narrative; and he set up altars to Apollo Didymaeus'.

Demodamas' report clearly included documentation of Antiokhos' refounding of several Alexandrias- one in Margiane and one in Ariana. Though neither Pliny nor Strabo makes mention of a refounding of Alexandria-Eschate, Stephanos would seem to allude to such a refounding when in his entry under 'Αντιοχεία he listed as the tenth Antioch one εν ξυθί αποκλ. Alexandria on the Oxos appears as Antioch Tharmata in the Peutinger Table and Antioch Tarmata in the Ravennate geographer. Nomad invasions may not only have been the reason why these Alexandrias had to be refounded, they may also have been the reason why they were rebuilt so securely. It would seem that Seleukos had strung out his cities along the road to Baktria (via Hyrkania and Margiana), the center of his military power in the east, and that Isidore of Charax's itinerary followed this same road.

Demodamas had clearly been very active in Central Asia:

---

22 Tarn, 'Tarmita', 1940.
23 Pliny VI.47: 'In Margiana Alexander had founded a city bearing his name, which was destroyed by the barbarians, but Antiochus son of Seleucus re-established a Syrian city on the same site intersected by the river Murghub which is canalized into Lake Zotha; he had prefered that the city should be named after himself. Its circuit measures eight and three quarter miles [70 stadia]...' and Pliny VI.48: '...the town of Heraclea, founded by Alexander and subsequently overthrown, but restored by Antiochus, who gave it the name of Achais...',' and in Strabo XI.x.1 the Akhaia is counted as one of the three main towns of Aria. See Wolski, 'Les Iraniens et les royaume grec-bactrien', 1960, pp.113-4.
24 Tarn, 'Tarmita', 1940, p.90.
'Beyond are the Sogdiani and the town of Panda, and on the farthest confines of
their territory Alexandria, founded by Alexander the Great. At this place there are
altars set up by Hercules and Father Liber, and also by Cyrus and Samiramis and
by Alexander, all of whom found their limit in this region of the world, where they
were shut in by the river Syr Darya [Tanais], which the Scythians called the Silis
and which Alexander and his soldiers supposed to be the Don.27

The same tension which has been noted in the works of the Alexander historians between
new information and stock images is evident here in Demodamas' report. On the one hand
Demodamas gave the hitherto unrecorded indigenous name for the Syr Darya, the Silis.
The derivation of 'Syr' from 'Silis' has been argued by Justi, Barthold and Kljashtornij28,
but whether 'Silis' is derived from an old Indian word29, the Iranian word 'sir', meaning
'abundant'30, or the Turkish word 'sili/g/k', meaning 'clear'31 is a matter of debate. On the
other hand, included in the account of Demodamas' campaign as Pliny presents it, and as,
in all probability, Demodamas himself presented it, are references to the exploits of
Herakles, Kyros, Samiramis and Alexander. Such references would seem to indicate a
heavy literary influence in Demodamas' work.

Demodamas' contribution to the literary tradition has been, more often than not, completely
overlooked32. Hennig was the first to pay him any real attention when, in 1936, he
suggested the list in Pliny VI.50 came from Demodamas33. In 1940 Tarn, though prepared
to reconstruct a Saka invasion of Sogdia and Baktria and to conclude that: 'One regrets the
loss of Demodamas' book, which doubtless told the whole story', believed the inclusion of
names from Herodotos and the Alexander-story shows the passage 'is only one of Pliny's
usual lists, combining his notes from many sources'34. In 1961 El'nitskij argued that
Eratosthenes used Hekataios on the shape of the Black Sea, Pytheas for the tribes on the

27 Pliny VI.49. Similarly in Julius Solinus, Collect. Rerum memorabilium IX.5.
28 Justi, Grunrdiss der iranische Philologie, 1896, p.392; Barthold, 'Sir-darja', 1934,
pp.4668-9; Kljashtornij, 'la x r p H - Sir-darja', 1961, p.25.
29 Trubachev, 'Ангвистическая периферия древнейшего славянства', 1977, p.22.
31 Shiratori, 'A study on Su-t'ě', 1928, p.132.
32 Rostovtzeff, Skythen und der Bosphorus, 1931; Heidel, The Frame of the Ancient Greek
Maps, 1937 (1976); Junge, Saka-Studien, 1939; Herrmann, Das Land der Seide und
Tibet, 1938 (1968); Fraser, Ptolemaic Alexandria, 1972; Peters, The Harvest of
Hellenism, 1971; Bivar, 'The history of eastern Iran', 1983, p.186 mentions the
refounding of Marv in c.293-290 B.C. without naming the man responsible,
Demodamas.
33 Hennig, Terrae Incognitae, 1936, I, p.172.
34 Tarn, 'Tarmita', 1940, p.94.
'northern' of Asia, and Demodamas' *Periegesis* on the Oxos and Iaxartes, and the tribes on these rivers, concluding;

Eratosthenes' account of the Central Asian tribes for all the brevity and summary nature with which it is characterised by Strabo (XL.viii.8), must indirectly be related to the description be related to the description of the north Asian region in the work of Pliny, who refers directly to Demodamas, and also in that of Ptolemy, where a wide range of sources is used,...".\(^{35}\)

The exact date and purpose of Demodamas' expedition are as unclear as those of Patrokles\(^{36}\). The greatest aid in determining both is, however, the high probability that the dates and purposes of the two expeditions are in some way related. The following scenario would seem to satisfy best the source information.

At the end of the fourth or beginning of the 3rd century B.C. Central Asia was shaken by a combination of nomad invasions across the Iaxartes and Sogdian rebellions. Some time between 293 and 281 Demodamas was sent to restore Seleukid power in the region. During a successful campaign, Demodamas refounded numerous cities, including Alexandria Margiana as Antiokh Margiana, Herakleia in Aria as Antiokh Ariana, Alexandria on the Oxos as Antiokh Tarmata, and Alexandria Eskhate as Antiokh in Scythia\(^{37}\). Given that the first of these town is said in Pliny VI.47 to have been destroyed by 'barbarians' before its refounding, and that neither Seleukos nor Antiokhos I would have renamed an Alexandria unless circumstances were compelling, it can be concluded that all three towns were destroyed in what must have been a large scale nomad invasion, perhaps a forerunner to that which brought the Parthians into Iran. As Wolski has pointed out, the danger of nomad invasions from Central Asia was appreciated far better by Kyros, Dareios, Alexander and Euthydemos, than it has been by modern writers on the ancient Near East\(^{38}\). Patrokles may have been despatched to the Caspian not only to search for the Oxos' mouth and the Ocean's inlet with a view to trade, but also to gather better information on the tribal and

---


36 Zeimal, *The political history of Transoxiana*, 1983, p.237 in fact only briefly mentions Demodamas' expedition 'about the aims and results of which we have no detailed information...'. All we know is that Demodamas crossed the Iaxartes and erected there an altar in honour of Apollo.


38 Wolski, *Les Iraniens et les royaume gréco-bactrien*, 1960, p.113. Beloch even wrote in his *Griechische Geschichte* IV.1, 1925, p.669 that such invasions were not rare and presented no threat to the Hellenisation of Iran. They may not have been rare, but this did not mean the threat was small, only that it had to be constantly checked.
physical geography of a region which had so recently caused the Seleukids great problems.  

As both Pliny and Strabo would seem to be using Demodamas, if not solely through Eratosthenes, then at least together with Eratosthenes' reworking of Demodamas' original, all that might be noted concerning Demodamas' material is that it was used by Pliny, not simply in his account of the lands of Margiane, Baktria and Sogdia, but also his account of the tribes across the Iaxartes, a section which follows immediately upon the citation of Demodamas:

'Beyond are some tribes of Scythians. To these the Persians have given the general name of Sacae, from the tribe nearest to Persian, but old writers call them Aramii, and the Scythians themselves give the name of Chorsari to the Persians and call Mount Caucasus Croucasis, which means 'white with snow'. There is an uncountable number of tribes, numerous enough to live on equal terms with the Parthians; most notable among them are the Sacae, Massagetae, Dahae, Essedones, Astacca, Rummici, Pestici, Homodoti, Histii, Edones, Camae, Camacae, Euchatae, Cotierii, Authusiani, Psaceae, Arimaspis, Antacati, Chroasai and Oetaei; among them the Napaei are said to have been destroyed by the Palaei.'

Though the statement that the Persians call all the Scythians Sacae, appears in Herodotos' Histories and though the comparison between the numerosness of the Scythians and Parthians might have been drawn from Apollodoros of Artemita, who discussed Parthian and Scythian history in this period, the other notes on names may have come from Demodamas, who would seem to have been the source for the statement (Pliny VI.49) that the Scythians called the Iaxartes the 'Silis'.

Besides the reports of Patrokles and Demodamas, there were several other Seleukid sources drawn upon throughout the Hellenistic period for geographical information. These were the Stathmoi of Asia, measurements of lands based on military marches. There are at least three known Stathmoi. The first is a work Σταθμοὶ τῆς Ἀλεξάνδρου πορείας, ascribed by Athenaios (X, 442b) to Alexander's bematists, Baeton and Diognetos. The second is a work variously called Σταθμοὶ Ἀσίας, Σταθμοὶ περαίκων and simply Σταθμοὶ, ascribed by Athenaios (II.67a, XI.500d & XII.529e) and Aelian (XVII.17) to a certain Amyntas, who they say accompanied

---


40 See Chapters 13 and 14.
Alexander on his expeditions\textsuperscript{41}. The third is the 'Ασιατικοὶ Ἀσταθμοὶ, which Strabo, when describing Ariana in XV.ii.8, says Eratosthenes used\textsuperscript{42}. The relationship between these three works is unclear. Tarn sees the \textit{Stathmoi} of the bematists as 'the foundation of the book of Amyntas', while Eratosthenes' work was based on a Seleukid survey, parts of which survive in the Peutinger Table\textsuperscript{43}. Amyntas' \textit{Stathmoi} was, however, no more or less than a Seleukid survey, and Jones was probably correct in identifying Amyntas as the author of the \textit{Stathmoi} to which Strabo refers\textsuperscript{44}. The real problem lies in identifying in Strabo's work that material which, through Eratosthenes, came from Patrokles, that which came from Demodamas and that which came from Amyntas. One key may be the attention the \textit{Stathmoi} seems to have paid to main roads\textsuperscript{45}. Demodamas and Patrokles seem to have been more concerned with combined descriptions of distances, geography and ethnography.

Ptolemaic Alexandria.

No less concerned with the 'Scythian frontier' than the generals of Seleukid Syria were the scholars of Ptolemaic Alexandria. Never having been anywhere near 'Scythia', it is not surprising that these scholars filled their works with even more literary anachronisms than did the Seleukid generals. The Alexandrian library in which these scholars toiled, was indeed, a physical representation of the very close relationship between Peripatetic and Hellenistic scholarship. The Aristotelian Lyceum and the Alexandrian library had probably both been designed by Demetrios of Phaleron who, as Kassandros' governor in Athens, had arranged for the Lykeion's regularisation under the directorship of his friend and one

\textsuperscript{41} Susseimihl, \textit{Griechischen Literatur in der Alexanderinerzeit}, 1891, I, p.544; Tarn, \textit{Greeks in Bactria and India}, 1938 (1951), p.55; Jones' note to his translation (Loeb) of Strabo XV.ii.8.

\textsuperscript{42} He says that the breadth of the country is the length of the Indus from the Paropamisus mountains to the outlets, a distance of twelve thousand stadia (though some say thirteen thousand); and that its length from the Caspian Gates, as recorded in the work entitled Asiatic Stathmi, is stated in two ways: that is, as far as Alexandreia in the country of the Arii, from the Caspian Gates through the country of the Parthians, there is one and the same road; and then, over the mountain pass into Ortospana to the meeting of the three roads from Bactra, which city is in the country of the Paropamisadae; whereas the other turns off slightly from Asia towards the south to Prophthasia in Drangiana, and the remainder of it leads back to the boundaries of India and to the Indus; so that this road which leads through the country of the Drangae and Arachoti is longer, its entire length being fifteen thousand three hundred stadia...'


\textsuperscript{44} Jones, Loeb ed. of Strabo, 1966, note on Strabo XV.ii.8.

\textsuperscript{45} e.g. Straob XV.ii.8.
time fellow student, Theophrastos. Though the Ptolemies converted Aristotle's private undertaking into a public institution, Peters rightly sees the latter as a 'direct lineal descendant' of the former46. The works of the Peripatetics were, moreover, to be counted among the four centuries of literature held in the library. For all these links, however, the work produced by scholars working in the library during the third century B.C. was generally not characterised by the scepticism and empiricism of the Peripatetics47.

Hekataios of Abdera.

As antiquarian approach to the north is evident from the very earliest years of the Ptolemaic Kingdom. Hekataios of Abdera, who spent a period studying in Alexandria and wrote a book on Egypt c.300 B.C., also wrote extensively on Hyperborians. He associated the Hyperborians with the Boreas wind, a fertile land, Apollo, Apollo's sacred precinct and temple, a city were most inhabitants play the cithera and which sent embassies to the Athenians and Delians48. Every element of the description of these people's land, customs and history seems to have been drawn from much earlier literature associated with utopians, Hyperboreans and Scythians49.

Amometos.

Even when new information on distant lands fell into the hands of Alexandrian scholars it seems to have been worked into preexisting literary forms. Amometos' work on the Attacorae is an example of such a reworking of original information. Pliny twice refers to the Attacorae. In VI.xx.55 he wrote that after the Sere comes a series of rivers, then the Golden Chersonese, and then:

'the tribe of the Attacorae on the bay of the same name, sheltered by sunbath hills from every harmful blast, with the same temperate climate as that in which dwell the Hyperborei. The Attacorae are the subject of monograph by Amometus, while the Hyperborei have been dealt with in a volume by Hecataeus. After the Attacorae

48 Diodoros II.xlvii.1-6.
there are the Thuni and Focari tribes, and (coming now to natives of India) the Casiri, situated in the interior in the direction of the Scythians.'

In IV.xii.90 Pliny wrote:

'Some authorities have placed these people (the Hyperborians) not in Europe but on the nearest part of the coasts of Asia, because there is a race there with similar customs and a similar location, named the Attaci'.

The 'Attacorae' have been identified with the people of Tibet, on the grounds that Pliny associated them with the Thuni, Focari and Seres, and that Ptolemy referred to a people called 'Ὅττορακόρρα η (VI.xvi.3), a place called 'Ὅττορακόρρα (VI.xvi.8), and a mountain range called 'Ὅττορακόρρας to the north of the Seric mountains, an eastward extension of the Imaus and Emodii. Through this same region Ptolemy had run a river called Βαΰτισσα, similar to the Tibetan's self-appellation 'Bod'.

The 'Attacorae' have also been identified with a people on the West Malaysian coast, on the grounds that Pliny mentions them immediately after alluding to the Malay peninsular, and says they lived by the sea, and the Ptolemy refers to a town on this coast called Τάκυλα.

The 'Attacorae' have also been identified with the Uttara-kuru, 'the northern people', of early India cosmography. This tribe is frequently mentioned in the Mahabharata, which suggests that they were well known to the peoples of the lower Ganges at least, from at least as early as the 4th century B.C. In the epic they are a sacred, happy, beautiful and peaceloving people, among whom women are promiscuous (VI.6, 7; XIII.102). They live for 11,000 years and when they die birds take them for burial in mountain caves. Their land is one of the four dvipa surrounding the mountain Meru (III.145 & 231; VI.6 & 7), abounds in all produce and gems (VI.7; XIII.102), and is blessed with perfect weather.

---

50 The identification with Tibetans was first made by Richthofen, China, I, 1877, pp.490-491. It was adopted by Charpentier, 'Die ethnographische Stellung', 1917, p.355 and Umnjakov, 'Токарская проблема', 1940, p.183, and argued more fully by Herrmann, 'Ottorokorrai', 1942, pp.1888-1889.


52 This town was called Qaqola by Ibn Battuta and T'ou-kü-li in the Liang Shu. Herrmann, 'Ottorokorrai', 1942, p.1889.

(VI.6). There are even trees that yield milk and cloths (VI.7). Both the name and the concept of the Uttara-kurru, matches well with the name and concept of Amometos' 'Attacorae'.

The above identifications are not, and have never been conceived of as being, mutually exclusive. Herrmann has suggested that the Greeks picked up the term Uttara-kurru from the Indians, applied this term to the people in Tibet, calling them the Ottorokorrai, later confused the name with that of the Malaysian trading centre called takoola, and reorientated the people towards the East. This model might, however, be modified in several ways.

Firstly, Amometos, or his source, had clearly picked up not only the Indian name, but also enough of the Indian concept of Uttara-kurru to see in them a people not unlike the Greek Hyperboreans. Indeed, the characteristics of the Uttara-kurru and 'Hyperboreans' are so similar, and Pliny's notice on Amometos' work so brief, it is difficult to judge to what extent Amometos made direct use of Indian concepts, and to what extend he used these only after they had been couched in traditional Hyperborean terms.

Secondly, though Herrmann believed Pliny's orientation of the Attacorae by the Malay peninsular was the result of confusing the tribal name with the town name Τάκουλα, it is more probable that the name of the town Τάκουλα played no part in the reorientation at all. The reorientation of the tribe was probably the result of the need to locate the tribe by a body of water, in conformity with both the Indian and Greek conception of the people. By Pliny's day Indian and Greek geographical horizons had expanded so far to the north of Tibet that it was evident no body of water was in fact there to be found. The solution was to force the tribe eastward.

Kallimakhos.

Kallimakhos came from a Peripatetic education in Athens to a leading position in the intellectual life of Alexandria. Like Hekataios, he wrote on Hyperborians and associated them with a holy town, the Boreas, and envoys to Delos54. Kallimakhos' further association of the Arimaspi with the Hyperborians can not be detected in any extant fragment of Hekataios' work, but as Aristeas of Prokonnesos probably described

Arimaspians and Hyperborians as neighbours, it is not surprising to find the terms still closer together four hundred years later in the work of Kallimakhos. Unlike the extant remains of Hekataios, Kallimakhos also referred to Scythians, Amazons and Kimmerians. The references to all three people are couched in traditional terms. The Scythians are associated with waggons, the Amazons with a queen Hippo and the Kimmerians with Hippemolgoi and activity on the Ionian coast.

Philostephanos of Kyrene, Kallimakhos' friend, perhaps student, showed similar antiquarian interests. He combined the geographic and fantastic and like Kallimakhos he treated Homer's tribal names. In Stephanos' entry under Abioi Philostephanos is said to have identified them with the Thracians.

Apollonios of Rhodes.

Apollonios of Rhodes, perhaps also once a pupil and friend of Kallimakhos, had a major falling out with his elder. The falling out was perhaps over how to approach literature, Kallimakhos turning from the Homeric epic poem form to composing short intellectual pieces and Apollonios choosing to build on the Homeric epic form, perhaps over how to run the library, Kallimakhos having devoted his life to it but never, apparently having become director (Prostates), while Apollonios appears to have succeeded to Zenodotos' directorship. Apollonios then seems to have had a more serious falling out with the wider Alexandrian intelligensia when the first version of his Argonautika appeared - perhaps for


57 *Hymn* III.237, 266f. Cf. Queen Hippolytes in passages of Diodoros and Justin, discussed in Chapter 3.


60 Though the titles of several of Philostephanos' works are known it is not clear in which work he mentioned the Abioi, but as this judgement contradicts no extant judgement of Kallimakhos and as his fragment in Scholia on the *Iliad* II.145 suggests Philostephanos here used Kallimakhos' Aitia, it is possible that Stephanos' reference to Philostephanos' discussion of the Homeric Abioi was taken from an Aitia which Philostephanos wrote in imitation of Kallimakhos. See Susemihl, *Geschichte der Griechischen Literatur in der Alexanderzeit*, 1891, pp.476-477.
its great divergence from the Kallimakhian form, perhaps for its conscious perversion of accepted geographical models. He retired to Rhodes. Though Apollonios had written many works while in Alexandria, it was the completion in Rhodes of his Argonautica which brought him his greatest fame. Apollodoros' work showed a degree of characterisation unusual for the Greek epic, in which geographic and ethnographic exotica, not psychological drama or development, usually provided the tension and interest. His poem, however, included ample quantities of such exotica, and his geography and ethnography of the east Pontic region warrant our special attention.

In the Phineus' anticipatory account of the adventure, II.369ff., Apollonios makes mention of numerous peoples well known to early literature, the Khalybes iron workers\(^1\), Amazon queen Otrene and Antiope\(^2\), Makrones\(^3\), Saspeires\(^4\) and Kolkhians. Not so easily explicable in terms of earlier literature, however, is the description of the land of the Kolkhians which Apollonios gives when the Argonauts are there, in IV.132ff. The Kolkhians are said to live:

'by the outfall of Lycus, the river that parts from the loud waters of Araxes to unite his sacred stream with that of Phasis and flow in company with him till both debouch into the Caucasian Sea'.

The scholiasts themselves had difficulty interpreting this passage. According to one scholiast:

'Eratosthenes too had the river Lycos bearing off from the Araxes, joining with the Phasis, loosing its own name and discharging into the Sea [unspecified, but from the context the Euxine], while Metrodoros identifies the Araxes with the Thermodon and the Caucasian Sea with the Caspian'.

Strabo XI.xiv.7 held a similar view:

There are several rivers in the country, but the best known are the Phasis and Lycus, which empty into the Pontic Sea (Eratosthenes wrongly writes "Thermodon" instead of "Lycus") whereas the Cyrus and Araxes empty into the Caspian, and the Euphrates into the Red Sea'.

There are, however, several problems with a westward flowing river system. Apollonios suggested the Lykos was a tributary of the Phasis, but the westward flowing Rhion has no major tributary. Strabo suggested the Lykos entered the Euxine independent of the Phasis, but will not accept Eratosthenes' substitution of the name Thermodon for Lykos, and there is no other major river beside the Phasis and Thermodon which discharges into the south

\(^1\) Hek. F 203 and Aiskhylos, Prometheos Bound, 715 and Seven against Thebes, 728.
\(^2\) For discussion of Amazons see Chapter 2.
\(^3\) Cf. Hek. F 206; Her. II.104; Xenophon, Anabasis IV.viii.1, V.v.18; Skylax 85; Dionysios Periegetes 766; Anon. Per. 37; Arrian, Periploi, 946.
\(^4\) Cf. Her. I.104; Orphika, Argonautika, 758; Ammianus XXII.viii.20.
\(^5\) Scholia IV.131 b).
east Pontos. Apollonios suggests the Lykos branched off the apparently eastward flowing Araxes to join the westward flowing Phasis, but no major river branches off the Araxes.

How then did Apollonios arrive at his model of the river-system? The answer may be that he was drawing heavily on old Ionian geographical conceptions wherein the Euxine was linked to the outer encircling ocean by a combination of the Phasis and Araxes. Xenophon indeed seems to have believed 'Phasis' was an alternative name for the Araxes.

Eratosthenes.

From this romantic antiquarianism of the Alexandrians, there was one scholar who stood apart, Eratosthenes of Kyrene (c.275-c.194). The most practical approach to the study of Eratosthenes' contribution to the ancient literary conceptualisation of the north might be first to investigate his sources and attempt a reconstruction of his own ethnographic model, and to then examine the attitude with which he approached the subject of ethnology and the debate in which he became involved over his refusal to flatter Alexander or idealise the nomads.

Eratosthenes produced a Geographika in three books. The main division of the world was a north-south (along an axis defined by his Taurus mountains), rather than a Europe-Asia one, though he clearly did believe the Iaxartes-Tanais to be the continental boundary. His ethnographic conception of the north would seem to be preserved best in two passages of Strabo. Firstly, Strabo XI.viii.8:

'Eratosthenes says that the Arachot and Massagetae are situated alongside (παρακατάβασις) the Bactrians towards the west along the Oxus River, and the Sacae and the Sogdiani, with the whole of their lands, are situated opposite (ἀνατολικὰ) India, but the Bactriani only for a slight distance; for he says, they are situated for the most part alongside (παρακατάβασις) the Paropamisus, and the Sacae and the Sogdiani are separated from one another by the Iaxartes River, and the Sogdiani and the Bactrians by the Oxus River; and the Tapyr live between the Hyrcanians and the Arians; and in a circuit round the sea after the

---


67 As Fraser writes in his *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, 1972, pp.525f., in Eratosthenes work there can be found 'no trace of the antiquarian, paradoxographical, quasi geographical studies of Kallimakhos and Kallimakhos' own pupils, his contemporaries'. On Eratosthenes' life see Susemihl, *Geschichte der Griechischen Literatur in der Alexanderzeit*, I, 1861 (1965), pp.409-428.

Hyrcanians one comes to the Amardi, Anariacae, Cadusii, Albani, Caspii, Vitii (Ou ltvouc), and perhaps also other peoples, until one reaches the Scythians; and on the other side of the Hyrcanians are Derbices; and the Cadusii border on the Medi and Matiani below the Parachoothras'.

Strabo's brevity would seem to have been achieved at the expense of sense. The words παρακείμενοι and ἀνακείμενοι, which Strabo clearly took from Eratosthenes, would seem to hold the key to the sense. The Eratosthenes fragment in Strabo II.i.2 reads 'the most southerly capes of India rise opposite to the regions about Meroe (κατὰ τὴν ἀνακείμενον ἀνακείμενον ἄνα'). It appears Eratosthenes used his prefixes παρα- and ἀνα- with a scientific precision, the former signifying an adjacent location on the same latitude and the latter signifying an adjacent location on the same longitude, but on opposite sides of, and equal distance from, his equator. It also appears that Eratosthenes enumerated the nomad tribes in the order in which they would be seen by one sailing 'in a circuit round the sea'. A similar perspective, and west-east enumeration of Central Asian nations, is found in Pliny VI.53:

'After leaving the Caspian Sea and the Scythian Ocean our course takes a bend towards the Eastern Sea as the coast turns to face eastward.'

The details which follow would not, however, seem to have all come from Eratosthenes.

The second passage in which Eratosthenes' northern ethnography would seem to be preserved is Strabo XI.xi.8, where accounts are given of the customs of the Derbikes, Siginnoi, Tapuroi, Hyrkanoi and Kaspioi. One apparent contradiction in Strabo's work deserves consideration. In XI.viii.8 the Iaxartes is said to separate the Saka and the Sogdians, but in XI.viii.2 the Saka are said to have occupied Sogdiana. The explanation would seem to be that in the former passage Strabo is following Eratosthenes, whom he indeed cites, but in the other passage he is following a much later writer, Apollodoros of


70 The first part of the coast after the Scythian promontory is uninhabitable on account of snow, and the neighbouring region is uncultivated because of the savagery of the tribes the inhabit it. Then we come to more Scythians and to more deserts inhabited by wild beasts, until we reach a mountain range called Tabis...The first human occupants are the people called the Chinese [Seres]...[then eventually] the tribe of the Attacorae on the bay of the same name, sheltered by sunbathed hills from every harmful blast, with the same temperate climate as that in which dwell the Hyperborei. The Attacorae are the subject of a monograph by Amometus, while the Hyperborei have been dealt with in a volume by Hecataeus. After the Attacorae have been dealt with in a volume by Hecataeus. After the Attacorae there are the Thuni and Focari tribes, and (coming now to natives of India) the Casiri, situated in the interior in the direction of the Scythians—the Casiri are cannibals; also the Nomad tribes of India reached this point in their wanderings.'
Artemita\textsuperscript{71}. The separation of Eratosthenes' and Apollodoros' material is not, as will be seen in the following chapter, always easy.

Having sketched above Eratosthenes' conception of Scythian tribal geography, the discussion may now turn to the attitudes with which Eratosthenes' approached the description of the Scythian tribes. Eratosthenes' intention of reforming the Hekataian map of the world and, as only Dikaiarkhos had attempted before him, of writing a trustworthy, well researched model of the whole world\textsuperscript{72}, set him on a course bound for collision with all those who insisted on attributing to Homer extraordinary geographical knowledge, and these include Alexandrian poets and librarians, Greek and Roman Stoics and nearly all literate Greeks. Eratosthenes was the first major writer to defy Homer's aura, and the challenge he issued to Homer's credibility on geographical matters was the first exchange in a debate which was to last for three centuries, the so called 'Homerfrage'\textsuperscript{73}.

As has been discussed in Chapter 8, one of the main forces behind the idealisation of the Scythians in literature had been Ephoros, and one of the main means he employed had been use of Homeric and Hesiodic names and epithets. Though direct use of Ephoros' work is difficult to prove, it is highly probable that Eratosthenes was familiar with that writer's geography\textsuperscript{74}, granted the statue of the man and the fact that so much of Eratosthenes work would seem to be designed as a refutation of Ephoros' method. Eratosthenes is indeed said to have quoted Hesiod's words: 'The Ethiopians, the Ligurians, and also the Scythians, Hippemolgi', words quoted also by Ephoros\textsuperscript{75}.

Eratosthenes' point would seem to have essentially been: 'that although Homer and other early authors knew the Greek places, they were decidedly unacquainted with those that were far away'\textsuperscript{76}. The detail of this criticism would seem to have provide the substance of

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{72} Bunbury, \textit{A History of Ancient Geography}, 1883 (1957), p.616.
\item \textsuperscript{73} Schenkeveld, 'Strabo on Homer', 1976, pp.52-64. Berger, \textit{Die geographischen Fragmenten des Eratosthenes}, 1880, pp.19-40.
\item \textsuperscript{74} Fraser, \textit{Ptolemaic Alexandria}, 1972,1, p.522.
\item \textsuperscript{75} Strabo VII.iii.7 (=Merkelbach-West Fr.150, line 15). Pap.Oxy. 1358 makes it clear that these words were indeed those of Hesiod and from the number of other Hesiod papyri it is clear that this poet was very popular in Hellenistic times. See also Chapter 8, and Strabo VII.iii.9.
\item \textsuperscript{76} Strabo VII.iii.6.
\end{itemize}
Apollodoros' criticism of the early writers in his work On Ships, Strabo's lengthy discussion of which (VIII.iii.6) concluded as follows:

'To these criticisms Apollodoros adds some petty ones of like sort and then stops, but he borrowed most of them from Eratosthenes, and as I have remarked before they are wrong. For while one must concede to Eratosthenes and Apollodoros that the later writers have shown themselves better acquainted with such matters than the men of early times, yet to proceed beyond all moderation as they do, and particularly in the case of Homer, is a thing for which, as it seems to me, one might justly rebuke them and make the reverse statement: that where they are ignorant themselves, there they reproach the poet with ignorance'.

It is safe then to regard as appropriated from Eratosthenes the work of Apollodoros which Strabo reviewed as follows:

'At any rate, he says, although about forty rivers flow into the Pontus, the most famous, as, for example, the Ister, the Tanais, the Borysthenes, the Hypanis, the Phasis, the Thermodon, the Halys; and, beside, he does not mention the Scythians, but invents certain "proud Hippemolgi" and "Galactophagi" and "Abii"; and as for the Paphlagonians of the interior, he reports what he has learned from those who have approached the regions afoot, but he is ignorant of the seaboard, and naturally so, for at the time this sea was not navigable, and was called Axine because of its wintry storms and the ferocity of tribes that lived around it, and particularly the Scythians, in that they sacrificed strangers, ate their flesh, and used their skulls as drinking cups; but later it was called "Euxine", when the Ionians founded cities on the seaboard. And, likewise, Hesiod is also ignorant of the facts about Egypt and Libya...'.

Strabo referred again to Eratosthenes' and Apollodoros' critique of Homer's conception of the north when he wrote:

'...they say that the poet through ignorance fails to mention the Scythians, or their savage dealings with strangers, in that they sacrifice them, eat their flesh, and use their skulls as drinking cups, although it was on account of the Scythians that the Pontus was called "Axine", but that he invents certain "proud Hippemolgoi, Galactophagi, and Abii, men most just" - people that exist nowhere on earth'.

Strabo may have drawn much of the material for the detailed criticism of Eratosthenes and Apollodoros which then follows from Poseidonios. Though the sense of the only reference to Poseidonios in this section is not clear, Strabo declaring his intention to ἄρα οὕτως τὸ τε ὑπὲρ ᾗ μᾶν καὶ ὑπὸ Ποσείδονίου λέξειντα καὶ τὰ ὑπὸ τούτων, Trüdinger has good reason for interpreting this as aligning Poseidonios with

---

77 Strabo VII.iii.6.
78 Ibid.
Eratosthenes and Apollodoros\textsuperscript{79}, and Rostovtzeff and Jones would seem to be much nearer the sense of the passage when they interpret it as a comparison between Stabo and Poseidonios on the one hand and Eratosthenes and Apollodoros on the other\textsuperscript{80}. Though Poseidonios is nowhere else cited in this section, the fact that Strabo elsewhere used Ephoros through Poseidonios, and that much of the material for criticising Eratosthenes and Apollodoros sounds Ephorean, would seem to suggest a major contribution from Poseidonios\textsuperscript{81}.

Conclusion.

It might be concluded that though the early Seleukid commanders Patrokles and Demodamas actually explored various regions of Central Asia, their reports were heavily influenced by old Ionian literary conceptions and forms. Though the scholars of Alexandria had at their disposal many reports and surveys, their writings on the Scythian frontier were marked by antiquarianism and similarly influenced by early literary tradition.

\textsuperscript{79} Trüdinger, \textit{Studien zu Geschichte der griechisch-römischen Ethnographie}, 1918, pp.143-4. Trüdinger's argument that Poseidonios could not have been the source of Strabo's criticisms because he is not plainly cited as such, is insubstantial, and his conclusion that Poseidonios did not approach the peoples of the world as a moralising Philosopher, is insupportable. His claim that it was Poseidonios who Strabo said aired Eratosthenes' criticisms of Homer is wrong. It was Apollodoros His claim that Strabo said Poseidonios identified the Abioi as Thracian is also wrong. Strabo said Poseidonios identified the Myrsoi, not the Abioi, as Thracian.

\textsuperscript{80} Rostovtzeff, \textit{Skythien und der Bosporus}, 1931, p.91 note 1, and Jones, 196 translation of VII.iii.7: 'because I wished to make a comparison between the statements made by Poseidonius and myself and those made by the two men in question'.

\textsuperscript{81} For example, VII.iii.7 'In fact even now there are Wagon-dwellers and Nomads, so-called, who live off their herds, and on milk and cheese, and particularly on cheese made from mare's milk, and know nothing about storing up food or about peddling merchandise either, except the exchange of wares' resembles the passage in VII.iii.9 where Ephoros is cited, concerning the 'Scythian Nomads who feed only on mare's milk...' and 'are frugal in their ways of living and not money-getters...'. Rostovtzeff, \textit{Skythien und der Bosporus}, 1931, p.91, believes Poseidonios was used extensively by Strabo on the Scythians and the question of idealisation, though were Poseidonios ends and Strabo begins, he has difficulty in determining.
CHAPTER 13.

APOLLODOROS OF ARTEMITA AND THE CENTRAL ASIAN SKYTHIANS (1).

Introduction.

Ancient conceptions of the history and ethnography of the Eurasian nomads from the mid 3rd to the late 2nd century B.C. would be totally inaccessible if it were not for the intermittent access provided by ancient notices on the history of the Parthian and Baktrian kingdoms. These notices are, however, far from consistent and coherent. Reconstructing the history of the Parthian and Baktrian kingdoms from these notices has proved extremely difficult. Reconstructing the history of the eastern Scythian from these notices is even more difficult.

Though the Parthian and Greco-Baktrian kings can be assumed to have kept some form of court journal, not one recognisable fragment of any such official record has survived. Our two main sources on the history of the Greco-Baktrian and early Parthian kingdoms are Strabo, who frequently cites a certain Apollodoros of Artemita as his source, and Strabo’s contemporary, Trogus Pompeius, at least as epitomised by Justin, whose source is simply referred to by modern scholars as 'Trogus' source'. It is to these two 'original' sources that the discussion may now turn.

Apollodoros of Artemita.

As Debevoise, Political History of Parthia, 1938, p.xxv, observed, 'The peculiarity of the source material for the history of Parthia lies not in its scarcity but in the wide extent to which it is scattered through documents of much diversified character'. For the later Parthian period they do indeed include documents in Armenian, Syriac, Arabic and Pahlavi, as well as Greek and Latin, but in the period in which we are here interested the material is, as Debevoise writes, p.xxv, 'far from contemporary, widely scattered, and small in quantity', or as Tarn, Greeks in Bactria and India, 1938 (1951), p.574, writes of the sources on Baktria 'very scrappy'. According to Tarn, ibid., 'What passes for history of Parthia as derived from classical writers has been truly called a conventional fiction...Until we reach the history of Rome, an account has to be put together as best it may from the scraps collected from many diverse sources, and the margin of uncertainty is considerable'.
Apollodoros of Artemita is said by Strabo to be of Artemita, a Seleukid city which at an unknown date was incorporated into the Parthian realm. It is significant, as Tarn and Altheim have both noted, that this Artemita lay on the main road which joined Seleukia, Ecbatana, Hekatompylos, and Baktra.

Apollodoros' detailed description of Parthia and Hyrkania suggests that he had travelled widely inside the Parthian empire. It is even possible that he had travelled to Baktria.

Strabo must have had Apollodoros in mind when he wrote, in XI.vi.4:

>'But the supremacy of the Romans and that of the Parthians has disclosed considerably more knowledge than that which had previously come down to us by tradition; for those who write about those distant regions tell a more trustworthy story than their predecessors, both of the places and of the tribes among which the activities took place, for they have looked into the matter more closely [actually, μᾶλλον γὰρ καταπεπεύκασι, 'they have spied out the land much more'].'

Apollodoros' date is difficult to ascertain. The last Parthian King with which his work would seem to have dealt was Mithridates II (123 to 87 B.C.) so that dating the compilation to that period is an immediate temptation. Tarn suggested that: 'His date must fall between the conquest of Baktria, c. 130 B.C. (...) and the death of Mithridates II of Parthia in 87 B.C. ', adding that:

'There is no reasonable doubt that Apollodorus belonged to the flourishing period of the reign of Mithridates II, somewhere round about 100 B.C., the period that saw the Parthian survey of their empire, (...) made of course by Greeks; as two of Strabo's named citations from Apollodorus deal with the distances, it is conceivable that he himself had something to do with the survey.'

As this same survey may have been the basis for Isidoros' Parthian Stations, which though written sometime in the 1st century A.D. was relevant to the situation in the 1st century...
B.C.\textsuperscript{7}, it is possible that Apollodoros had had something to do with this survey. Indeed, as Strabo's account of the foundation of the Parthian kingdom seems to include official Parthian material, it is not impossible that Apollodoros worked for the Parthian court\textsuperscript{8}.

The nature of Apollodoros' \textit{Parthika} is somewhat easier to ascertain than its date. It was a work in at least four books\textsuperscript{9}. Besides a detailed account of Parthian history and customs, the work included an account of Hyrkania, Bactria and the nomads beyond. Thus Strabo wrote in II.v.12:

'Information has been given us also concerning Hyrcania and Bactriana by the writers of Parthian histories (Apollodorus of Artemita and his school\textsuperscript{10}), in which they marked off those countries more definitely than many other writers'.

Strabo would seem to have had the same group in mind when he wrote in I.ii.1 that:

'the Parthians have increased our knowledge in regard to Hyrcania and Bactriana, all of which countries were but imperfectly known to the early geographers'.

As to the actual format of the work, Münzel believed Apollodoros produced a \textit{Periegesis} of the above lands\textsuperscript{11}. Thus, Strabo took note in I.iii.21 of 'the regions beyond the Pontus and Colchis (regions which are separated, from Armenia by the Araxes according to

\textsuperscript{7} Tarn, \textit{ibid.}, pp.53-54. See Schoff (ed.), Isidore of Charax, \textit{Parthian Stations}, p.9 and Bunbury, \textit{History of Geography}, 1883, II, pp.164-165. As Isidoros' work is nothing more than a bare itinerary for travel along the main roads in the Parthian Empire, it is possible that the work is simply a summary of an early larger work. As Isidoros wrote of two routes, one from Zeugma through Seleukia and out to Merv, the other south from Merv to Seistan and hence north-east to Alexandria-Ghazni 'to which Parthian rule extended', as Parthia would seem to have acquired Merv early in the reign of Mithridates II and lost Arachosia after his death, and as Seleukid kings frequently commissioned surveys, Isidore may have been using a survey sponsored by Mithridates II in the middle of his reign, c.110-100 B.C., in imitation of the Seleukids.

\textsuperscript{8} Cf. Wolski, 'The decay of the Iranian Empire of the Seleucids and the chronology of the Parthian beginnings', 1959, pp.35-39.

\textsuperscript{9} Athenaios XV.682c: 'Apollodorus in the fourth book of his \textit{Parthian History} records a flower called \textit{philadelphum} in the Parthian country of which he says: 'And there are various kinds of myrtle such as \textit{smilax} (bindweed) and the so-called \textit{philadelphum}, which got its name as being appropriate to its nature. For whenever separate sprays of it meet accidentally, they remain united in an embrace like that of animate creatures, as though sprung from a single root, and then continue to run on and put out new shoots; hence men contrive from them a protection for their cultivated plants. For taking the lightest shoots, they interweave them like a net and plant them round about their garden-plots; and thus entwined together they provide a fence of impenetrable security'.

\textsuperscript{10} The Greek τῶν περὶ Ἀπολλοδόρου τῶν Ἀρτέμιττινων might mean Apollodoros and his school in the sense of his students, but may mean no more than scholars like Apollodoros. The expression might even be a periphrasis of the proper-name, and thus simpy mean Apollodoros.

\textsuperscript{11} Münzel, 'Apollodoros von Artemita', 1894, pp.2853-4.
Apollodorus...)’ and in XI.vii.3 cites Apollodoros on the river Ochus and the border to Parthia. The pattern may even be discernable from Strabo XI.ix.1 to xi.2, for this section starts with a survey of Parthia (XI.ix.1), followed by one of Aria and Margiane (XI.x.1-2) and Baktriana and Sogdiana (XI.xi.1-4)\footnote{On Baktria see Strabo XI.xi.1: ‘As for Bactria, a part of it lies alongside Asia towards the north, though most of it lies above Asia and to the east of it. And much of it produces everything except oil. The Greeks who caused Bactria to revolt grew so powerful on account of the fertility of the country that they became masters, not only of Ariana, but also of India, as Apollodorus of Artemita says: and more tribes were subdued by them than by Alexander... In short, Apollodorus says that Bactriana is the ornament of Ariana as a whole; and, more than that, they extended their empire even as far as the Seres and the Phryni’. In XI.xi.2 Strabo wrote: ‘Their cities were Bactra (also called Zariaspa, through which flows a river bearing the same name and emptying into the Oxus), and Darapsa, and several others...’. Finally, ‘And they also held Sogdiana, situated above Bactriana towards the east between the Oxus River, which forms the boundary between the Bactrians and the Sogdians, and the Iaxartes River. And the Iaxartes forms also the boundary between the Sogdians and the nomads’. As the above geographical descriptions are all linked to references to Parthian history or geography, the source was probably Apollodoros. Though XI.xi.3 also deals with the Baktrians and Sogdians, it deals with their customs, and was thus probably, as Münzel, 'Apollodoros', 1894, p.2854, suggests, 'meistens aus Poseidonios, dem er in solchen Dingen zu folgen pflegt'.}. Apollodoros possibly included Hyrkania in his discussion of Parthia, it being after all one of the earliest homes of the dynasty (XI.vii.3).

Though praised for the care with which he defined the geography of Central Asia, Apollodoros’ conception of the river system would seem to have presented problems even to Strabo, who wrote in XI.vii.3 that:

‘Hyrkania is traversed by the rivers Ochus ["\[\text{"}\] and Oxus ["\[\text{"}\] to their outlets into the sea; and of these, the Ochus flows also through Nesaea, but some say that the Ochus empties into the Oxus...The Ochus is not mentioned at all by the ancient writers. Apollodorus, however, who wrote the Parthica, names it continually, implying that it flows very close to the country of the Parthians’.

As the Aparnoi are said to live along the Okhos in Strabo XI.ix.2 and on the shore of the Caspian in XI.vii.2, Apollodoros probably believed the sea into which the Okhos flowed was the Caspian. Though some modern scholars have identified the Okhos of these passages with Strabo’s Μάτρυσια in XI.x.1, the modern Murghab, and others with
Strabo's 'Ἀχώς' in the same passage, the modern Tejend, these scholars would seem only to be falling into the same confusion as the ancients. Tarn suggested that the Ochos, the lower Arios, was confused with the Atrek, and this Ochos-Atrek, then confused with the Oxos. Herrmann and Bosworth make an even more plausible suggestion. Strabo combined a tradition coming from Apollodoros, who used 'Ochos' for the Atrek (rising in the Kopet Dag massif just south of the old Parthian capital of Nisa and discharging into the Caspian) and one from the Alexander historians who used 'Ochos' for a Baktrian river east of the Oxos, perhaps the Surhab. This explanation fits into Bosworth's thesis that in 328 Alexander did not campaign in Margiana, but in Baktria, for it was in Baktria he would have met the eastern 'Ochos'.

The most appropriate understanding of Apollodoros' conception of the Ochos might then be as follows. Its upper course (actually the Arios, now Tejend) flowed through Margiane a little to the west of the Margos (now Murghab), and represented the border between Margiane and Parthia to which Strabo refers in XI.ix.2. That Apollodoros might conceive of a river which never in fact reached the Caspian to have flowed into that sea need cause no surprise. It was conceived of as an important river, for as Strabo reported, the plains of Aria and Margiana are intersected and irrigated by the Arios and Margos, and all important Central Asian rivers had long been thought of as flowing into the Caspian.

Though the concept of all rivers flowing into the Caspian is Patroklian, there is a non-Patroklian concept in Strabo's account of this region. In XI.ix.3, the Apamian Daai are described as 'emigrants from the Daai above Lake Maiotis, who are called Xandii or Parii'. If the Caspian were conceived of in Patroklian terms, it would be a gulf of the Ocean and the Apamians could not have migrated from north of the Maiotis, around the Caspian and into Parthia. Was this non-Patroklian concept Apollodoros'? Strabo alludes to a variant

---

13 On the former identification see Münzel, 'Apollodoros', 1894, p.2854. On the latter Kiessling, 'Hyrcaenia', 1914, pp.470, 483 & 492; Tarn, Alexander, II, 1948, p.8 n.1, p.310 n.4, and Greeks in Bactria and India, 1951, p.113 n.4; and Tret'jakov and Mongajta, Ocherki Istoriom CCCP, 1956, p.266. Bosworth, 'A missing year in the history of Alexander the Great', 1981, p.26 calls this latter identification 'outrageous' for the Tejend 'is neither parallel to the Oxus nor a tributary but flows at right angles to it, discharging into the desert, equally far from Bactria and the Caspian'.

14 Tarn, Greeks in Bactria and India, 1951, p.113.


16 See Chapter 12.
view on this matter when he continued: 'But the view is not altogether accepted that the Daeae are a part of the Scythians who live about Maeotis'. It is impossible to determine which was Apollodoros' concept, but, whatever his hydrographic concept, as he seemed to believe Arsakes used Daai in the invasion of Parthia, he could not easily have believed the Daai to have migrated from the west side of the Caspian.

Bunbury is thus not entirely correct in concluding that Apollodoros offered a good account of the Hyrkanian river Okhos, hitherto confounded with the Oxos, nor in writing: 'there is no evidence of Strabo having any additional geographical information concerning those countries, beyond what he derived from Eratosthenes and the historians of Alexander'.

In the former case he overestimates Apollodoros' originality, and in the latter, underestimates the amount of new information on northern tribal movements and ethnography with which Apollodoros provided Strabo.

'Trogus' source'.

Trogus Pompeius has long been a somewhat mysterious figure. He may have been a Vocontian from Gallia Narbonensis. His grandfather may have served with Gn. Pompeius Magnus, who passed through Gaul to campaign in Spain in 76-71 B.C. and his father may have served with Caesar. He wrote, in addition to several works on natural history, a *Historiae Philippicae* in 44 books. This work survives in the form of an epitome made by Justin in the 3rd century A.D. and a series of short summaries of the contents of each chapter, the *Prologi*, made either by Justin or, more probably, some other writer. That the contents of the *Prologi* and epitome does not always correspond, speaks not, as Debevoise

---

17 Cf. Strabo XI.viii.2 ff.
20 See Justin XLIII.v.11-12.
21 Trogus' original work would seem to have been divided as follows: Books 1-6 on the ancient orient and Greece, 7-12 on Macedonia, 13-40 on the Hellenistic kingdoms, 41-42 on Parthian history to 20 B.C. and 43-44 on the early history of Rome and Western Europe. Chapters 41 to 42 contain several notices on the Central Asian Scythians in the period from the mid 3rd to mid 4th century.
believes, in favour of the former's 'originality' and the latter's deviation, but only of an inevitably different summarisation of Trogus' original.

Trogus' source is an even more mysterious figure. Of Trogus' source Tam wrote:

'Neither his name nor his city is known; his very existence has been forgotten... But he survived in other works besides Trogus, and there is not doubt that he wrote a comprehensive history of the whole of the Greek and Parthian East.'

Tarn likens Trogus' source to Hieronymos of Kardia in the way it is possible to combine under his name the fragments of a whole tradition. Despite his importance to our understanding of Hellenistic historiography, 'Trogus' source' has received hardly any scholarly attention. Characterisations of his work have been sketchy.

Tarn believed that 'Trogus' source' travelled widely, saw and admired the Parthian capital Dara (Justin XLI.v.2-4), spent time in India, wrote a history of Parthia from its origins to the death of Mithridates II in 87 (and as he would seem to have concluded his history with a panegyric of Mithridates II, he must have been living in Parthia when he wrote the work), wrote a history of Baktria down to the nomad conquests (Trogus, Prol., XLI-XLII) and of India down to Menander's death, mentioned the various Alexandrias and writing his work some time in the 80's B.C. Similarly, Bachhofer, citing Tarn, suggested Trogus' informants 'about the conquest of Baktria had written a history of events in the east at about the time of Apollodoros, shortly after 87 B.C.'

Bussagli recommended several significant modifications of Tarn's model. Whereas Tarn conceived of Trogus using a single pre-80's B.C. source for all his information on Parthia, Baktria and India, Bussagli conceived of Trogus as drawing upon several different sources. Bussagli traced Trogus' material on the origin of the Maurya dynasty, the life and

22 Debevoise, A Political History of Parthia, 1938 (1968), p.xxvii. Though it is fair to remind readers that Justin's work 'suffers from the combined errors of two persons, plus the copyist's mistakes, but some of the severe criticism levelled at it comes from readers who are prone to forget that it is an epitome', it is not fair to imply that the prologues and epitome were produced by different hands simply because 'In a number of cases the prologues of the original work supply additional facts and correct or make clear the epitome'.

23 Tarn, Greeks in Bactria and India, 1938 (1951), p.45.

24 Tarn, ibid., pp.49-50.


times of Chandragupta, back to Megasthenes, ambassador to the court of Chandragupta, to Deimakhos, ambassador to the court of Chandragupta’s successor, Bindushara, and to an indigenous Jaina tradition concerning the latter. He traced Trogus’ material on the Baktrian king Menandros back to a later Buddhist tradition. The question of whether this material might be traced back still further to another Greek author, ‘for instance Apollodorus, who seems to have travelled over North-West India, and who lived at a period when he could have known the Buddhist tradition on Menandros’ is, however, left unanswered.

It is surprising, however, that Tam (followed by Bachhofer) and Bussagli can sketch the life, work and literary tendencies of ‘Trogus’ source’ and Apollodoros of Artemita in very similar terms, and still not choose to identify this source with Apollodoros. It is particularly surprising considering that Tam thinks it:

‘a sound canon of historical method in dealing with ancient history that sources are not to be multiplied beyond necessity; and this is especially true of the Farther East, where one cannot postulate many Greek historians’

The suggestion that ‘Trogus’ source’ was Apollodoros has been made only twice to the present writer’s knowledge. In 1944 Bickerman argued that Strabo’s, Justin’s and Arrian’s accounts of the beginnings of the Parthian Empire are in ‘substantial agreement’ and remarked that they ‘go back, probably, to a common source which may be the Parthica of Apollodorus of Artemita’. In 1947 Altheim argued this case energetically, not with the intention of supporting Bickerman, whose remarks he had not noticed, but with the intention of refuting Tarn’s arguments. Accordingly Altheim noted half a dozen correspondences between the accounts of Parthian and Greek history in the works of Strabo and of Trogus (as epitomised by Justin). Both accounts have a certain Arsaces lead a group of northern nomads against the Seleukid satrap of Parthia, though Arsakes is said by Strabo to have been of nomad origin and by Justin to be of uncertain origin, and though the nomads are said by Strabo (XI.ix.3) to have been Parnian Daai living north of the Maiotis and by Justin (XLI.i.10 & iv.6) to have simply been inhabitants of Scythia. Both Strabo (XI.ix.2) and Justin (XLI.vi.8) offer descriptions of Parthian customs. Both Strabo (XI.ix.2) and Justin (XLI.vi.3) refer to a Parthian victory over the Euphrates. Both Strabo (XI.ix.2) and Justin (XLI.vi.3) refer to a Parthian victory over the

---

27 Ibid., p.239.
29 Bickerman, ‘Notes on Seleucid and Parthian Chronology’, 1944, p.79.
Baktrian Greeks. Lastly and perhaps most importantly, both Strabo (XI.viii.2) and Justin (Prol. XLI & XLII) catalogue the tribes that overthrew the Greko-Baktrians at the end of the 2nd century B.C. and the catalogues are very similar.

Altheim's *Weltgeschichte Asiens*, 1947, was criticised by Tarn on several justifiable grounds- its aim was unstated, its structure chaotic, its argumentation often hard to follow (e.g. the section on Pliny's *Arsi*) and its details often incorrect (e.g. the statement that Amometos wrote a book 'On the Seres')31. Yet Tarn's only ground for rejecting Altheim's identification of 'Trogus' source' as Apollodoros of Artemita is that Strabo's and Justin's catalogues of the tribes that invaded Baktria could not be derived from the same source. Strabo named the Asioi, Pasianoi, Tokharoi and Sakarauloi, where Justin named the Asii, Asiani, Thocari, and Saraucae. Tarn offered only two grounds for rejecting Altheim's linking of the two catalogues32. The first is that Justin used *Asiani*, where Strabo used only *Asioi*. This is believed to evidence Trogus' use of a source which added the Iranian genitive plural suffix -ana to the tribal-name. The second is that Justin used *Thocari*, with an initial aspirate, where Strabo used *Tocharoi*, with a middle aspiration. This is believed to evidence the names derivation from different Iranian dialects.

Tarn's reasons for rejecting the identification of 'Trogus' source' as Apollodoros are not convincing. Though the differences in the forms of the tribal names might better be explained in terms of passage through different Iranian dialects, than in terms of manuscript errors, the names might still have been drawn from a common text. Apollodoros may have offered different forms in the one history or, while Strabo may have been using the original work of Apollodoros, Trogus' may have been using a reworking, perhaps done by one of Apollodoros' students, perhaps by Timagenes33. There is no need to postulate the existence of two entirely independent yet contemporary historians of Parthia and Baktria.

Though Strabo frequently refered to the writers on Parthia and Baktria in the plural (I.i.1; II.v.12; XI.vi.4) in II.v.12, he qualifies his mention of those writers with the phrase τῶν περὶ Ἀπολλοδόρου τῶν Ἀρτεμίτην. This implies that the work of the other writers may have to some extent been derived from Apollodoros' work. The survey

33 For the thesis that Timagenes was Trogus' chief source see Schwab, *De Livio et Timagenes*, 1834, cited and discussed by Walbank, 'Sources for the period', 1984, pp.7-8.
which Isidoros reworked, and the Parthika from which Strabo worked, may have been produced by Apollodorus' original. Strabo and Trogus were contemporaries. It is more probable that there were several different versions of Apollodorus' Parthika available, than several totally independent Parthika.

The establishment of the Parthian and Baktrian kingdoms.

After this review of the relevant source material and some of the associated historiographical problems, the discussion may now turn to the problem of reconstructing the ancient literary conceptions of the Saka tribes in the period from the mid-3rd to mid-2nd century B.C. In Chapter 12 above, the notices of Patrokles and Demodamas on Central Asian tribal geography at the beginning of the third century B.C. were traced through Eratosthenes to Pliny and Strabo, it being conjectured that some time during the joint rule of Seleukos Nikator and Antiokhos Soter, perhaps in the early 280's Saka nomads had temporarily wrenched Sogdiana, Baktria and Margiana from Seleukid hands. The order Demodamas appears to have reimposed on the region in the name of Antiokhos (I) Soter, fell apart during the reign of Antiokhos' (II) Theos (c.261-247) when first the Baktrian satrap Diodotos, and then the 'Parthians' under a certain 'Arsakes' revolted. At least three versions of the Parthian 'revolt' survive. The first has Arsaces as a Scythian in league with the Dahae. Strabo wrote in XI.ix.2 that:

"...those who had been entrusted with their government first caused the revolt of Bactriana and of all the country near it, I mean Euthydemus and his followers; and then Arsaces, a Scythian, with some of the Daae (I mean the Apamians, as they were called, nomads who lived along the Ochus), invaded Parthia and conquered it."

Similarly Justin wrote in XLI.iv that:

"One Arsaces, a man of uncertain origin, but of undisputed bravery, happened to arise at this time; and he, who was accustomed to live by plunder and depredations hearing a report that Seleucus was overcome by the Gauls in Asia, and being consequently freed from dread of that prince, invaded Parthia with a band of marauders, overthrew Andragoras his lieutenant, and after putting him to death, took upon himself the government of the country."

The second version has the revolt the work of two brothers subject to the Seleukid governor Pherekles. Thus Photius' epitome of Arrian's Parthika, 58 records:

The Parthians, he [Arrian] says, at the time when Sesostris was ruling in Egypt and I-andynes in Scythia, emigrated from their country Scythia, into their present habitat. Arsakes and Tirdates were two brothers, sons of Arsakes, son of Arsakes, descendant of Phriapites. Pherekles had been established by the King Antiochus (Theos, as they called him), but the sons of Arsakes assassinated this Pherekles, whom Antiochus had made satrap over the country, since this man had been shamefully violent towards the brothers, and they, not being able to bear the insult, killed the insulter and banding together for the deed with five others, revolted from the Macedonians and governed themselves and emerged as powerful as those who gave battle to the Roman...

The third version is alluded to by Strabo in XI.ix.3:

'At any rate, some say that Arsaces derives his origin from the Scythians, whereas others say that he was a Bactrian, and that when in flight from the enlarged power of Diodotus and his followers he caused Parthia to revolt'.

Tarn has attempted to reconcile all three versions.

[Part of the Dahae], the Parni, led in the tradition by two brothers, Arsaces and Tirdates, had before 250 B.C. separated from the rest and moved to the lower Ochus (Tejend); the powerful and semi-independent satrap of Bactria, Diodotus, attempted to bring them under his rule, and to escape him they migrated into the Hyrcanian-Parthian satrapy; there they came into conflict with, and killed, the Seleucid satrap Andragoras (...), whose name is variously given. Arsaces, afterwards reckoned the founder of the dynasty, is a legendary figure; the founder of the kingdom was Tirdates, who took the name Arsaces, subsequently borne as a family name by all his descendants.

By such a scenario the founders of the dynasty could be said to have come from Scythia, Baktria and Parthia, these origins representing different stages in the tribe's progress, and the brothers Arsakes and Tirdates could be both said to be historical personages. A very similar 'harmonising' of the sources was performed by Bickerman in 1944.

In more recent years Wolski and Neusner have rejected the above attempts to harmonise the sources on the grounds that they do not take account of, let alone explain, the different ideological tendencies in the various accounts. Wolski and Neusner have preferred to see Strabo's and Justin's accounts as going back to Apollodorus' account at the turn of the 2nd-1st century B.C. and preserving an accurate notion of Arsakid origins current among official Arsakid circles at the end of the 2nd century B.C., wherein the first Arsakids were nothing more than the successful leaders of a band of northern nomads. Arrian's account

---

37 Bickerman, 'Notes on Seleucid and Parthian Chronology', 1944, pp.79-83.
echoes a romantic notion of Arsakid origins current in the 1st and 2nd centuries A.D.,
when the Arsakids started to lose their grip over the diverse elements in their kingdom (the
Iranian nobles, Greek cities, Jewish colonies, Armenian separatists), wherein the Arsakids
were the heirs of the Akhaemenids. For Wolski, the notion of two brothers, found in
Arrian alone, was part of this later romanticisation, a fabrication to satisfy Iranian
preferences for brothers in mythological events.

Though Wolski and Neusner are undoubtedly justified in detecting the influence of 1st
century A.D. Parthian political ideology in Arrian’s account, an influence Tarn and
Bickerman overlooked, Wolski is probably not justified in counting as fictitious Arrian’s
figure of Tiridates. The Aramaic text of Ostracon 1760 from the old Parthian capital of Nisa
strongly suggests that Arsakes did have a brother, who, for a time, ruled the kingdom. The
text might be translated as follows:

In the year 157 of King Arsakes, grandson of Priapatius, (who was) son of the
nephew of Arsaces

This short text, its translation and its genealogical implications have attracted an enormous
amount of attention since first being published in 1951. As the 157th year of the Arsakid
era, beginning 247 B.C., is 91 B.C., in this year Gotarzes usurped Mithridates II’s throne,
and as there is an extant reference to Gotarzes as an ‘Arsakes’, the Arsakes of the above
text is usually taken to be Gotarzes, the Priapatius to be Mithridates’ grandfather referred to
by Justin (XLII.v), and the nephew of Arsakes to be the son and heir of the Tiridates who
Arrian mentions as the brother of Arsaces.

In 1966 Bickerman saw a problem with the above schema. To adopt this schema is to have
Justin’s Priapatius the grandson of Tiridates, when Justin does not mention a Tiridates, and
specifically says (XI.v) Arsakes I was succeeded by his son Arsakes II, and that
Priapatus became Arsakes III. Bickerman solves this problem by reading the Aramaic text as:

'The year 157, Arsakes, king, grandson of Priyapatak and son of the nephew of Arsakes'.

Thus the Priapatus of the ostracon would not have been Justin's Priapatius. Indeed, he would not have been a King, but only Gotarazes's link with a king. Bickerman does not, however, say to which King Priapatus linked Gotarazes. As Gotarazes was a contemporary of Mithridates, if the brother of Gotarazes's grandfather was an Arsakid ruler, he could only be Mithridates II's grandfather, that is, Priapatus, and it is unlikely in the extreme that two brothers would both have the same name. Thus Bickerman creates more problems than he solves.

Koshelenko, in 1977, offered the most satisfactory interpretation of the ostracon published to-date. Koshelenko saw the Priyapatak of the ostracon as Justin's King Priapatius, not Gotarazes. That Justin has Arsaces I's son become Arsaces II does not preclude Arsaces I's brother's grandson, Priapatus, becoming Arsaces III. Indeed, Justin does not say Arsaces II was succeeded by his son Priapatus, and succession of brother's sons (in this case Arsaces II's cousin's son) was very common among ancient Iranian peoples. Koshelenko's scenario has the advantage that there is no need to postulate the existence of otherwise unknown royal family members, and it is evident that Gotarazes's genealogy has been constructed, as might be expected of someone striving to establish his legitimacy, around the names of two ruling Arsakids.

Though Wolski and Neusner were correct to see a need to take account of different ideological tendencies in the various accounts of Parthian origins, this having been done, discussion might return to reconstructing the events leading up to the establishment of the Parthian and Greko-Baktrian states.

Seleukid troubles started with the defection in the early 240's B.C. of their Parthyenian satrap, Andragoras, named in Justin XLI.iv, on several coins from the Oxus treasure and on a Greek inscription. This disaster was followed by the twin disasters of nomads

---

44 Koshelenko, 'Генеалогия первых аршакидов', 1976, pp.31-37 (omitted from Bivar's otherwise thorough review of the relevant literature in 'The political history of Iran under the Arsacids', 1983, pp.30-31.
46 See the references cited by Bivar, The political history of Iran under the Arsacid', 1983, p.29.
overrunning Parthyene and Hyrkania, and the Baktrian satrap revolting, though which happened first is a matter of some debate\textsuperscript{47}.

Investigation of the nomad overrunning of Parthyene might begin with the etymology of the word 'Parthi'. Marquart, Gutschmid and Altheim have derived the name from 'Parni', and thus strengthened the link with the Dahai\textsuperscript{48}. Herzfeld and Lozinski have derived the word from the Pahlevi word for "victorious" or "proud"\textsuperscript{49}. No modern scholar has taken seriously an etymology offered by Justin himself in XLI:i:

"The Parthians...were originally exiles from Scythia. This is apparent from their very name; for in the Scythian language exiles are called Parthi...".

Though Lozinski rightly called this a 'folk etymology'\textsuperscript{50}, and though the etymology is probably worthless from a linguistic point of view, it might contain one important piece of information. This piece of information, perhaps drawn from Apollodoros' history, might be that the Parthian conquerors were exiles.

The parallels between the above notice and the story Herodotos offers in IV.110-116 on the origins of the Sauromatai and in IV.22 on the origin of the detached eastern Basileioi Scythians, are striking. Just as the Sauromatai and the detached eastern Basileioi Scythians seem to have been formed from a band of expelled Scythian youths, so might the Parthian dynasty have been established by a band of expelled Dahai youths called the Pamoi\textsuperscript{51}. A theory that young warriors were habitually, almost ritually, expelled from their home tribes, would go further towards explaining the complex history of nomad raids, withdrawals, mercenary services and settlement than the more commonly employed theory

\textsuperscript{47} Wolski, 'Le problème de la foundation de l'état grèco-bactrien', 1982, pp.131-146 and Bivar, 'The political history of Iran under the Arsacids', 1983, p.28. It is unclear, for example, whether the beginning of the Arsakid era began, in 247 B.C., coincides with Andragoros' revolt, with the Arsakid conquest of Parthia or the coronation of an Arsakid king. Cf. Musti, 'Syria and the East', 1984, pp.213-215.


\textsuperscript{49} Herzfeld, 1924, I, p.232, cited by Lozinski, \textit{ibid}.

\textsuperscript{50} Lozinski, \textit{ibid}.

\textsuperscript{51} The only scholar to date to touch upon such an interpretation of 'Parni' is Jettmar, who in his \textit{Art of the Steppes}, 1967, p.214, writes, '...the Parni we now know to have been not an independent people but only the young men of the Parthians'.

which tends to treat the Scythians as an amateur chorus lingering uneasily at the back of a stage, ready at any moment to swarm forward and smother the brilliant principals.\(^{52}\)

Arsakes may have then been leading a breakaway war-band when he first invaded Baktria and Parthia, and it is to this group Apollodoros may have referred as exiles. The war-band was, however, clearly joined by full tribes, such as the Aparni, during the struggle to expel the Seleukids from Parthia and Hyrkania. Thus in XI.viii.2 Strabo wrote:

'And as for the Daeæ, some of them are called Aparni, some Xanthii, and some Pissuri. Now of these the Aparni are situated closest to Hyrcania and the part of the sea that borders on it, but the remainder extend even as far as the country that stretches parallel to Asia.'

Investigation of the events leading up to the Baktrian revolt might centre on the figure of Diodotos. In XI.ix.3 Strabo referred to Arsakes' flight from Diodotos, suggesting the latter was at one time the Governor of Baktria. Justin continued the story with his account in XLI.4 of how:

'Theodotos [=Diodotos], governor of the thousand cities of Baktria, revolted, and assumed the title of king; and all the other people of the east, influenced by his example, fell away from the Macedonians'. A second version of events is detected in Strabo’s reference in XI.ix.2 to the revolt of Euthydemos and his followers.

The two versions can be reconciled to some degree by noting the emphasis placed on ὁ ἐπὶ τότε θυράδιος in Strabo XI.ix.2 and totius Orientis populi in Justin XLI.iv.5. Diodotos may have been the Baktrian Governor, and first Greko-Baktrian king, while Euthydemos a subordinate in Sogdiana, Margiana or Aria.\(^{53}\) The revolt probably occurred in the reign of Seleukos (II) Kallinikos (c.247-222 B.C.)\(^{54}\).

\(^{52}\) See, for example, Rawlinson, Bactria, 1914, p.69, where in the time of the Euthydemid: 'The Scythian hordes were on the move, and threatening the borders of the Jaxartes like a storm-cloud' and 'The barbarians beyond the Jaxartes were still moving uneasily'.

\(^{53}\) Gafurov & Litvinskij, История Таджикского Народа, 1963, p.293. Wolski, 'Les Iraniens et le royaume gréco-bactrien', 1960, pp.117-8, speculates that besides the Baktrians, peoples in numerous other regions took part in the defection of Diodotos and Euthydemos- e.g. Sogdia, Aria, Drangiana and Arakhosia, all of which were more connected with Baktria than with Mesopotamia, and perhaps even Gedrosia and Karmania.

There have been several theories as to the causes of the Baktrian revolt. The first is the personal ambition of the local governor. The second is the resentment local Greeks and Iranians seem to have felt for rule by the Makedonians. Baktria especially had mainly been colonised by Greeks and though Alexander gave Baktria a Makedonian satrap, he was the last Macedonian willing to take the difficult command. Chandragupta's defiance of Seleukos in 306 had perhaps encouraged the Greeks and Iranians by showing them that the Makedonians were not invincible. The third cause suggested is the central government's diversion of resources from the north eastern provinces, then under increasing nomad pressure, to the south-western, under Ptolemaic pressure. Whatever the causes of the initial revolt, the defection became permanent when Ptolemy III overran the easternmost parts of the Seleukid empire.

The chronology of the above events has proved very difficult to establish. According to Justin XLI.iv, not long after the overthrow of Andragoras, and during the reign of Theodotus of Bactria, before the succession of his son of the same name, Arsaces conquered Hyrkania. 'Theodotus' clearly stood for 'Diodotos'. Tarn's argument that the Parthian conquest of the region must have postdated 217 B.C. because Polybios V.79.3 & 7 records Antiokhos III using Kadasian and Dahaian contingents in his 219-217 Syrian campaign is weak. Mercenaries were in common use in this period, and no source testifies to stability in Seleukid control in the Hyrkanian region in the period 250-217 B.C. The Dahai of Hyrkania and the lands to its north would seem to have been Arsakes' allies from the outbreak of hostilities, and the Seleukid outposts in Hyrkania had probably seen under pressure from rebels and invaders for some years before the final subjection to which Justin's record refers. As Tarn even observes, the Greeks only called the new Kingdom 'Parthia' because its first face was that of the old satrapy of Parthyene. The region of

57 Gafurov & Litvinskij, История Таджикского Народа, 1963, p.297. To this identification Debevoise, A Political History of Parthia, 1938 (1968), p.11 adds the identification of this Arsakes as Tiridates, and argues that the conquest took place 'Not long after the succession of Tiridates...', interpreting the Synkellos fragment of Arrian's Parthika as implying Arsakes lost his life in the initial years of the new kingdom.
59 Ibid., p.577.
Astauene, which the Arsakids came to regard as their homeland at the outbreak of hostilities probably belonged to Hyrkania, not Parthia.

Contending Kingdoms.

Reconstructing the course of subsequent events demands the accommodation of several elements: an invasion of Parthia by Seleukos II, an Arsakid flight to the Apasiakai, a Seleukid recall to Mesopotamia and an alliance between the Arsakid king, whom Arrian calls Tiridates, probably Arsakes II, and Diodotos II of Baktria. Extant accounts of this period are confused. According to Justin XLI.4 Arsakes:

'raised a large army, through fear of Seleucus and Theodotos [Diodotos I], king of the Bactrians. But being soon relieved of his fears by the death of Theodotus, he made peace and an alliance with his son, who was also named Theodotus [Diodotos II]; and not long after, engaging with king Seleucus, who came to take vengeance on the revolters, he obtained a victory; and the Parthians observe the day on which it was gained with great solemnity, as the date of the commencement of their liberty'.

Justin then recorded in XLI.5, as if subsequent to the action in XLI.4:

'Seleucus being then recalled into Asia by new disturbances, and respite being thus given to Arsaces, he settled the Parthian government, levied soldiers, built fortresses, and strengthened his towns'.

Two explanations are thus offered for Seleukos II's withdrawal. Firstly, he was defeated by the Arsakid Parthians and secondly, he was recalled by disturbances in Asia Minor. By the latter, Trogus could have meant either events in the 240's, Ptolemy III's march into Seleukid territory and the rebellion of Antiokhos Hierax, who had allied himself with the Galatians in Asia Minor, or events in about 227 B.C. when Antiokhos Hierax rebelled and together with Stratonike, invaded Mesopotamia. The two explanations are by no means incompatible. Seleukos may have first been defeated by the Arsakid Parthians, then thought it best to return to face the problems nearer home.

The account of Arsakes defeating Seleukos would, however, seem to be inconsistent with Strabo's account in XI.viii.8 that:

On the beginning of the Parthian era, see Bokshchanin, К вопросу о времени и обстоятельствах возникновения греко-бактрийского и парфянского государств, 1962, pp.473-4. The Armenian translation of the Chronicle of Eusebios I, (227, 25) and Hieronymos (II.121) would place the foundation of Parthia in the period 248-245 B.C.

The ensuing war was only ended by a revolt in the Nile delta, and a treaty with his brother in which he surrendered Asia Minor. An attempt to win back the lost territories from Antiokhos and his Galatian allies in 240 failed.

242

'... Arsaces, when he fled from Seleucus Callinicus, withdrew into the country of the Apasiacae.'

Where might an Arsakid withdrawal fit into the story which Justin tells? Debevoise, Gafurov and Litvinskij fit it in between the two Antiokhan wars and date the death of Diodotos I and Diodotos II's alliance with the Parthians, to this same period, but do not note the difficulty presented by Strabo's reference to an Arsakid flight and Justin's to reference to an Arsakid victory.

The above difficulty can only be resolved by taking the references to an Arsakid withdrawal and victory to be an allusion to different periods in the Arsakid-Seleukid conflict. The Arsakid flight was followed by an Apasiakai assisted return and victory. This scenario best accommodates two further circumstances. Firstly, the so-called Arsakid Era had its starting point in 247/6 B.C., and secondly, Isidoros (Parthian Stations 11) wrote: 'The city Asaak, in which Arsakes was first called King...'. For two reasons these two circumstances have been significant to the Parthians, but in that year they were still a minor power in the shadow of the mighty Seleukid empire. The town Asaak must have been significant to the Parthians, but it was nothing more than a small station on the upper Atrek in Astaunene. These two circumstances might, however, be accommodated by the above scenario. In 231 Seleukos went against the Parthians who retired to the Apasiakai. Hearing then of new trouble in Asia Minor between Antiokhos Hierax and Attalos I, Seleukos withdrew. The Parthians then returned to Parthia and overtook Seleukos at Asaak. Winning a great victory, the Parthians crowned their leader, Tiridates. This Tiridates proclaimed a new era, reckoning its beginning from the year of his accession to the leadership of the horde, 247/6 B.C.

Whether the alliance with Diodotos II also helped the Arsakid ruler to recover his kingdom, or whether it was the Arsakid's successful recovery of Parthia which forced

64 Bickerman, 'Notes on Seleucid and Parthian Chronology', 1944, pp.79-83.
65 πέρας δὲ Ἀσαάκ, ἐν ᾗ Ἀρσάκης πρῶτος βασιλεὺς ἀπέδεξεν. (In Greek: πέρας δὲ Ἀσαάκ, ἐν ᾗ Ἀρσάκης πρῶτος βασιλεὺς ἀπέδεξεν.)
66 Bickerman, 'Notes on Seleucid and Parthian Chronology', 1944, pp.82-83, offers a similar reconstruction of events, but saw Tiridates as having the support of Diodotos of Baktria and saw the disturbances in Asia Minor breaking out only after Seleukos' defeat.
67 As Tarn, 'Parthia', 1931, p.576, suggests.
Diodotos II into an alliance\(^6\) is impossible to say. The relationship between the reasons for, and effects of, any alliance is invariably unclear.

As the Arsakid sojourn among the Apasiakai brings Parthian history back once again to the land of the Saka, the episode demands some further investigation. This may be understood in the terms outlined earlier, of a small mobile Saka band raiding a more sedentary people and then taking refuge back among a nomad group. Though Strabo does not mention this tribe again, Polybios offers the following account of the tribes' habitat in X.xcvii:

> The Apasiacae inhabit the district between the Oxus and Tanais, the former of which rivers falls into the Hyrcanian Sea, while the Tanais falls in the Palus Maeotis...'

and where the Oxos throws itself into the Caspian:

> '...they say the Apasisacae pass dry-shod with their horses to Hyrcania, skirting the precipice under the waterfall. There is more reasonable probability in the [following] second account than in the [above] first. They say there are at the foot of the cataract large slabs of rock on which the river falls, and by the force of the current hollows out and pierces these rocks for some depth and flows underground for a short distance, after which it comes to the surface again. The barbarians are acquainted with this and cross to Hyrcania with their horses at the place where the river thus interrupts its course'.

As Polybios preserves an identical form of the tribal-name to that given in Strabo XI.viii.8, it is probable that the two writers shared a common original source, and as Strabo mentions the Apasiakai in connection with Arsakes' war with Seleukos, it is probable that this source was Apollodoros. The similarity between Polybios' and Eudoxos' conception of a waterfall where the Oxos enters the Caspian is striking\(^6\), but is easily explained as yet another instance of Apollodoros, through his reading of Eratosthenes, being influenced by old geographical conceptions. Failing to realise that there was a land passage between the mouth of the Oxos at the Aral sea, and the Caspian shore, Greeks had from an early day found themselves answering the question of how Saka tribes moved into such southern regions as Hyrkania by postulating the existence of a road beneath a waterfall or a break in the river's course. Apollodoros, dealing with precisely such migrations as these, felt a stronger need than most Greeks to postulate the existence of such passages.

Polybios' passage is of interest for one further reason. The Apasiakai are initially said to inhabit the district between the Oxos and Tanais, and then said to have moved into Hyrkania. This may be the evidence in favour of the theory posited above, that after


\(^6\) For Eudoxos' conception see Chapter 7.
Arsakes fled to the Apasiakai, the Apasiakai marched back with him into Parthia and Hyrkania, and it was thus that Arsakes won the victory over Seleukos to which Justin referred. The Apasiakai then settled in Hyrkania.

De St.Martin saw Aspasiakai, a manuscript variation of the Apasiakai of Strabo XI.viii.8, as being derived from 'Asp (horse) + asioi', i.e. 'Asioi Cavaliers'70, but a more convincing, and more commonly accepted interpretation of the name Apasiakai was Tomaschek's suggestion in 1883 that it meant 'Apa' or 'Water' Saka, the tribe living beside the Aral, between the Amu-darya and Syr-darya71. This second interpretation has been widely adopted, and most Soviet scholars have taken the further sound step of linking the tribe with a branch of the Massagetai, whom, they note, Herodotos seems to locate in this same region and among whom Herodotos says there were those who lived from fishing72. It is possible that the Dahai group from which the Aparnoi broke away, and which first brought Arsakes into Parthia, were in fact the group Strabo and Polybios referred to as 'Apasiakai', and to which this same Arsakes or his successor fled some years later.

To summarise the above suspicions, the following scenario may be offered. Arsakes, the leader of a nomad group known to the classical writers as the Aparni, broke away from a Dahai tribe then living near the Aral known as the Apasiakai. They settled first in Baktria, but were forced out by Diodotos I in about 247 B.C. The band, perhaps joined by other nomads, then moved into the Parthian satrapy (which included Hyrkania). Seleukos was occupied with wars with Ptolemy III, Antiokhos Hierax and Galatians till c.240 B.C., but in c.239-7 B.C. he turned his attention back to Parthia. Seleukos succeeded in expelling 'Tiridates', perhaps the original Arsakes, perhaps his successor. Sometime during this latest Seleukid-Parthian war Diodotos I was succeeded by his son Diodotos II, and when Seleukos was called back to Syria to face the rebel Antiokhos, 'Tiridates' made an alliance with Diodotos II, gained the assistance of the Apasiakai and recovered his kingdom73.
In about 211 B.C. the Seleukid King Antiokhos III embarked on a series of eastern campaigns, directed in part against the new Parthian King Artabanos and in part against the new King of Baktria, Diodotos II's murderer, Euthydemos. It is possible that Euthydemos had acted with the support of Greeks who were unhappy with Diodotos' alliance with the Parthians. It is clear from Polybios XI.xxxiv that Euthydemos was prepared to justify his action as being in Antiokhos' interests:

'For Euthydemus himself was a native of Magnesia, and he now, in defending himself to Teleas, said that Antiochus was not justified in attempting to deprive him of his kingdom, as he himself had never revolted against the king, but after others had revolted he had possessed himself of the throne of Bactria by destroying their descendants.'

Euthydemos' usurpation, like Diodotos I's rebellion, has often been explained in terms of personal ambition. Wider political circumstances ought be considered. Diodotos II's alliance with Parthia may have been unpopular with the Baktrians and the nomad threat a cause for anxiety. In any case, Euthydemos successfully maintained the loyalty of the Greko-Baktrians throughout Antiokhos' two year long siege of Baktra (Zariaspa), 207-206 B.C. According to Polybios (XI.xxxiv.5), writing a generation after these events, Antiokhos made a treaty with Euthydemos, raised the siege, recognised Euthydemos' sovereignty over Baktria, and marched off into India only after Euthydemos entreated Antiokhos:

'not to grudge him the name and state of king, as if he did not yield to this request, neither of them would be safe; for considerable hordes of Nomads were approaching, and this was not only a grave danger to both of them, but if they consented to admit them, the country would certainly relapse into barbarism'.

Though Rawlinson and Mazzarino believe Euthydemos was here expressing his concern that the Greek world be protected from the nomads, most other scholars have noted that

74 Justin XLI.vi called this King too Arsakes, for upon the death of 'Arsakes' I: 'His son and successor on the throne, whose name was also Arsaces, fought with the greatest bravery against Antiokhus, the son of Seleucus, who was at the head of a hundred thousand foot and twenty thousand horse, and was at last taken into alliance with him'.
75 Tam, Greeks in Baktria and India, 1938 (1952), p.74.
77 Narain, The Indo-Greeks, 1957, p.20 and Woodcock, ibid., p.70.
78 Rawlinson, Bactria, 1914, p.69; Mazzarino, The End of the Ancient World, 1966, pp.24-25. Mazzarino believes Polybius intended an analogy with the Roman World when he put into the mouth of Euthydemos, the creator of Bactrian power, a reasoned forecast of the 'migration of peoples' into the highly civilised states'. This thesis is disputed by Walbank, A Historical Commentary on Polybius, II, 1967, p.313.
Euthydemos was effectively threatening to let the nomads destroy both his and Antiokhos' nations, if Antiokhos did not raise the siege. The main problem of relevance to the present work posed by the above passage is that of determining at what frontier Euthydemos was holding the northern nomads. Tarn believed Euthydemos' kingdom included Aria, Arakhosia and Seistan to the south and Sogdiana and Ferghana to the north. But were Ferghana and Sogdiana ever part of the Greko-Baktrian kingdom? Tarn believed Antiokh in Skythia may have been the capital of the Ferghana province, but this city was clearly Alexandria-Eskhate, on the middle Iaxartes, refounded. Tarn takes the list in Justin XLI.vi.3 to be a list of provinces Eukratides received from Euthydemos, but it is plainly simply a list of peoples with whom Euthydemos' successors fought. Tarn believes Euthydemos wish not to \( \text{προσέχεσθαι} \) the nomads implies Euthydemos had secured the passes between Ferghana and the Tarim Basin, but it need only imply that Euthydemos had secured a frontier with forts and forces somewhere in the north. Indeed, Walbank has argued that this Greek word does not mean 'admit', as Tarn believes, but means 'to be attacked by'. Altheims' model of the Iaxartes as Euthydemos' frontier against the nomads, and Gafurov and Litvinskij's characterisation of Euthydemos' northern frontier as being a defensive one short of Ferghana seems more sober. Strabo does indeed state that Euthydemos won over to the rebellion Baktria and all the adjoining territory. Zeimal's objection that Strabo XI.xi.2 does not explicitly say Euthydemos ruled Sogdiana and suggestion that the frontier to which Euthydemos ruled was the Oxos, seems unnecessarily cautious. 

79 e.g. Tolstov, Древний Хорезм, 1948, p.231; Tarn, Greeks in Bactria and India, 1938 (1951), pp.82-83; Staviskij, Кушенская Бактрия, 1977, p.11; Bivar, 'The history of eastern Iran', 1983, p.188; Walbank, ibid.
80 Tarn, 'Notes on Hellenism in Bactria and India', 1902, pp.281-2, 289 and Greeks in Bactria and India, 1938 (1951), pp.82-3.
81 See Chapter 11 and Tarn's own reservations in his Greeks in Bactria and India, 1938 (1951), p.83 n.3.
82 The Parthians under Mithridates (171-138/7 B.C.) grew in power: 'While the Bactrians, harassed with various wars, lost not only their dominions, but their liberty; for having suffered from contentions with the Sogdians, the Drangians, and the Indians, they were at last overcome, as if exhausted, by the weaker Parthians'. See also Narain, The Indo-Greeks, 1957, p.23.
83 Tarn, 'Notes on Hellenism in Bactria and India', 1902, p.289.
Though Euthydemos may not have substantially expanded his kingdom, it is clear that his son Demetrios, who succeeded him in 200 B.C. and Demetrios' contemporaries, Menandros and Apollodotos, did. Indeed, by 168 B.C. two kingdoms had come into existence. There was a Baktrian kingdom in the hands of the usurper Eukratides, and an Indian kingdom in the hands of the Euthydemids. Though Eukratides struggled to conquer the latter, an alliance in 159 B.C. between dissatisfied Baktrians and Mithridates of Parthia, drew him back over the Hindu Kush to defeat and death in 155 B.C.

Baktrian Expansion in Central Asia.

A full reconstruction of the careers and conquests of the above Indo-Greek Kings falls outside the scope of this thesis, but it is of these men that Strabo, citing Apollodoros of Artemita, makes one claim of particular interest: 'they extended their empire even as far as the Seres and the Phryni'. This statement poses two questions. Where did Apollodoros believe the Seres and Phrynoi to live and under which Baktrian King did he believe the Kingdom extended so far.

No scholar has failed to note the correspondence between the term 'Seres' and the Greek word for silk 'Ser'. Many, seeing 'Ser' as a derivative of the Chinese 絲, 'Szu', 'silk', appreciating that the ancient Chinese monopolised silk production, and noting that Ptolemy located a land 'Serika' on the eastern border of his map, have identified Strabo's 'Seres' with the Chinese. This identification is, however, unacceptable on several grounds. Firstly, though the Chinese monopolised silk production they did not monopolise its distribution. Secondly, Ptolemy's 'Serika' lay no further west than the Tarim Basin. Laufer has argued that would never have been pronounce with a retroflex 'r', that the character probably had the ancient phonetic value 'si' or 'sa', and that the Greek words ser, Serika and Seres were probably derived from the name used by the Iranian middlemen, for in modern Persian 'sarah' means 'silk'. The use of the Persian word 'Sarah' for silk is,
however, almost unknown and it is not hard to imagine the middle men being called after a version of the name by which their suppliers called the product. It is not surprising then that Herrmann, Altheim, Tarn, and Narain have all found identifications here with the Chinese out of the question⁹² and preferred to compare the usage with that which is found in Pliny VI.88 where Rachis, a Singhalese ambassador to Claudius is reported as saying: ‘that beyond the Hermodos they also face towards the country of the Serae, who are known to them by intercourse in trade as well, the father of Rachis having travelled there, and that when they arrived there the Serai always hastened to meet them. That people themselves (they told us) are of more than normal height, and have flaxen hair and blue eys, and they speak in harsh tones and use no language in dealing with travellers. The remainder of the envoys’ account agreed with the reports of our traders- that commodities were deposited on the opposite bank of a river by the side of the goods offered for sale by the natives, and they took them away if satisfied by the barter...’⁹³

Pliny's blond 'Serae' are clearly not the Chinese. They have been identified by Hennig with an Indogermanian people in the Tarim Basin⁹⁴, by Herrmann, Tarn and Haussig with the Wu-sun of the Issik-kul region⁹⁵, and by Berthelot with a southern Siberian people⁹⁶. The range of identifications for Strabo's 'Seres' is comparable, though they have always been seen as middle men in east-west trade. They have been identified by Cunningham with the Shu-lo (Su-le) of Han Shu 96-42A, the people of Kashgar⁹⁷, Herrmann with a


⁹³ This is a modified version of Rackham's 1942 Loeb translation, which prejudices geographical interpretation by using 'Himalayas' instead of 'Hermodos', 'Chinese' instead of 'Serae' and has the Serai would hasten 'down to the beach' to meet them, when Pliny made no mention of a beach.


⁹⁵ Herrmann, 'Die blonden Serer und die türkischen Wu-sun', 1936, pp.200-1, and *Das Land der Seide*, 1938, pp.33-34, did not believe Pliny's Seres could have lived in the oases of the Tarim basin for the curious reason that he believed they had their own markets and translators. The Wu-sun, however, were friendly enough with the Chinese to have been acting as middle men, and the river across which trade was conducted may have been the Tschu. Though this argument leaves much to be desired, his conclusion that 'Seres' was 'ein Sammelname für alle am Seidenhandel beteiligten Völker des fernen Ostens gewesen ist', i.e. at different times the Tarim Basin, Wu-sun and Chinese, is reasonable. Tarn, *Greeks in Bactria and India*, 1957, pp.110-111 and Haussig, 'Die Beschreibung des Tarimbeckens bei Ptolemaios', 1959, p.165.

⁹⁶ Berthelot, *L'Asie ancienne centrale et sud-orientale d'après Ptolémy*, 1930, p.239.

people in the Tarim Basin\textsuperscript{98}, Altheim and Tarn with middlemen in the region of Issyk-köl\textsuperscript{99}, and by Egami and Haussig with the Yüeh-chih and Issedonians\textsuperscript{100}.

In recent years the Chinese connection has been reinvoked. Pulleyblank argued in 1962 that \( \text{Se} \mathfrak{p} \varepsilon \) was derived from \textit{Ch'in} and Hulsewé and Loewe adopting this argument in 1979\textsuperscript{101}. In 1982 Daffina restored reason by pointing out that such an argument suggests that in the early 2nd century B.C., at a time when the Hsiung-nu were at the height of their power, Demetrios' Baktiran Greeks were able to reach the Chinese border. Daffina endorses Tarn's view that the Seres could only be the middle men in the Siberian gold trade, adding that the word is probably derived form the Iranian 'zaray', 'gold'\textsuperscript{102}. Though phonetic identifications such as Cunningham's with Su-le and Daffina's with 'zaray' are of dubious value, the Seres might be identified with a merchant people from the Tarim basin.

Numerous identifications of the Phrounoi have been posited\textsuperscript{103}. In 1882 Kingsmill considered Phrounoi the phonetic equivalent of a tribal-name which Chinese rendered as Ta-yuan 大宛. This people he located near Yarkand, at the eastern end of the Tarim basin\textsuperscript{104}. Though the Euthydemid Kings may well have contacted the 'Phrounoi' in the eastern end of the Tarim basin, the identification of this tribe with the Chinese Ta-yuan, and Ta-yuan with the Yarkand region, is insupportable. In 1884 Cunningham saw the Phrynoi as the P'u-li of \textit{Han Shu} 96-21A, a people living a little west of Yarkand\textsuperscript{105}. This identification forms a tempting pair with the identification of Seres with Su-le, but is no more easily substantiated. A more conceivable identification has been that between the Phrounoi and the 'Hsiung-nu'\textsuperscript{106}. This identification deserves special attention. Though a phonetic link between Phrounoi and Hsiung-nu is not readily apparent, one between

\textsuperscript{98} Herrmann, \textit{Das Land der Seide}, 1938, pp.27ff.


\textsuperscript{100} Egami, 'Casia regio and Seres', 1959, p.224 and Haussig, 'Die Beschreibung des Tarimbeckens bei Ptolemaios', 1959, pp.166-8 & 171.


\textsuperscript{102} Daffina, 'The Han Shu Hsi Yu chuan re-translated', 1982, pp.331-2.

\textsuperscript{103} The \( \Phi \rho \nu \nu \alpha \) found in most editions of Strabo is actually a modern editorial correction of the manuscript name \( \Phi \alpha \nu \nu \alpha \). As there is no other extant reference to \( \Phi \alpha \nu \nu \alpha \), but there are extant references to \( \Phi \rho \nu \nu \alpha \) and \textit{Thuni}, the correction may be justified.

\textsuperscript{104} Kingsmill, 'The intercourse of China with Eastern Turkestan', 1882, p.78.

\textsuperscript{105} See note n.91.

\textsuperscript{106} Egami, 'Casia regio and Seres', 1959, p.224.
several apparent variants of 'Phrounoi' and several apparent variants of 'Hsiung-nu' would seem distinctly possible. Though it is not the present writer's intention to enter the controversy over the supposed identity of the Hsiung-nu and Huns, it is distinctly possible that the terms, if not the people or 'concepts', are renderings of the same indigenous name. Thus, when Tomaschek, in 1888, suggested that Strabo wrote $pou\omega l$ and that this is an equivalent of Kosmas' $\omega l\nu o\nu l$, and identified these as Huns107, he was opening up the possibility of identifying the 'Phrounoi' with the 'Hsiung-nu'. The identification with Huns was not acceptable to Tarn, Maenchen-Helfen or Altheim on the grounds that the link was phonetically weak and historically absurd, the Hsiung-nu living in Mongolia and the Phrounoi, judging from Dionysios Periegetes 752, living in the Tarim Basin108. The case in favour of the identification has recently been put by Daffina109.

There are at least three grounds for suspecting that the Greek Phrounoi were the rough equivalent of the Chinese Hsiung-nu. Firstly, the Hsiung-nu controlled the Tarim-Basin region from at least as early as Mao-tun's major south westerly offensive in 176 B.C.110, and it may have been to a period subsequent to this date that Apollodoros was referring when he wrote of the Baktrian contact' with the Phrounoi. Secondly, a legend on an Hephthalite coin which reads $\Phi P O N G 111$. Thirdly, the reference in a Sogdian letter to Hsiung-nu as $xv\nu$ suggests that the Hsiung-nu's self-appellation may indeed have been something like Hun, giving rise to Hunni in Latin, Huna in Indian languages, Hun in Khwarazmian, but $\omega l\nu o\nu l$ and $\phi o\nu o l$ in Greek112.

107 Tomaschek, *Kritik der ältersten Nachrichten über den skythi-schen Norden*, I, 1888, p.769. In 1917 Charpentier 'Die ethnographische Stellung', 1917, p.356, extended Tomaschek's equation by identifying Strabo's 'Phrounoi' with several other ethnonyms (e.g. the *Udini* of Pliny VI.xv.38) besides the $\phi o\nu o l$ of Dionysius 730 and the Huns of latter literature.

108 Tarn, *Greeks in Bactria and India*, 1938 (1951), pp.84-85: 'Phryni may be a general term for the peoples of the Kashgar-Yarkand or the Khotan country'; Maenchen-Helfen, 'The legend of the origin of the Huns', 1944-45, pp.249-250; Altheim, *Weltgeschichte Asien*, 1947, I, p.348, and *Alexander und Asien*, 1953, p.191. Maenchen-Helfen, *ibid.*, p.250 went so far as to write that 'to identify the Hsiung-nu in Mongolia with the Fauni who may have lived anywhere east of Bactria, and both Hsiung-nu and Fauni with the Huns in the Pontic region is, from any point of view, an idle play with assonance'.


110 Hansen, 'Die Berliner Hephthalitenfragmente', 1951, p.84.


112 Henning, 'The date of the Sogdian ancient letters', 1947/8, p.615.
On the question of the nature of Baktrian contact with the Seres and the Phrounoi, several scholars, most notably Narain, have argued for direct Greek contact with the Tarim Basin. Thomas and Tarn noted that a 3rd century A.D. Kharosthi Saka document from Khotan used the words *Yonu/Yona* (=Yavana, Greek), *milima edimos* (bushel), *satera* (stater) and *trakhme* (drachma), but though no Indo-Greek king is known to have struck staters after Eukratides, the word survived as a measure of weight and so the reference *trakhme* provides no clue as to the time or nature of the contact. It has been argued that the introduction of vine cultivation in Central Asia was connected with Macedonian rule, but as Laufer has argued, vine cultivation was older in this region than in Greece.

Tarn interpreted the Apollodoros passage as saying the Baktrian kings carried their arms into the Tarim valley and believed Euthydemos conquered the region to open up a route to Siberian gold, but as Narain points out, the Baktrian kings used little gold. Tarn has also argued that the nickel from which Euthydemos II and later Pantaleon and Agathokles struck some coins, may have come from beyond Sodgiana, but this need not imply Greek occupation of the region. Lozinski interprets a Georgian source's reference to Greek

---

116 e.g. Hirth, 'The story of Chang-K'ien', 1917, p.146; Laufer, *Sino-Iranica*, 1919, p.226; Narain, *The Indo-Greeks*, 1957, p.26. The earliest literary reference to vine culture in Central Asia is to be found in Chang Ch'ien's report (*Han Shu* 96 A.17B 37A). Chang Ch'ien passed through Ferghana in the early 120's B.C., sixty years after the reign of Euthydemos II. Though 60 years may be enough to establish vineyards, it would not be sufficiently long to account for the situation the HS passage describes: 'In Ta Yuan and to its left and right [i.e. east and west] grapes are used to make wine. Rich people store up to ten thousand *shih* [bushels] or more, and in cases when it is kept for a long period it may last for several decades without being spoilt.' Wine production must have predated any Euthydemid contact with the region.
117 Tarn, 'Notes on Hellenism in Bactria and India', 1902, p.289, says the trade route goes back to Aristeas' day, but realises that such a trade route depends on the 'correctness of Tomaschek's location of the Issedones and other peoples mentioned by Aristeas'. That Aristeas' poem does not in fact depict such a trade route, has been argued in Chapter I above. See also Tarn, *Greeks in Bactria and India*, 1938 (1951), pp.86 & 104-112. Needham, *Science and Civilisation in China*, 1954, I, p.176, adopted Tarn's interpretation: 'Euthydemus, King of Bactria, feeling the lack of gold which had formerly come from Siberian sources, made an effort to reach the Seres along a road north of the Thien Shan, but he did not succeed, though the blue-eyed red-haired race which the expedition met with gave rise to a tradition that the Seres were people of that kind'; Narain, *The Indo-Greeks*, 1957, pp.26-7.
occupation of Thoukharis near the sea Arsian (Arm, Arsik) and Ammianus' suggestion in XXIII.vi.57 that the Tokharians were Baktrian subjects, as implying Baktrian control as far as southern Siberia\(^{119}\), but this hardly follows.

The contact the above material does suggest needs no more elaborate explanation than the following. After Antiokhos' withdrawal, Euthydemos I had entrusted his son Demetrios with expansion in the south-west and his other son, Euthydemos (II) with the northern frontier. That the former enjoyed much success is well documented, but the latter may have also enjoyed some success and conquered some districts beyond Sogdiana, up to, but not including, the Seres and Phrounoi\(^{120}\). Though the difficulties in reconstructing the careers of Demetrios, Menander and Eukratides are immense\(^{121}\), it is unlikely that any of these Greko-Baktrian Kings added an occupation of the Tarim Basin to their deeds in India.

Conclusion.

It might be concluded that Apollodoros of Artemita served as the source for both Strabo's and Trogus' account of the establishment and expansion of the Parthian and Baktrian Kingdoms in the 3rd century B.C. From a close examination of this material it is evident that Apollodoros was very familiar with the geography and ethnographic history of Central Asia, that he was far less dependent on preexisting literary traditions than most Greek writers dealt with in the preceeding chapters, that he supplemented the pre-existing Greek literary record of Central Asian hydrology and that he introduced into the literary tradition a whole new set of ethnographic terms, including Parni, Apasiakai, Phrounoi and Seres. The

\(^{120}\) Narain, *The Indo-Greeks*, 1957, p.27.
\(^{121}\) The difficulties include interpreting Strabo XI.xi.1: 'The Greeks who caused Bactria to revolt grew so powerful on account of the fertility of the country that they became masters, not only of Ariana, but also of India, as Apollodorus of Artemita says: and more tribes were subdued by them than by Alexander- by Menander in particular (as least if he actually crossed the Hypanis towards the east and advanced as far as the Imaüs), for some were subdued by him personally and others by Demetrius, the son of Euthydemus the king of the Bactrians; and they took possession, not only of Patalena, but also, on the rest of the coast, of what is called the kingdom of Saraostus and Sigerdis...', and Trogus, *Prologus*, XLI: 'In Parthia, where an Empire had been established by King Arsakes. Then of his successors Artabanus and Tigranes, called 'The God', by whom Media and Mesopotamia had been conquered ...In Bactria where, on the other hand, an Empire was established by King Diodotos'. See Tarn, *Greeks in Bactria and India*, 1938 (1951), pp.141-145; Narain, *The Indo-Greeks*, 1957, pp.47-100 and Woodcock, *The Greeks in India*, 1966, pp.74-114.
Apollodoran material also documents well the conflict between the nomadic and sedentary peoples which so shaped the history of Central Asia in the 3rd century B.C., offering accounts of the nomad role in the formation of the Parthian Kingdom and the nomad factor in the formulation of Seleukid and Baktrian strategies.
CHAPTER 14.

APOLLODOROS OF ARTEMITA AND THE CENTRAL ASIAN SCYTHIANS (2).

Introduction.

Little is heard of nomad movements in western Central Asia during the early 2nd century B.C. The reason for this was probably not that the Euthydemids had been successful in maintaining their northern frontier, though they clearly had been, but simply that the extant literature is too fragmentary, and the interests of the original historians too confined to the Mediterranean Greek world to offer an appropriate record. From this fragmentary record it is, however, possible to reconstruct a rough history of Central Asian Saka movements in the period shortly after Eukratides had taken Baktria from Demetrios and Mithridates I had succeeded his brother Phraates on the Parthian throne.

Parthian expansion and nomad invasions.

One of the major forces in Central Asian history in the mid 2nd century B.C. was Mithridates I. The extent of the Parthian Kingdom's expansion under Mithridates I is a subject of some debate, but his new empire may have included Tapuria, Traxiana, Seistan, Media and, for a brief period, Baktria. Tam offers three sound reasons for postulating a temporary Parthian conquest of Baktria. Firstly, Justin wrote in XLI.vi. that:

'the Bactrians, harassed with various wars, lost not only their dominions, but their liberty, for having suffered from contentions with the Sogdians, the Drangians, and the Indians, they were at last overcome, as if exhausted, by the weaker Parthians'.

After Mithridates I, the Parthians could not be described as weak. Secondly, coins bearing the legend Βασιλείς Αρακός but imitating Eukratides' Dioskouroi coins have been found in Baktria. Thirdly, Ptolemy VI.xi.7 refers to a town Σουραγάνα Φράταος in Baktria. Thus, for a short period at the end of Mithridates', beginning of Phraates' reign, the period of the war between Demetrios and Eukratides, the Parthians might have held sway in Baktria. It is indeed possible that Eukratides' usurpation of Demetrios' throne had more to do with the Parthian threat than it did with the Antiokhos IV's ambitions.

1 Cf. Tarn, Greeks in Bactria and India, 1938 (1951), pp.222-3.
2 The later theory is propounded by Tarn, Greeks in Bactria and India, 1938 (1951), pp.183-224.
On Mithridates' wars Justin (XLI[vi].6-8) offers an account which though mentioning neither Scythians or Baktrians deserves some attention:

"...after fortune on each side had been some time fluctuating, victory at length fell to the Parthians: when Mithridates, enforced with this addition to his power, appointed Bacasis over Media, while he himself marched into Hyrcania. On his return from thence, he went to war with the king of the Elymaeans, and having conquered him, added this nation also to his dominions'.

Justin offers no reason for Mithridates' march into Hyrkania. Debevoise, however, believes that:

"The cause of his departure from Mesopotamia at this critical juncture in his campaign [with Babylonia not yet captured] was probably a raid by the Sacae, who shortly before 165 B.C. had been forced from their homeland in Turkestan by the Yüeh-chi and by this time were certainly close to the eastern borders of Parthia".

This is possible, but as the seat of Parthian power was at the time in Hyrkania, there are many other affairs which might have brought the King back. That Mithridates I may have come into contact with Saka is, however, possible, for as Justin (XLI[vi].8) records, after taking Hyrkania he:

'extended the Parthian empire, by reducing many other tribes under his yoke, from Mount Caucasus to the river Euphrates'

or as Orosius (V.iv.16) put it:

'...Mithridates, the sixth king of the Parthians after Arsaces, conquered the prefect, Demetrius and as victor attacked the city of Babylon and all its territories. In addition he subjugated the nations that dwelt between the Hydaspes and Indus rivers. He also extended his bloody rule to India.'

No source offers any reason for Mithridates relinquishing his control of Baktria, but it is possible that he left Baktria for lengthy campaigns in the Hindu-Kush and Gedrosian regions, and that in his absence a certain Heliokles, possibly the son of Eukratides, renewed the Greek hold on Baktria. Tarn dates to this same period, c.155 B.C., Mithridates I's settlement of his Saka on the lower Helmund in the province afterwards called Sacastene, but as there are no references to Mithridates I having any dealings with Saka (only with Baktrians), it is possible that the settlement of Sakastene by Saka occurred

3 Debevoise, A Political History of Parthia, 1938 (1968), pp.24-5.
4 Mithridates was in Hyrkania to receive the captured Demetrios II, but the date of this sojourn is unclear. See I Macabees; Justin XXXVI[i].5-6, XXXVIII.ix.2-3; Debevoise, ibid., p.25.
5 Tarn, Greeks in Bactria and India, 1938 (1951), p.223. Thomas, 'Sakastana. Where dwelt the Sakas named by Darius and Herodotos?', 1906, pp.181-200 & 460-464, had argued that Sakastana (Seistan) was settled by Saka, not in the 2nd century B.C. but in the 6th century B.C., under the Achaemenids. His thesis is not widely supported. The most thorough refutation has been Daffina, L'immigrazione dei Saka nella Drangiana, 1967.
in the reign of Mithridates II, who, as will be discussed shortly, is recorded as having dealings with the Scythians.

Upon his death in 137 B.C., Mithridates handed on to his son, Phraates II, an empire which included Hyrkania, Parthia proper, Tapuria, Traxiana, Media, Babylonia, Assyria, Elymais and Persis. After several defeats at the hands of Demetrios' brother Antiokhos VII (Sidetes) and the loss of Babylonia, Phraates scored a devastating victory in the field, killing Antiokhos. Justin XLII.i is the only extant account of what followed:

'having proceeded to make war upon Syria, in revenge for the attempts of Antiochus on the Parthian dominions, [Phraates] was recalled, by hostilities on the part of the Scythians, to defend his own country. For the Scythians, having been induced, by the offer of pay, to assist the Parthians against Antiochus king of Syria, and not having arrived till the war was ended, were disappointed of the expected remuneration, and reproached with having brought their aid too late; and when, in discontent at having made so long a march in vain, they demanded that "either some recompence for their trouble, or another enemy to attack, should be assigned them", being offended at the haughty reply which they received, they began to ravage the country of the Parthians. Phraates, in consequence, marching against them, left a certain Himerus who had gained his favours in the bloom of youth, to take care of his kingdom'

The above passage has been interpreted literally by Altheim and Bivar. Phraates summoned the Scythians but when they arrived and found themselves unneeded, they started to ravage Parthia. The passage has been interpreted more freely by Tarn. The Scythians had crossed into Parthia uninvited and Phraates tried in vain to stave off the invasion by offering them mercenary service. It is impossible to say which of these two interpretations is most appropriate.

According to Justin XLII.i.5, Phraates took with him a body of Antiokhos' Greeks to meet the Saka and in the ensuing battle:

'...when they saw the Parthians giving ground they went over to the enemy, and executed that revenge for their long captivity, which they had long desired, by a sanguinary destruction of the Parthian army and of king Phraates himself'.

The fate of the Greeks who deserted to the Saka side is unknown, but it is possible, as Simonetta suggested, that the Saka allowed them to reach the Greek settlements in

6 For the evidence by which this date is fixed see Debevoise, *History of Parthia*, 1938 (1968), p.25.
7 Justin XLII.1; Diodoros XXXIV.16-17.
10 Rev. Selby-Watson's translation has been corrected at this point from 'Persians' to 'Parthians' (Parthorum).
Drangiana and that from there some may even have reached Menander's Indian Kingdom. It was Phraates' uncle, Artabanos (II) who took over not only the Parthian throne, but also a critical Saka problem. Little is known of the new monarch's reign other than that he would seem to have extracted peace terms from the Scythians in exchange for tribute. As a fragment of John of Antiokh records:

'When the Scythians were overrunning Mesopotamia and ravaging the Kingdom of Arsakes, the Parthian himself put an end to the war and after this he received the leadership and became tributary to the Scythians.'

Artabanos, however, refused to remain a subject for long, and was soon involved in yet another war with the Scythians, or at least one group called the 'Thogarii', a war in which he lost his life. As Justin XLII.ii.2 records:

'The Scythians, content with their victory, and having laid waste Parthia, returned home. Artabanus, making war upon the Thogarii, received a wound in the arm, of which he immediately died.'

This war may be dated to 124 B.C., for by 124/3 Himeros, involved in wars in the south, had clearly assumed the title of King.

It is noteworthy that where Phraates II is said in Justin XLII.i to have died fighting the Sacaraucæ, Artabanos II is said in Justin XLII.ii to have died fighting the Thogarii. Tarn believes it would have been impossible for the 'Tocharoi', who were behind the Saka, to be in contact with the Parthians in 124 B.C., but as Bivar writes:

'where the sources are so fragmentary as for these incidents, and the detailed succession of events so little known, it is best to retain the evidence of the texts so far as possible.'

The timetable of Scythian invasions will be investigated in more depth later in this chapter and Chapters 15 and 16.

13 See Diodoros XXXIV.21, Poseidonios F13; Simonetta, 'A new essay on Indo-Greeks', 1958, p.164. Debevoise, History of Parthia, 1938 (1968), p.38, makes the curious suggestion that Artabanos' wound was from a poisoned weapon, as if it would not otherwise have been fatal.
In 123 B.C. the Parthian throne was in the hands of the legitimate heir, Artabanos' son, Mithridates II, and according to Justin XLII.ii:

'He carried on many wars, with great bravery, against his neighbours, and added many provinces to the Parthian kingdom. He fought successfully, too, several times, against the Scythians, and avenged the injuries received from them by his forefathers'.

Tarn has argued convincingly that Mithridates II extended Parthia to the Aral Sea in the north and Merv in the east. Whether Mithridates II, like Mithridates I, had included in his conquests Baktria, is unclear. It is clear, however, that Mithridates II extended Parthian rule over Saka tribes in Drangiana and perhaps also in the Punjab.

The nomad overthrow of the Greko-Bactrian Kingdom.

For all the above allusions to Scythian pressure on the Parthians in the century before Mithridates II's accession, there are none to Scythian pressure on the Bactrian Greeks. When the extant record of Central Asian affairs next mentions Scythians in relation with the Greko-Bactrian kingdom, it is in connection with their total destruction of the kingdom. The last Greko-Bactrian dynasts fell some time during the reign of Artabanos, and Baktria was occupied by Scythians during the reign of Mithridates II. What happened and how the nomad conquest of Baktria might correlate with the nomad pressure on Parthia, is by no means clear. The problem is, however, of such a magnitude that a thorough investigation is called for.

15 Tarn, 'Seleucid-Parthian Studies', 1930, pp.120-121, basing the thesis on finds of 'campaign coins', on Chang Ch'ien's report, wherein Merv appears to be Parthian and wherein Parthia is said to be bound on the north by the An-ts'ai and to be close to the Oxos in the west. Tarn concludes, ibid., p.121, 'that in 115 Mithridates II was overlord of the Massagetae up to the lower Oxus and the Aral, which brought his rule up to the bounds of the Aorsi'.

16 Konow, Kharoshti Inscriptions, 1929, p.xxx, 'Kalawān Copper-plate Inscription of the Year 134', 1932, p.959, and 'Indo-Scythian Chronology', 1933, pp.16-18, suggested that the Saka moved into Seistan during the reigns of Phraates II (138-128 B.C.) and Artabanos I (128-123 B.C.), a period in which the Saka won numerous victories over the Parthians, but under Mithridates II (123-88 B.C.) Parthian suzerainty was extended over the Saka in Seistan, and indeed, Parthian pressure forced many Saka from Seistan on to the Indus. Narain, 'The early movement of the Sakas and the Pahlavas', 1969, p.75, does not entirely reject Thomas' thesis, in 'Sakastana', 1906, pp.181-200 & 460-466, that the Scythians settled Seistan in the Achaemenid period, but does reject Thomas' thesis that Scythians could not possibly have settled there in the 2nd century B.C. Narain sees Mithridates II arranging the settlement of the Scythians in Seistan, where there may have been earlier Scythian settlement.

Entry into the above problem is afforded by the following brief records of Strabo and Justin. Strabo wrote (XI.viii.2) that of those Scythians situated east of the Daai, named Massagetai and Sakai:

"Μάλιστα δὲ γνωρίμων γεγόνασί τάν νομόδων σι τούς ἐλληνας ἀφελόμενοι τήν βακτριανήν, Ἀσιοὺ καὶ Πασιανοὶ καὶ Τοχαροὶ καὶ Ἑλεφραυλοί, ὁμοθέντες ἀπὸ τῆς περαιάς τοῦ Ἰαξάρτου τῆς κατὰ Σάκας καὶ Σογδιανοὺς, ἤν κατείχον Σάκαι."

This passage might be translated as follows:

"...the best known of the nomads are those who took away Bactriana from the Greeks, I mean the Asii, Pasiani, Tochari, and Sacarauli, who originally came from the country on the other side of the Iaxartes River that adjoins that of the Sacae and the Sogdiani and was occupied by the Sacae'.

The Prologus to Trogus' book XLI reads:

"deinde quo regnante Scythicae gentes, Saraucae et Asiani, Bactra occupavere et Sogdianos"

and to Trogus' book XLII:

"Additae his res Scythicae. Reges Tocharum Asiani interitusque Saraucarum'.

The first of the above entries in the Prologus to Trogus' book XLI is usually translated as: 'Since then it has been ruled by Scythian people, the Saraucae and the Asiani, who occupied Bactria and Sogdia', and the second of the above entries as: 'Added to this is the history of the Scythians. The Asiani (became) kings of the Thocari and the Saraucae are annihilated.' The commonly accepted translation of the second entry may, however, in the light of the discussion to follow in Chapter 15, need to be reconsidered.

As has been noted earlier, the similarities between the material presented in these texts, have been noted by most scholars. Indeed, in 1917 Charpentier was prepared to reduce Strabo's catalogue of four tribes to three, by postulating the reduction of πασιανοὶ ἄνδρον, thus bringing Strabo's catalogue into even closer alignment with Trogus19. Curiously, however, Charpentier did not argue that the two catalogues were drawn from a common source. Similarly Haloun and Bachhofer, who later adopted Charpentier's reduction, posited different sources for the two accounts20.

18 '...the best known of the nomads are those who took away Bactriana from the Greeks, I mean the Asii, Pasiani, Tochari, and Sacarauli, who originally came from the country on the other side of the Iaxartes River that adjoins that of the Sacae and the Sogdiani and was occupied by the Sacae'.
19 Charpentier, 'Die ethnographische Stellung der Tocharer', 1917, pp.366-370. See also Chapter 13.
Similarities between Trogus' and Strabo's catalogues were also noted by numerous scholars, but very few scholars have commented upon Charpentier's reduction or tackled the question of the relationship between the texts. Indeed, Altheim's 1947 extension of Charpentier's thesis that the catalogues name the same tribes, into a thesis that Apollodoros was not only Strabo's but also Trogus' source, has hardly raised its head since receiving that blow from Tam in its year of publication.

Even if Charpentier's reduction is not to be accepted, and it will shortly be argued that it ought not be, the similarity between Strabo's and Justin's account of the invasion of Baktria are strong enough to justify the identification of both accounts as reworkings of the same Apollodorian original.

Piecing together the events which led up to, and immediately followed, the overthrow of the Greko-Baktrians from the slender ancient testimony available has been a challenge scholars have for a century met with great imagination. Too often, however, scholars have employed their imagination to perform but one task. They have tried to identify the tribes named by Strabo with as many tribes named in as wide a sample of ancient literature (ancient Near Eastern, Indian, Chinese etc.) as possible. Too often these identifications and localisations are based solely upon the phonetic similarity of the tribal-names and no attention is paid to the concept behind the name, and the context in which the name is used. Accordingly, despite the mass of scholarship devoted to the ethnic identification and geographical localisations of Strabo's tribes, there is room for a contribution in which the tribal-names are treated not as easily equatable objects, but as context moulded concepts. The most important questions associated with Strabo's four tribal names might now be discussed.

Asioi.

---


22 Tam, 'rev. of Altheim', 1947, p.141. See also Chapter 13.
One question Asioi frequently raises in the minds of modern scholars is whether Justin’s reference to them defeating the Thocari is an allusion to the same event recorded in the Chinese History, the Han Shu, as the Wu-sun’s conquest of the Yüeh-chih. Modern scholars invariably believe it was, and thus effectively identify the Asioi with the Wu-sun. The reasons they offer are many. Firstly, it is argued that Asioi and Wu-sun are phonetic renderings of the same indigenous tribal-name. Secondly, the Han Shu testifies to a Wu-sun homeland in the Tarim Basin and references to Arči in a 7th century A.D. Dialect A document from the north Tarim basin and to arsi in two 8th century Turkic documents form the Orkhon, are taken as testifying to an Asioi homeland in this same region.

Thirdly, the Thocari whom Trogus Prologus suggests the Asii conquered can be identified with the Yüeh-chih whom the Wu-sun conquered.

All of the above reasons are of dubious value. Firstly, the phonetic equation of Asioi with Wu-sun can not be substantiated. Secondly, as Bailey has pointed out, arči in all probability meant ‘beggar monk’, and was not an ethnonym. Thirdly, as will be discussed in Chapter 15, in the sub-section on Wu-sun, the Wu-sun defeat of the Yüeh-


24 Sieg, 'Ein einheimischer Name für Toxri', 1918, pp.560ff.


26 See Chapter 15.


28 Bailey, 'Taugara', 1937, p.906 (Cf. Pelliot, 'A propos du "Tokharian", 1936, p.265). Bailey’s thesis was immediately attacked by Sieg, who defended his old identification in 'Und dennoch "Tocharisch" ', 1937, pp.130-139, and in 1944, pp.81-91, offered as an alternative to Bailey’s etymology Arsi < *argo, the indigenous name of the Karashahr, and the name the Chinese seem to represent in the 1st century A.D. as (Yen-ch’i, *ian-g’i). Thus, just the Orkhon inscriptions referred to toquuz arsin, ‘the nine arsi’, the Sui-shu 3/1a reads ....... 國內凡有九城

The land of the Yen-ch’i (Karashahr)... There are nine cities in their land'. Similarly in Pei-shih 97/1a and Wei-shu 102/7a. Thus the nine arsi of the Turkic inscriptions are the nine Yen-ch’i, or Karashahr, cities of the Chinese histories. This etymology would seem to preclude as effectively as Bailey’s does, the identification of the Arci/Arsi with the Asioi of the Greek texts.
chih, was simply a victory in the field, and the Wu-sun did not become kings of the Yüeh-chih.

Another question scholars have asked is whether Justin's reference to 'Reges Tocharum Asiani...' might not be an allusion to the establishment of the Kushan Empire. Scholars have invariably taken it to be just this, and this has amounted to an identification of the Asiani with the Kushanas. Indeed, a phonetic equation between Asiani and Kushana has even been argued. A close investigation of the texts which record the Asiani's and Kushana's rise to power, however, suggest a chronological problem with this identification. The Chinese History, the *Hou Han Shu*, compiled in the 4th century A.D., but based on 1st century A.D. materials, gives an account of how more than a hundred years after the Yüeh-chih moved into Ta Hsia, the old Greko-Baktrian kingdom, and divided the land into 5 hsi-hou, or princedoms, one of these princedoms, that of Kuei-shuang conquered the other four and went on to build a mighty empire. This is clearly an allusion to the foundation of the Kushan Empire. The Yüeh-chih's division of Ta-hsia into 5 hsi-hou could not have taken place before or during Chang Ch'ien's sojourn in Ta Hsia in 27 B.C., and thus the Kuei-shuang's unification of the hsi-hou more than one hundred years after their establishment, could not have occurred before 26 B.C. Trogus referred to the Asii and Thocari somewhere in his 42nd and last book. This book offered a narrative of world history from the death of Mithridates I in 137 B.C. to the return of the Roman eagles in 20 B.C. If the event is to correspond with that recorded in the *Hou Han Shu*, then it must have occurred sometime between 26 B.C. and 20 B.C.

---

29 There is, as Haloun, 'Zur Üe-tši-Frage', 1937, p.253 and Bachhofer, 'On Greeks and Sakas in India', 1941, p.245 noted, no hint in any Chinese text that the kings of the Yüeh-chih were of different stock to the populace, nor that the Wu-sun entered Baktria, as the Asiani did.


33 Ibid.

Though a date between 26 and 20 B.C. is possible, for several reasons it is improbable. Firstly, the Hou Han Shu says 'more than a hundred years later', and this may mean at a date a long time after 26 B.C. Secondly, though Trogus' dates are uncertain, he had probably finished writing his history sometime before the end of the 1st century B.C. As most of the Kushan expansion came in the first century A.D. it is unlikely that Trogus, writing at the end of the 1st century B.C., would have considered the dynastic change, if he had received notice of it, important enough to warrant inclusion in his history. Thirdly, to suggest that Trogus had received information that the Asii had become kings of the Thocari sometime between 26 and 20 B.C., is to suggest that a scholar, who was writing nearly a century after Apollodoros' death, used Apollodoros' ethnonyms in an account of later events. This is unlikely. It is much more probable that Trogus had mentioned the Asioi and Tochari in a much earlier part of Book 42, that is, soon after Phraates' accession in 137 B.C. and was not alluding to the establishment of the Kushan Empire.

There has been one other set of phonetic equations favoured by modern scholars. Strabo's Asioi were identified by Gutschmid in 1888 and Marquart in 1901 with the Iatioi of Ptolemy VI.xii.4. That Ptolemy's source may have been using a modified form of the old Asioi is extremely probable. These above scholars extension of the equation to include the Chinese term, the Yüeh-chih 首, the archaic pronunciation being represented by Gutschmid and Marquart as Goat-ti, is not, however, as compelling.

One final identification is that of the Asioi with the Yüeh-chih and the Asioi's conquest of the Tocharians with the Yüeh-chih's conquest of Ta Hsia. Though these equations might draw considerable support from the phonetic identification of the Asioi with the Arci and with Yüeh-chih, these identifications are of dubious value and, more importantly, unnecessary. The greatest support for this identification comes from the likelihood that Apollodoros was responsible for all occurrences of Asioi in Trogus' work, and that by the 'Reges Tocharum Asiani...", Trogus was describing not the later unification of the Yüeh-
chih under the Kushana's, but the initial Yüeh-chih conquest of Ta Hsia, that is, the old Greko-Baktrian lands.

Pasianoi.

The main question scholars have addressed to Pasianoi, in the absence of any other extant reference to a tribe by this name, is whether this was what Strabo's source had really written. Most scholars have argued it was not. Many 'corrections' have been offered.

In 1900 Schlegel wanted to correct Pasianoi to Gasianoi, the initial consonants being confused in Greek, and wanted to see in the later a variant on the name 'Get', the root of the name 'Massagetai'. He saw the Chinese Yüeh-chih  as an attempt to render the word 'Get' phonetically. The form 'Gasianoi' is, however, not to be found in any other ancient text, and the archaic pronounciation of Yüeh-chih is far from certain. The correction is not compelling.

In 1917 Charpentier wanted to eliminate Pasianoi altogether by reducing Pasianoi to . Charpentier was followed by Konow, Haloun, Bachhoffer and Narain. By so doing Strabo's account is brought into almost exact correspondence with Justin's. As has suggested earlier, it is surprising this possibility has not sponsored identifications of Trogus' source as Apollodoros. Yet though the present author finds the identification of Trogus' source as Apollodoros compelling, he does not find Charpentier's reduction compelling. Pasianoi can not so easily be erased from Strabo's text.

Just as Ptolemy's (VI.xii.4) might be the equivalent of Strabo's "Δαιοι, so might Ptolemy's Πασιανοι (VI.xii.4) be the equivalent of Strabo's Πασιανοι. Just as the "Δαιοι and Πασιανοι appear next to each other in Strabo's catalogue (XI.viii.2), so the 'Δαιοι and Πασιανοι appear next to each other in Ptolemy's...

---

39 For a full discussion of this theory see Chapter 15.
catalogue, between the lower Oxos and lower Iaxartes\textsuperscript{44}. Haussig has pointed out that Pasianoi and Paskai can be easily be explained in terms of variations upon an original Paskinoi\textsuperscript{45}.

It is unlikely that Ptolemy was simply building upon Strabo's errors. These ethnonyms of Ptolemy may in go back to the 1st century B.C. itinerary of Maes Titianus, the mentioned in Ptolemy's Geographia, or even back to the 2nd century B.C. work of Apollodoros of Artemita. The suspicion that Ptolemy's work incorporated mutated forms of names drawn from a work contemporary with Apollodoros', if not Apollodoros', are greatly strengthened when it is noted that not only do Apollodoros' Asioi and Pasianoi seem to have equivalents in Ptolemy's work, but so do Apollodoros' Tocharoi and Sakarauloi. In Ptolemy VI.xii.4 there is reference to Σόχοροι and Αὐγάλαι\textsuperscript{46}. If then Strabo's 'Pasianoi' is not able to be 'corrected', with what other tribal-name might it be linked?

The suggestion has often been made that the name 'Pasianoi' is connected with the name 'Parsa', and designates an eastern wing of the Persian people\textsuperscript{47}. The dropping of the consonant 'r' is not, however, easily explained.

The most attractive identification to-date is one which was in fact made over a hundred years ago. de St.Martin identified the 'Pasianoi' with the 'Ἀπασιάκαι\textsuperscript{48}. Variants of the latter might be detected in the 'Ἀπασιάκει' and 'Ἀπασιάκαι', manuscript variations of Strabo XI.viii.8, the 'Ἀπασιάκαι of Polybios X.48, and the 'Ἀπεύλωι or 'Ἀπάλωι of Ptolemy VI.xiv. The identification was supported by Gutschmid in 1888, Daffina in 1967 and Gnoli in 1980\textsuperscript{49}, and though the identification

\textsuperscript{44} Ptolemy VI.xii.4: 'The territories close to the Oxian mountains are inhabited by the Pasikai, those along the northern section of the Iaxartes by the Iatioi and the Tachoroi; below these dwell the Augaloi...'.

\textsuperscript{45} Haussig, 'Theophylakts Exkurs', 1953, p.421. Strabo's variation may have been the result of a misreading of ΠΑΣΚΙΝΗΣ ΠΑΣΙΑΝΟΙ. Ptolemy's variation may have been the result of a contraction of Paskinoi to Paskai. Altheim, Geschichte der Hunnen, 1959, p.64 refers to Haussig's theory but claims that the identification remains improbable.

\textsuperscript{46} See Herzfeld, 'Sakasten', 1935, pp.26-27, and sections on Tocharoi and Sakarauloi.


was rejected by Charpentier in 1917 and Umjakov in 1940\textsuperscript{50}, there are several good reasons for accepting it. The identification is both phonetically and geographically acceptable.

The four tribes said by Strabo to have overthrown the Greko-Baktrians ought not be thought to have restricted their activity to Baktria. The tribes were clearly involved in wars with both the Baktrians and Parthians. It is therefore not improbable that the 'Apasiakai' from whom Arsakes' Aparnoi may have come, and whose assistance 'Tiridates' sought against Seleukos II, were the 'Pasianoi' whom Strabo mentions in connection with the Greko-Baktrians. The variation in the form of the name might have been the responsibility of either scribes copying Apollodoros' work or near contemporaries reworking Apollodoros' work.

The only question remaining is then, why does Justin not mention either the 'Pasianoi' or the 'Apasiakai' in connection with the overthrow of the Greeks in Baktria, if the 'Pasianoi' were mentioned in Strabo's source, even though the name might be a manuscript variation of 'Apasiakai', and if, as argued above, Trogus and Strabo shared a common source, Apollodoros. The answer might be that he effectively does. Brief mention of the Asiani, Saraucae and Thocari is made in the Prologi to Trogus' books XLI & XLII. In his epitome of these books, however, Justin makes no mention of any Asiani, Saraucae or Thocari overthrow of the Baktrian Greeks. The overthrow of the Baktrian Greeks is attributed to the Parthians. It has been argued above that the Parthian dynasts had a close relationship with certain Daai tribes, and one of these tribes, the Apasiakai, was even used in a war with Seleukos II. It is possible that Mithridates I had used these same nomads in his invasion of Baktria, and Strabo's reference to an Apasiakai assisted overthrow of the Baktrian kingdom, and Justin's reference to, at one point, a Parthian overthrow, and, at another point, a Saka overthrow, are entirely consistent.

Tokharoi.

The secondary literature on the 'Tokharoi' easily outweighs the few extant uses of this term. It does not, however, outweigh the mass of questions which might be addressed to these extant uses. These questions have tended to constitute two 'Tocharian problems'.

\textsuperscript{50} Charpentier, 'Die ethnographische Stellung', 1917, p.366; Umjakov, 'Тохарская проблема', 1940, p.185.
The first 'Tocharian problem', and that which scholars usually mean when they refer to the Tocharian problem, is the problem of determining the linguistic affinities of the languages in which manuscripts found at the end of the last century near Kucha were written and the ethnic affinities and self-appellations of the language's speakers. 'Bactrian' was used in coins and inscriptions from the Baktrian heartland of the Kushan Empire, the Tokharistan of the early medieval Muslim geographers, dating from 1st century B.C. This dialect was written in a form of Greek script. There is no record of the name by which the speakers of this dialect called themselves, but they were doubtlessly the Tocharoi of Strabo, and perhaps the 'Toxri' of a 9th century Uighur colophon. 'Khotanese' or 'Khotan Saka', was used in all sorts of texts from the southern Tarim Basin, Khotan and Tumshuq, dating from the 4th to 10th century A.D. This language was written in a form of north-west Brahmi. The main self-appellation of the speakers seems to be 'hvatanau'. 'Sogdian' was used in manuscripts of Buddhist, Manichaean and Christian texts, comprising of letters and epics, dating from about the 4th century to the 9th century A.D. This language was written in a west-Syriac script.

Besides the Iranian languages there was a non-Iranian, Indo-European language being spoken often called 'Tocharian'. Whether this language ought be classed as a centum or satem language and if centum, whether it had affinities with Celtic or Thrako-Phrygian Kimmerian was once a matter of debate. Of the manuscripts collected there are Buddhist texts from near Karashahr in what has come to be called Tocharian A, and Buddhist,


52 Huan Ts'ang described the language of Tokharistan as being written with an alphabet of 25 letters form left to right. This was clearly a Greek alphabet with the addition of a letter to represent 'S'. See Walters, On Yuan Chwangs travels in India, 1904-5 (1973), p.103.

53 Müller, 'Тохри und Kuišan', 1918, pp.566-586. Henning, 'Argi and the "Tokharians"', 1938, p.549 argues, however, that the Toxri of the Uighur colophon are not the same as the Tokharians.


55 Ibid., p.66.

historical, economic, magical and medical texts from Kucha and the region to the east of Kucha as far as Tun-huang in what is now called Tocharian B. The texts were all written in modified forms of Brahmi. The speakers of Dialect A have been variously identified with the Arsi, Twgri, and Agni mentioned in 7th century Uighur and 8th century Sanscrit texts57. Identification with the Arsi has, as seen above, set off a series of identifications with the Asioi of Strabo and the 'Wu-sun' of the Chinese sources58. The identification with the 'twgri' has set off a series of identifications, starting with the Thorougharoi which Ptolemy located in the Tarim Basin, progressing through Justin's Thogarii to Strabo's Tocharari59.

The identification of the speakers of this new Indo-European language with Strabo's Tocharari has led in the first place to the language being dubbed 'Tocharian', and in the second to a migration of a powerful Indo-European speaking people eastward to the Tarim Basin and then back westward to Baktria being postulated60.

It has, however, been noted by some scholars that no name like Tokharian or the Uighur 'twgri' can be found in any text of this language, that the people of Kuchi could not be the 'twgri' as they are referred to in the same Uighur colophon as 'kwysan' and that the term arsi was not a self-appellation but possibly a word for a 'beggar monk'61. Thus, there are no grounds for calling the speakers of this non-Iranian language 'Asioi', 'Wu-sun' or 'Tocharians', and no grounds for linking the nomad migration into Baktria with the migration of a western Indo-European speaking people into the Tarim Basin.

58 See Chapter 14 'Asioi' and Chapter 17 'Wu-sun'.
59 See Chapter 14 'Tocharoi'; Müller, Beitrage zur genaueren Bestimmung der unbekannten Sprachen Mittelasiens, 1907, pp.958ff and 'Toxri und Kui§an', 1918, pp.566-586; Sieg and Siegling, 'Tocharisch, die Sprach der Indoskythen', 1908, pp.915ff. and Tocharische Sprachreste, I, 1921.
60 e.g.Charpentier, 'Die ethnographische Stellung', 1917, pp.347-388; Haloun, Seit wann kannten die Chinesen die Tocharer, 1926; Heine-Gelden, 'Das Tocharerproblem und die pontische Wanderung', 1951, pp.225-255.
Though the Iranian language spoken in Baktria better deserves the name 'Tocharian' than any language in the Tarim Basin, Languages A and B have become too well known as 'Tocharian' for the usage to be changed. Baktrian has accordingly been called 'Eteo-Tocharian'62. The 'Tokharoi' cannot be identified with the speakers of Language A and B63.

The second 'Tokharian problem' is the problem of tracing the history of the tribal-name Tokharoi, and the history of the tribe which Strabo called Tokharoi and said invaded Baktria. The problem may be investigated firstly through an examination of tribal-names, upon which Tokharoi might be a variant, or which might be a variant upon Tokharian. Besides the possible similarity with Ptolemy's Θάγουροι, Τάχοροι and Τάχωροι, Justin's 'Thogarii' and the Uighur 'twgri', explored above, the similarities with the Assyrian 'Tuḥarru', Indian 'Tukhara', Pliny's 'Attacorae', the Khotanese 'taugara', and the Chinese 'Tu-ho-lo' deserve consideration.

The 'Tuharra' are mentioned as a town-dwelling mountain people in the Annals of Shenacherib (705-681 B.C.)64. Their identification with the Tocharians was quite popular in the late 19th century65. In more recent years two objections have been raised to the identification. Firstly, in 1935 Haloun pointed out that Tuharru is only one possible reading of the Assyrian cuneiform66. Luckenbill, for example, transliterates the name Tumurru 67.

Secondly, in 1940 Umnjakov noted that no Assyrian army ever marched so far east that they could be expected to contact Tokharians68. Both these objections are, however, answerable. Though the cuneiform may be read in several ways, uharru remains, by Haloun's own admission, a possible reading69. Though Assyrian armies may not have marched very far east there is the possibility Assyrians contacted the 'Tuharru' nearer home
and the ethnonym was used out of its original context when applied to Central Asia. One objection, however, entirely rules out the possibility that the Tokharoi might be identified with the 'Tuhaarru'. The latter are described in the Annals of Shenacherib as being a town dwelling mountain people, and so the name would hardly have been used to designate a later day nomad people.

The Ttaugara, a place name found in a 10th century A.D. Khotanese text from Tun-huang has been identified by Bailey and Pelliot with Ptolemy’s Ṭaγόρα and the ethnonym Ṭukhāra has been seen in both toponyms.

The Tukhara are frequently mentioned as a northern people in the many early Indian texts, in particular in the sanscrit epic the Mahabharata, and numerous Puranic texts, including the 'Dynasties of the Kali age'. Though the people's name is often given as Tushāra, not Tukhāra, the 'sh' was often used in ancient northern Indian to represent a spoken 'kh', so the pronunciation of the name was in both cases very close to Tokharoi. Though the concept of Tukhara varies greatly depending upon the text, even part of text, in which it is found, they are often associated with Śaka (Saka), Yavana (the Indo-Greeks), Kuśa (Kushanas) and Cinas (Seres), and are always located to the north, often north of the Himalayas. In the Dynasties text, fourteen Tukhara kings are said to have ruled India after the rule of 4 Yavana kings. Though there are innumerable problems with the chronology implied in the Dynasties list, this might at least imply the Tukhara replaced the Bactrian Greeks, just as Strabo says the Tocharoi did. Thus, both the names and the concepts behind the names, of the people Strabo called the 'Tokharoi' and the Indians 'Tukhāra' are similar.

Numerous variants of Tho-gar' are to be found in 8th-9th century A.D. Tibetan documents from the Tung-huang region. The references usually seem to be to that people the Chinese

---

71 See esp. Mahabharata II.51; III.51 & 177; VI.75; VIII.73 & 88; XII.65, and the Dynasties text, pp.45, 47 & 72. See also Lassen, Indische Altertumskunde, 1867 (1968), pp.1023-5; Yule, 'Hswen Thsang's account of Tokhāristan', 1873, p.95; Pelliot, 'Tokharian et Koutchéen', 1934, p.34; Puri, 'The nationality of the Kushans' 1975, pp.185-6 & 189.
74 See Bagchi, 'Ancient Indian History up to 711 A.D.', 1943, pp.28-29 & 35-39.
called the little Yüeh-chih, thus encouraging suspicions that the Yüeh-chih may have called
themselves something similar to 'Tochara' long before they arrived in Baktria- indeed,
while they were still in the Tarim Basin75.

The Attacori are named as an eastern people in Pliny VI.xx.55. Their identification with the
Tocharoi was first made by Richthofen, without supporting arguments, in 187776. In 1917
Charpentier advanced two arguments in support of the identification77. Firstly, the Attacori
differs from Tochari in only two respects- an initial 'a' and an inversion of vowels. Both
are easily explicable in terms of Iranian dialectic variance, and transmission out of Iranian
into Greek. Secondly, the Attacori are mentioned by Pliny in a very similar context to that
in which Dionysius mentions 'Tocharoi'. Pliny offers the catalogue: Seres, Attacori, Thuni
and Focari, Casiri, Scythians, Indian nomads. Dionysios offers the catalogue: Tocharoi,
Phrounroi and Seres78. Charpentier did not, however, exhaust all possible supporting
arguments.

To Charpentier's arguments one more might be added. The phonetic gap between Tocharoi
and Attacori closes dramatically when note is taken of what appear to be 'intermediary'
forms. To Ptolemy's Thagouroi (VI.5), usually taken as a variant of Tokharoi, there are the
manuscript variations Ithagouroi and Athagouroi, and Ammianus Marcellinus
(XXIII.vi.66) has Athagryae 79.

The possibility that  Τόχαροι and Attacori' might be related forms must, however, be
rejected for the following reason. The Tokharoi would seem to have a close parallel in the
Tukhara of the Mahabaharata, the Attacori would seem to have a close parallel, indeed

---

75 Rerikh, Παμάτε στοχαρακι τη Τιμέτε', 1964, pp.140-143.
76 Richthofen, China, 1877, I, pp.490-491.
77 Charpentier, 'Die ethnographische Stellung', 1917, p.355.
78 Pliny VI.55: Ab Atacoris gentes Thuni et Focari et, iam Indorum, Casiri introrsus ad
Scythes versi hum anis corporibus vescuntur' and Dionysios, Periegesis v.752:
Τόχαροι, ἄρουντες τε, καὶ ἐθνα βάρβαρα Σηρᾶν. Cf. Rufus Festus
Avienus (4th cent. A.D.), Description of the earth, vv.933-935: Inde cruenti sunt
Tochari, Phrunique truces, et inhospita Seres arva habitant (Coedes, Textes d'auteur
grec et latins relatif à I'Extème Orient,1910, p.72) and Eustathios (12th cent. A.D.),
Paraphrasing Dionysios, vv.749ff.: ἵππαρχουσι δὲ καὶ οἱ Τόχαροι
καὶ οἱ Φρούροι καὶ τὰ βάρβαρα έθνη τῶν Σηρᾶν (Coedes, ibid.,
p.159).
79 Kingsmill, 'Ancient Tibet and its Frontagers', 1916, p.34, suggests a link between
Ammianus' Athagorae, Ptolemy's Thagouroi, and Pliny's Attacori, but does not
include Strabo's Tocharoi in the equation.
come from, the Uttara-kurru, 'Northern tribes', of this same great Indian epic. Though the Mahabharata was written and rewritten over the course of centuries, it is virtually inconceivable that in this period a term would leave north India for use in the Greek world, there be mutilated beyond recognition, and then return to be incorporated into the same epic, virtually alongside the original term. Kingsmill's linking of the Uttara-Kurru, who in Indian tradition are often believed to be one of the 'Lunar races', with the Yüeh-chih, whose name in the Chinese annals means 'Lunar branch/people', is entirely unconvincing.

In the mid-7th century A.D. report of Hsuan-tsang, the Wei-shu, the T'ang-shu and in the numerous translations of Indian Buddhist texts Tu-ho-lo is used to designate an area approximating Baktria and corresponding almost exactly, it would seem, with the territory inhabited by the Tukhara of Indian literature.

Ta Hsia 夜支, the name Chang Ch'ien used to refer to Baktria, has often been taken to be an attempted phonetic rendering of Tokharoi, but this phonetic equation has been soundly rejected by Haloun on the grounds that the phonetic similarity is not so near as to support the equation, and that the term 夜支 was used in Chinese literature long before Chang Ch'ien's day to designate a 'Wandervolk der Weltrandfablegeographie'.

The conceptual equation of Tokharians with Ta Hsia ought not, however, be as quickly dismissed. Though Strabo's inclusion of the Tokharians among the nomads who overthrew the Greeks in Baktria, would seem to preclude the equation of the Tocharians

---

80 Ptolemy VI.xvi.2-3 for ὄττοροκόρβας ὄρος, VI.xvi.6 for ὄττοροκόρβας ὄρος, VI.xvi.8 and VIII.xxiv.8 for ὄττοροκόρβας (πολύς).
83 e.g.Kingsmill, 'Intercourse of China with eastern Turkestan', 1882, p.77; 'Ancient Tibet and its Frontages', 1906, p.42; Marquart, Eränfahr, 1901, p.204; Shiratori, 'A study on Su-té', 1928, p.144; Bagchi, 'Ancient Indian History', 1943, p.36; Pulleyblank, 'Chinese and Indo-Europeans', 1966, p.22, n.5; Lindegger, Griechische und römische Quellen, I, 1979, p.90 n.9.
84 See Haloun, 'Zur Üe-tși-Frage', 1937, pp.289-290 and the material presented in Chapter 16, under 'Ta Hsia'. This phonetic equation was not supported by Konow (e.g. 'War "Tocharisch" die Sprache der Tocharer?', 1933, pp.463-4) even though he supported the identification of Ta Hsia with the Tokharians.
with the Greeks in Baktria, it ought not preclude their equation with one of the nomad peoples who overthrew the Greko-Baktrians. The equation with a people from the region of Baktria, in fact renders much easier the task of interpreting the classical record.

It has been argued that Justin's record of the Asii's conquest of the Thocari, could not have been an allusion to the Kushans rise to power, and might be reference to the Yüeh-chih's conquest of Ta Hsia. This would suggest not only that Strabo's Asioi is the approximate equivalent of Chang Ch'ien's Yüeh-chih, but also that Strabo's Tocharoi might be the approximate equivalent of Chang Ch'ien's Ta Hsia, that is, Baktria. The later Chinese use of T'u-ho-lo for Ta Hsia would reinforce this suspicion.

The main problem is then that if an equation between Tokharoi and Yüeh-chih is abandoned and the existence of two separate peoples is postulated, how do we account for Ptolemy naming Thagouroi in the very place were the Chinese would have the Yüeh-chih homeland?

The main casualties of the above revision are the theories which have most caught the scholarly imagination. Firstly, that a non-Iranian speaking people calling themselves something like 'Tokharians' migrated from western Eurasia eastward to the Tarim Basin, where they eventually divided into two groups, one which settled there and spoke the languages used in the 7th century A.D. at Kucha and Karashahr, the other group migrating south west into Baktria. Secondly, that the Yüeh-chih, whom Chang Ch'ien recorded as conquering Ta Hsia, overthrew the Greko-Baktrians.

Sakarauloi.

As the above tribal-name clearly contains the ethnonym 'Saka', there has been little scholarly debate over the ethnic and linguistic affinities of the people Strabo designated

85 This is Konow's position, e.g. in 'War ''Tocharisch'' die Sprache der Tocharer?', 1933, pp. 463-464.
86 One of the few modern scholars to see this possibility is Haneda, 'A propos des Ta Yue-tche et des Kouei-chouang', 1933, pp. 15-18. Though Haneda sees the Ta Hsia - Tokharian equation as the corollary of a Yüeh-chih - Asioi equation, he does not support the phonetic equations of the latter, offered by Marquart, Eransahr, 1901, pp. 204-7, and with the addition into the equation of 'Arsi', Müller, Toxri und Kuıšan', 1918, p. 569. As Haneda argues, if the Chinese had wanted to write 'Arsi', they would have used the same character they used for the same syllable in 'Arsak', that is , and would not have used ❯.
with this name. The questions which most scholars have addressed to the people designated by *Sakarauloi* are with what other tribal-names known from ancient literature might they be linked, and in what region were they most active. It is to these questions which the discussion might now turn.

No scholar has failed to identify Strabo's Σακαρούλοι with Justin's *Saraucae* and Lukian's Σαραγκοῖ. The earliest form in which this tribal-name may have been recorded may safely be supposed to be closest to either Strabo's or Lukian's form. The legend of a Hephthalite coin found in Begram, Afghanistan, reads, ΣΑΚΑΥΡ[ . . ]88. Many scholars have seen 'Sakarauloi'/Sarauka' as being derived from *Saka-rawaka,* but have varied in their theories as to the meaning of this original form. Some believe it meant 'Saka kings,' others 'quick Saka.' Objections have been raised to these derivations on the grounds that the form *Saka-rawaka* is nowhere attested in Greek, Persian or Indian sources. Should, however, the name have the meaning 'itinerant Saka,' it is possible the name is being echoed in the Greek when νομιδές is added to Sakai/Scythians.

Jacobi identified the *Sakarauloi* of Strabo and the *Saraucae* of Trogus with a people, the *Sagakula,* mentioned in the Jain legend of Kulaka, the Kalakacarya Katha. In 1873 Yule identified the land of *Sagakula* with the small Hindu-kush kingdom which Húan Tsang called Kii-lang-na, and in 1917 Charpentier argued that the Sakarauloi/Sagakula arrived in this area after conquering Baktria and being thrown out by the Asii.

---

87 One of the scholars failing to see Saka affinities in the 'Sakarauloi' is Kingsmill, who in his 'Ancient Tibet and its Frontages', 1906, p.42, saw this tribe, along with most other ancient central Asian tribes, as Turkic.
88 Hansen & Altheim, 'Die Berliner Hephthalitenfragmente', 1951, p.95.
92 Jacobi, cited by Charpentier, 'Die ethnographische Stellung...', 1917, p.368. For a fuller account of the insights this legend offers into the history of Saka tribes on the Indus in the 1st century B.C. and A.D., see Bagchi, 'Ancient Indian History', 1943, p.32. For an overview of the different extant versions of the story of Kalakacharya, see Da’ji, 'The inroads of the Scythians into India, and the story of Kalakacharya', 1872, pp.139-146.
93 Yule, 'Hwen Thsang's Account', 1873, pp.110-112.
94 Charpentier, 'Die ethnographische Stellung', 1917, p.368.
That these *Sagakula* were Saka is clear. The shift to *Saga* from the older Indian *Śaka* presents no problem. It is, however, also clear that they could not have been Hüan Ts'ang's *Kū-lang-u*. The phonetic similarity fades when the possible archaic pronunciation of the Chinese characters is investigated. Nor could they be Strabo's *Sakaraauloi*, which bears little phonetic resemblance beyond beginning, as hundreds of tribal-names must have, with the name *Saka*. It is more probable, as many scholars have suggested, that *Sakaraauloi/Sakaraukai* came from an original form *Śaka-Rawaka*, meaning 'Saka kings'.

Besides postulating an eastward migration of the remnants of the Sakaraauloi, Charpentier also postulated a westward one. In 1940 Umnjakov reckoned this westward migration of part of the defeated Sakaraauloi as an even stronger possibility than the eastern. Variants of the tribal-name appear in connection with the history of Parthia and the geography of the Chorasmian region.

'Augaloi' in Ptolemy VI.xii.4 is clearly a corruption of Sakaraauloi. This makes Ptolemy's reproduction of Apollodorus' catalogue complete. Where Strabo (VI.xii.4) had Asioi, Pasianoi, Thocari and Sakaraauloi, Ptolemy has strung out along the Syr Darya the Iatioi, Pasianoi, Thakoroi and Augaloi.

96 Umnjakov, *Тохарская проблема*, 1940, p.185.
98 There has been some debate over the origin of Ptolemy's *Geography*. Bagrow, *The origin of Ptolemy's Geographia*, 1945, pp.318-387, argue that the work extant under Ptolemy's name is nothing more than a careless Byzantine conflation of various ancient sources, into which some Slavic names have even crept. This argument was supported by Hambis, *Recherches sur les Saces*, 1974, p.496. While careless duplications of ancient names, such as 'Sakaraukai' and 'Augaloi', abound in the *Geography*, and while we ought not make as uncritical use of Ptolemy's text as does Kingsmill, in his *The Sérica of Ptolemy and its inhabitants*, 1886, pp.43-60, the case in favour of the work's complete spuriosity is not strong. For critical studies of Ptolemy's geography of Central Asia which do not find the work entirely useless see Herrmann, *Zur alten Geographie Zentralasiens*, 1911, pp.12-15; Berthelot, *Asie central et sud-orientale d'après Ptolemée*, 1930, Haussig, *Die Beschreibung des Tarimbeckens bei Ptolemaios*, 1959, pp.148-194.
Ptolemy VI.xiv.14 located the Σαγαράδαξαὶ between the Oxos mountains and the lower Iaxartes river. Herrmann correctly pointed out that Ptolemy's geography of this region is very distorted (he has no concept of an Aral Sea and has the Oxos and Iaxartes flow into the Caspian) and his description can not be taken literally. Ptolemy's notice does not, however, defy interpretation. It can be interpreted in either of two ways. His source may have suggested they dwelt on the north east coast of the Caspian, and his own faulty geography would accordingly place them between the lower Oxos and the Iaxartes, or his source may have placed them between the two rivers on the east coast of the Aral, and his geography forced him to place them on the east Caspian coast. It is difficult to say which was Maes Titianus' informants' concept. A habitat on the east coast of the Aral would bring the tribe closer to the Greko-Baktrian kingdom which their namesakes were said to have invaded, but a habitat on the east coast of the Caspian would bring them closer to the location given by Stephanos to a tribe with a very similar name, the 'Sargatioi': Σαγάρτια, κεραυνόνησος παρά τῇ Κασπίᾳ βαλάνθῃ. τῷ ἑβνικόν Σαγάρτιοι. This Chersonese is thought by Umnjakov to be the peninsula just to the north of the Kara-Bugaza gulf on the Caspian.

Whereas geographical orientation led us from Strabo's Σαγαράδαξαὶ, Justin's Sacaraucae, Lukian's Σακαράδαξαὶ to Ptolemy's Σαγαράδαξαὶ and Stephanos' Σαγάρτια, linguistic similarities have lead several scholars still further. Umnjakov has traced a path from Ptolemy's Σαγαράδαξαὶ and Stephanos' Σαγάρτια all the way back to the Σαγάρτιοι whom Herodotos (III.93) included in the 14th satrapy of the Persian Empire:

The fourteenth province was made up of the Sagartii, Sarangeis, Thamanaei, Utii, Myci, and the dwellers on those islands of the southern sea wherein the king plants the people to be "removed": these together paid a tribute of six hundred talents.'

Umnjakov does not, however, offer any explanation of how a people associated by Herodotos with the Persian Gulf might come to be associated by Apollodoros of Artemita with the Parthian and Baktrian frontier. Indeed, Umnjakov seems not even to see the problem. Yet should a linking of the two terms be seen as desirable, a historiographical explanation of the discrepancy in contexts is possible.

Modern scholars have been unanimous in accepting the derivation of the Greek 'Sagartoi' from the old Persian 'Asagarta', which appears on Dareios' Behistun inscription (lines 78-

99 Herrmann, 'Sacaraulai', 1920, p.1619.
100 Umnjakov, 'Тохарская проблема', 1940, p.185.
101 Ibid.
79) and Persepolis inscription E (line 15)\textsuperscript{102}, but few scholars have favoured the derivation of the old Persian 'Asagarta' from the Assyrian 'Zikirtu'\textsuperscript{103}. The chief objection to this derivation is geographic. While Herodotos associated the Sagartioi with islands in the Persian Gulf, and Dareios' inscriptions offer an unclear location for the Asagarta, Sargon clearly associated the Zikurtu with the Manneans and Uratians in Armenia, and seems to locate the people between Lake Urmia and the Caspian Sea\textsuperscript{104}. The Persian Gulf is a long way from Armenia.

A connection has been made between Sargon's Zikurtu and Herodotos' Sargatioi, with the thesis that the peoples were driven in Sargon's time from north west of Persia to the south west. This thesis is, however, unnecessary. As Grantovskij astutely observes, though Herodotos seems to associate the tribe with the Persian Gulf, he was actually drawing upon a source in which the tribe was associated with the north west. Besides associating the tribe with the islands in the Persian Gulf, he associates the tribe with the Outioi and Mykoi, and both of these peoples seem to have been associated in ancient literary tradition with Armenian lands\textsuperscript{105}. It is, accordingly, no surprise that Herodotos, probably following Hekataios, located the 14th satrapy, the one which included the Sagartioi, between the 13th satrapy of Armenia and the 15th of those people dwelling on the southern shore of the Caspian Sea. How a name originally mentioned in an Armenian context came to appear in Herodotos in a Persian Gulf context is, however, a mystery.

The probable location of Herodotos' source's 'Sagartians' between Lake Urmia and the Caspian Sea brings the Sagartians much closer to the 'Sagartia Chersonesos' of Stephanos. Indeed, it suggests Stephanos' Chersonesos might have been located, not on the east Caspian coast, as speculated above, but on the west.

The above associations might mean that Sakarauloi was a variant of the late 6th century B.C. Sargatioi, old Persian, Asagarta, but the probability of this being so is slim.


\textsuperscript{103} Mentioned numerous times in the inscriptive record of Sargon's campaigns from 719 B.C. to 715 B.C. See Luckenbill, Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia II, 1927 (1968), par. 6, 10, 19, 56, 92, 99, 118, 125 & 142.

\textsuperscript{104} Grantovskij, 'Σαργατίνι καὶ ΧΙΕ ὁκρύν ὁγοὺς ἀοῦτα αἰχμενίνην', 1962, pp.247-8.

\textsuperscript{105} Ibid., pp.230-241.
Yet even after dismissing the possibility of identifying Strabo's *Sakarauluoi* with the Indian *Sakakula* or Herodotos' *Sargatioi*, the possibility still exists for identifying them with a tribe somewhere between the Caspian and the Iaxartes.

One final question which might be addressed to the people designated *Sakarauluoi* is whether they survived the annihilation, mentioned in the *Prologue* to Trogus' Bk.XLII. Lukian wrote in his *Makrobiioi* 15 of how, in c.80 B.C., a certain Sinatrokes, king of the Ἑκαδρακοι became, at the age of 80, king of the Parthians. The annihilation of the Saraucae is linked in the *Prologue* to Trogus' book XLII with the 'Reges Tocha Kimi Asiani...'. If the latter is a reference of the Kushana's rise to power, then the Sarauca's annihilation might be dated to some time after 26 B.C., and if Sinatrokles was put on the throne in c.70 B.C., as seems to have been the case, then Lukian's reference to Sakaraukai presents no problem. If, however, the latter is a reference to the Yüeh-chih conquest and occupation of Baktria, then the Saraucae's annihilation must be dated much earlier, between 126 B.C. and the death of Apollodoros of Artemita and Lukian's reference would have to be taken as evidence that the Saraucae's annihilation was more of a dispersal.

**Conclusion.**

It was argued in the preceding chapter that Apollodoros, when writing on events of the 3rd century B.C. was Strabo's and Trogus' common source, was very familiar with the geography and ethnographic history of Central Asia, was less dependent upon pre-existing literary traditions than most writers dealt with in preceding chapters, and introduced into the literary tradition a whole new set of ethnological terms. The same can be argued of Apollodoros when writing on events of the mid to late 2nd century B.C. The ethnographic terms of relevance to the history of this period which Apollodoros appears to have introduced include *Tokharoi*, *Sakaraului* and *Asioi*. The Apollodoran material also clearly documents the steadily increasing pressure being exerted by the Central Asian nomads on the Parthian and Baktrian kingdom, and offers modern scholars an opportunity to reconstruct in part the tribal movements leading up to the destruction of the Greko-Baktrian Kingdom in the 130's B.C. An opportunity to view these movements from a very different perspective, and thus reconstruct them more fully, is offered by the material based on the

---

reports of Chang Ch'ien, the most famous Central Asian envoy of Han dynasty China. It is to this material that the discussion might now turn.
CHAPTER 15.

CHANG CH'IEN AND THE CENTRAL ASIAN SKYTHIANS (1).

The great Central Asianist Barthold once wrote, 'The fall of the Graeco-Bactrian kingdom is the first event of world history recorded both in Western (Greek) and Far-Eastern (Chinese) sources'. This rare opportunity to approach the same piece of early central Asian history through two very different historical traditions has been grasped by many scholars. Unfortunately, most scholars have simply taken as their task the pairing off of tribal-names to be found in the Chinese sources with ones to be found in the Classical, without giving any consideration to the context in which these names are used in the sources, and the concept for which the name stands. It is with an emphasis on context and concept that the challenge offered by the wealth and diversity of sources dealing with the nomad overthrow of the Greko-Baktrian kingdom might be met.

The Han Dynasty records.

Whereas the classical Greek and Latin sources relevant to the study of the 'eastern Scythians' are scattered among hundreds of works of all periods and literary genre, the classical Chinese source material is concentrated in two works. The first is the Shih-chi by Ssu-ma Ch'ien, who died c.85 B.C. In SC 123 Lieh-chuan 63, the Ta-yüan chuan Ssu-ma Ch'ien purports to follow closely the reports submitted to Emperor Wu by Chang Ch'ien. Chang Ch'ien had travelled extensively in the Tarim Basin-Baktria region in the years c.138-125 and 115 B.C. The second is the Han-shu, compiled by Pan Piao, his son Pan Ku and daughter Pan Chao, during the latter part of the first century A.D. In HS 61, the Chang Ch'ien Li Kuang-li chuan, the compilers offer biographies of two of the greatest agents of Han designs in the western regions, Chang Ch'ien and General Li Kuang-li. The substance of these biographies bears many similarities to that of the SC chapter on Ta-yüan. In chapter 96, the Hsi-yü chuan, the compilers offer an outline of the history and political geography of the western regions.

2 On these dates see Leslie and Gardiner, 'Chinese Knowledge of Western Asia', 1983, p.20.
3 Van der Sprenkel, Pan Piao, Pan Ku and the Han History, 1964; Hulsewé and Loewe, China and Central Asia, 1979, p.8.
Though more easily accessible than the classical Greek and Latin sources, and though attributed to more easily identifiable authors, the classical Chinese sources are no less riddled with historiographical problems. The two main historiographical problems are the relationship between SC 123 and HS 61 and HS 96. These problems will now be discussed in turn.

The authenticity of SC 123 has been challenged by numerous scholars this century, Ts'ui Shih, Li K'uei-yao, Pelliot, Jaeger, Haloun, Daffina, Hervouet and most earnestly and recently by Hulsewé. The chief reasons for the challenge have been given as follows. Firstly, the SC is known to be broken and faulty in parts. Secondly, SC 123 and HS 61 resemble each other not only in content but also in confusion. Thirdly, the text of SC 123 is not what the synopsis of the chapter in SC 130 suggests we should expect. Fourthly, that SC 123 purports to be a monograph on Ta-yiian but is mainly a biography of Chang Ch'ien and includes reports on many other outlying states. Hulsewé thus concluded in 1975 that SC 123 is basically nothing but the text of HS 61 with considerable additions, taken from other parts of the Han-shu', with the apology:

'That the present SC 123 has preserved a few isolated fragments of an ancient text of unknown provenance, perhaps of the original version of the lost genuine Memoir on Ta Yüan, is a fortunate circumstance which, however, in no way weakens the foregoing conclusions'.

Hulsewé returned to this position with Loewe in 1979, recommending a reconstruction of HS 61 by reference to the Han-chi, the third century A.D. 30 chapter epitome of the HS, which was written on paper, not bamboo, and thus believed to preserve a more accurate version of the text, arguing further that at some points the HC would seem to have been used to fill lacunae in the SC. They concluded that:

'the Han shu ch.61 is primary, and that Shih-chi ch.123 was practically lost, to be reconstructed out of Han shu material, chiefly Han shu ch.61, in which a few fragments of an earlier text, perhaps of the original Shih-chi chapter, which had fortunately been preserved were inserted. This reconstruction may have been made some time during the 3rd or 4th century of our era'.


6 Hulsewé and Loewe, China in Central Asia, 1979, pp.8-25.
The whole argument in favour of SC 123’s spuriousness, conceding, as it has to, that some material from an original SC 123 has been preserved and that the HS text is itself faulty, invites objections. The case in favour of the SC 123’s authenticity was made by Pulleyblank in 1966 and 1970, Zürcher in 1968, and Leslie and Gardiner in 1983. Their arguments meet all the doubts raised by Hulsewé and Loewe.

Though it is more probable that the compilers of HS 61 and 96 used 123 than it is that a recompiler of SC 123 used HS 61 and 96, in either case a large portion of all these texts goes back to Chang Ch’ien’s report.

Discussion might now turn to the texts themselves. The following uncritical epitome of SC 123, noting the variations in HS 61 and 96 when appropriate, might serve as a means of introducing the source material and orientating the reader chronologically and geographically (where a commonly accepted date or identification is not going to be challenged in this chapter, it will be given in brackets). It is not intended as a substitute for direct consultation of the SC and HS material: SC 123 and HS 61 both give an account of how Chang Ch’ien was sent by Emperor Wu to establish contact with the Yüeh-chih. The Yüeh-chih, whose king had recently been killed by, and who had recently been driven west by China’s great foe, the Hsiung-nu, were to be encouraged to move back east against the Hsiung-nu. Chang Ch’ien tried to pass through the territory of the Hsiung-nu, but was captured and detained for ten years. In 128 he escaped and continued his mission westward. He is said to have come first to the kingdom of Ta Yuan, next to the state of K’ang-chü, and finally to the land of the Great Yüeh-chih. The son (in the HS, not son but wife) of the late Yüeh-chih king had conquered Ta Hsia, a rich peaceful land, and the Yüeh-chih king had no interest in moving back east against the Hsiung-nu. After a year in the area (127 B.C.), he attempted to return to China through the territory of

---


8 Leslie and Gardiner argued that Pan Ku was loyal to the Former Han sources and followed the time-honoured practice of "scissors and paste" and that the SC should, for several reasons, be considered the primary source and HS the secondary in the passages on An-hsi and Li-kan/T’iao-chih. For example, if the SC was copied from the HS, why is such HS material as the description of Wu-i-shan-li and the sentence in the An-hsi account, ‘the reverse of the coin bears the face of the consort’ not to be found in the SC, and why are the details of An-hsi names and accounts of Ta Hsia and the Yüeh-chih not to be found in the HS. See Leslie and Gardiner, ‘Chinese Knowledge of Western Asia’, 1983, pp.265-270.
the Ch'iang barbarians, but was again captured by the Hsiung-nu. A year later, in 126 B.C., in the turmoil that ensued upon the death of the Shan-yü (the Hsiung-nu king), he escaped. Upon his return to China he submitted a report. The SC then goes on to give an account of the states in the Western region purportedly based on this report and paralleled to some extent in the HS 61 and 96. Ta Yuan is a land south west of the Hsiung-nu where the people live in some seventy cities, plough the land, and own blood-sweating horses (HS 96 has a digression on Han attempts to acquire some of these). The Wu-sun live north west of Ta Yuan, are nomads, recently stopped attending the Hsiung-nu court, but still acknowledge Hsiung-nu suzerainty. The K'ang-chü are nomads who living north west of Ta Yuan, acknowledging the sovereignty of the Yüeh-chih in the south and the Hsiung-nu in the east (HS 35b-36a offers details on the 5 lesser kings in K'ang-chü). The Yen-tsai are nomads who live north west of the K'ang-chü and live adjacent to a shoreless lake, known as the North Sea. The Ta Yüeh-chih live west of Ta Yuan, north of the Kuei river, are bordered on the north by K'ang-chü and bordered on the south by Ta Hsia. They conquered Ta Hsia, but retained their capital north of the Kuei river. The Yüeh-chih who had fled south from the Hsiung-nu and settled among the Ch'iang became known as the Hsiao Yüeh-chih. An-hsi \( \text{Parthia} \) to the west of Ta Yüeh-chih is described in detail. Mention is even made of how people in this land write horizontally on strips of leather. T'iao-chih \( \text{Parthia} \) lies further west and is described vaguely. Ta Hsia (Baktria) lies south west of Ta Yuan and south of the Kuei river, and is inhabited by people who live in cities, trade and till the land, but have no single leader, are weak and are afraid of battle. Shen-tu (India) is a land through which Chinese goods had been reaching Ta-hsia. Chang Ch'ien concluded his report by recommending opening a southern route to the west through Shu and Shen-tu. The emperor accordingly sent missions off to the south west but they failed to penetrate far. The SC then gives an account of how after his return Chang Ch'ien helped the Han armies fight the Hsiung-nu, but in 122 B.C. failed to relieve General Li Kuang-li's force in time and was disgraced. The emperor nevertheless continued to question Chang Ch'ien about the West. Chang Ch'ien said that the Hsiung-nu had once attacked the Wu-sun, killed their king, and cast out his son to die. Being suckled by wolves the boy was believed to be a god, and the Shan-yü decided to raise him. He was eventually made K'un-mo of his people and fought for the Hsiung-nu, but when the then Shan-yü died he lead his people away and refused to attend the Hsiung-nu court. HS 61 (4a) adds that the Wu-sun had lived with the Ta Yüeh-chih between Ch'i lien and Tun-huang, i.e. in the Kan-su corridor. HS 61 (4b) has the Yüeh-chih kill the Wu-sun king and drive the Wu-sun into the arms of the Hsiung-nu. The HS also has the Hsiung-nu attack and drive westward the Yüeh-chih, and the Yüeh-chih attack and drive southward the Sai Wang, not mentioned
in the SC. The Wu-sun chief, the K'un-mo, avenging his father, attacked the Yüeh-chih and drove them into Ta Hsia but adds that the Sai crossed over the 'Suspended Crossing', and that among the Wu-sun there are elements of Sai and Ta Yüeh-chih. According to SC 123 and HS 61 (4A-5A) Chang Ch'ien recommended that the Wu-sun be drawn into an alliance with the Chinese, and be persuaded to take their old lands, those of the Hun yeh King, back from the Hsiung-nu. Other peoples west of the Wu-sun might then too join in an alliance with the Chinese. Chang Ch'ien was sent to the Wu-su in 115 B.C., but the Wu-sun were at the time divided into three groups and could not be persuaded to move eastward. Chang Ch'ien dispatched his assistant envoys to Ta Yuan, K'ang-chü, the Ta Yüeh-chih, An-hsi, Shen-tu, Yu-tien, and Han-mi (HS 61.5b ommits An-hsi, Shen-tu, Yu-t'ien and Han-mi), and returned. He died a year later (c.113 B.C.). In subsequent years the Chinese were able to conclude an alliance with the Wu-sun, sending a Han princess in return for some horses, and the Emperor sent numerous missions to states west of Ta Yuan, to small ones such as Huan-ch'ien and Ta-i and larger ones such as An-hsi (HS 6b adds Li-kan, Tiao-chih and Shen-tu). The people between Ta Yuan and An-hsi were said to speak mutually intelligible languages, have deep set blue eyes, profuse beards, haggle well and respect women. SC 123 then offers a lengthy account, parralleled in HS 96 9A-13B of the Emperor's attempts to acquire some Ta Yuan 'heavenly horses', culminating in General Li Kuang-lyi's seige of the capital, Erh-shih in 102 B.C. Li, fearing K'ang-chü intervention accepted a Ta Yuan offer of horses and turned to attacking the city of Yü-ch'eng, where the force of his second-in-command had been treacherrously treated. Yü-ch'eng's king fled to the K'ang-chü, but the latter, hearing of the Han defeat of Ta Yuan, handed the king over. The Wu-sun, whose aid the Han had requested, sent a force to the region but joined neither side. Li returned in c. 100 B.C.

Modern scholars have been very eager to pair off the tribal names and migrations mentioned in the Chinese texts with those mentioned in the Greek and Near Eastern texts. This pairing, however, rarely produces more than sets of simple equations and these equations are usually based upon supposition that two phonetically similar tribal-names are attempted phonetic renderings of the same indigenous tribal-name. There is rarely any investigation of the history of the tribal name in the literature of the peripheral people.

The problems associated with understanding the often very nebulous concept that lies behind each of the main tribal-names used in the above material and each of the main tribal-names used in the above material and each of the main tribal conflicts alluded or referred to in the above material, deserves the closest examination. Discussion in this chapter will
focus on the problem of 'identifying' the Wu-sun and Yüeh-chih, the two tribes that figure most prominently in Chang Ch'ien's report, and 'reconstructing' the stages of their migrations.

**Wu-sun 烏孫.**

One the questions most frequently addressed to the Wu-sun in the 19th and early twentieth century, is whether they were ethnically Europoid, Finno-Ugrit or Turkic. The theory of their Europoid origin was born in the early 19th century when Klaproth, Rémusat and Grjimailo drew attention to the entry on 'Wu-sun' in the 8th century *Yen shi ku* commentary to the HS:

> The Wu-sun are completely different in physique from all the barbarians of the Western Regions. The present day barbarians with pale blue eyes, red beard and ape-like appearance originally belonged to this race.

Of the later scholars who subscribed to the Europoid theory there were those who considered them to be one of the Iranian speaking Indo-European people left in the east after the Sarmatians had moved west in the mid 3rd century, most commonly, the Alans, and those who considered them to be one of the non-Iranian speaking Indo-European people who lived in the region of the north Tarim Basin and spoke a 'Tokharian' dialect.

In 1898 Gemard introduced the theory of the Wu-sun's Finno-Ugrian origin, and in 1906 Kingsmill suggested that the Wu-sun might have been Tibetan, but the main rival to the Europeoid theory became the Turkic. This theory was first advanced in 1896 by

---


10 e.g. Gronbech, 'The steppe region in world history', 1959, p.17; Haussig, 'Die Beschreibung de Tarimbeckens', 1959, p.163, linked them with the Alans through the following phonetic associations: Wu-sun < *uo-suen < *Aswal < *Asfal, which was the ossetic form for Spala, an Alanic tribe. Haussig, ibid., pp.172-3 gives the etymology of K'un-mo as < *kumbag, Kum (the Κούμ of Ptolemy VI.xi.6) + Bag (Iranian for Prince). The Alan identity is found in Sarkisyanz, *Geschichte der orientalischen Völker Russlands bis 1917*, 1961, p.303.

11 e.g. Windekens, 'Huns blancs et Arçî', 1941, pp.176-180. See Chapter 14, 'Tokharoi'.


13 Kingsmill, 'Ancient Tibet and its frontagers', 1906, p.50.
Aristov, who associated the tribe with the *Nu-shi-pi*, part of the then Kara-Kirgis.\(^{14}\) Hirth subscribed to the theory in 1898, and in 1902 Shiratori offered two grounds for considering the *Wu-sun* turkic - the story of the wolf suckling the *K'un-mo*, and the final syllable ‘-mi’ in *Wu-sun* names, this being thought an equivalent of 'bi' of 'bey', 'prince'.\(^{15}\) The Turkic theory was adopted by Franke in 1904, Marquart in 1914, Pelliot in 1920 and de Groot in 1921 and 1926, and still more recently by Zuev in 1957 and 1960.\(^{16}\)

In 1909 and 1926 Grumm-Grzhimajlo and in 1913 Czaplicka recommended the obvious compromise, considering the *Wu-sun* to be of mixed Turkic-Indo-Gothic origin.\(^{17}\) In 1936 Herrmann rendered this theory a little more sophisticated by arguing that they were originally Turkic, but in the 2nd century moved to the Issyk-kul valley where they mixed with those Saka and Yüeh-chih who did not migrate south.\(^{18}\)

Whether they were Europeoid, Finno-Ugrian, Tibetan or Turkic by race is, fortunately, not a main issue today.\(^{19}\) The crude concept of race is no longer seen as appropriate to historical research. The main issues today seem to be with which one of the tribes named in Greek sources might the *Wu-sun* best be identified. The identifications recommended have been numerous.


\(^{15}\) Hirth, 'Nachworte zur Inschrift des Tonjukuk', 1892, p.49 and Shiratori 'Über die Wu-sun Stammm in Zentral Asien', 1902, pp.103-140, esp. pp.134ff.


\(^{17}\) Grumm-Grzhimajlo, Булокурая раса в Средней Азии,1909, p.186 and Западная Монголия и Уральский край, 1926, II, pp.5-6, and Czaplikc, *The Turks of Central Asia*, 1918, p.66.

\(^{18}\) Herrmann, *Das Land der Seide*, 1938, p.147.

\(^{19}\) See the treatment of the subject by Bernshtam, *On the origin of the Kirgiz People*, 1962, pp.119-125; Sankrityana, *History of Central Asia*, 1964, p.34; and Oshanin, *Anthropological composition of the Population of Central Asia and the Ethnogenesis of its People*, 1964, pp.11-13. Bernshtam makes the important comment that 'All peoples of Central Asia, the Kazakhs and Kirgiz in particular arose historically from different tribes, nationalities and races', and saw in the T'ien Shan Kirgiz, for example, a mixture of Indo-European Saka and Wu-sun and Turkic Hsiung-nu/Huns.' For a broad, but methodologically very sober, study of Asian ethnogenesis see Bowles, *The peoples of Asia*, 1979.
The identification with the Issedones of Herodotos (through Aristeas) and Ptolemy has been popular. This identification was recommended by Hudson in 1931, and has been adopted by such scholars as Bernshtam, Tret'jakov, Mongajt, Hambly and Lindegger.

This identification is an extraordinary example of an identification which cannot serve any useful purpose and cannot be in any way meaningful. Aristeas was writing at the beginning of the 7th century B.C., not at the end of the 2nd century B.C., and was probably writing about tribes in the Caucasus, not in Central Asia. There was probably a great difference between the way Aristeas used the term Issedones and the way Ptolemy used it.

A question of more relevance to the work in hand, which has been asked by two centuries of scholarship is whether the Wu-sun might not be the Asii or Asioi of the Classical writings. This identification was first argued, primarily upon reference to phonetic similarity, by Deguignes in 1758 and Grigor'ev in 1871. It has subsequently been argued upon reference to Trogus' (Prol. XLII) account of Reges Tocharorum Asiani and the account in HS 61 5b of the Wu-sun attacking the Yüeh-chih, and been widely accepted.

The equation between the Wu-sun and the Asioi has, indeed, proved so popular that some scholars have even felt confident enough to extend it to include the Kushana. Kushana's have been added to the equation on both phonetic and historic grounds. Fleet and Bernshtam have both argued that Kushana phonetically renders the same indigenous name as that rendered in Greek by Asioi and in Chinese by Wu-sun, the variance being explicable.

---


in terms of the name having passed through speakers of different Iranian dialects on route to the ancient scholar and scribe, while other scholars have seen in 'Reges Tocharorum Asiâni interitusque Saraucaarum', the Kushana's rise to predominance.

Though accepting a connection between the As, Asioi and Asiani, the further identification of these with the Wu-sun was not accepted by Haloun, Maenchen-Helfen, by Bailey (who cut the equation back to one between the present day Ossetes, the As or Asioi who conquered Bactria and the ancient Khorasmians and Sogdians), Altheim, Harmatta, or Hambly, and the still further identification of the Wu-sun with the Kushana's can be rejected on historical grounds. These grounds become apparent after a detailed analysis of the Chinese texts. It is this analysis which will now be undertaken.

SC 123 and HS 61 4a-5b have long been seen to offer quite different accounts of the report which Chang Ch'ien is purported to have offered Emperor Wu in about 119-118 B.C. on the subject of the Wu-sun, just before recommending to the Emperor that he seek an alliance with this tribe. As the differences mainly consist of HS including material absent from SC, they might easily be highlighted by presenting a translation of the HS passage in which that material absent from the SC account is italisised:

'When I was living among the Hsiung-nu I heard of the Wu-sun; the king was entitled K'un-mo, and the K'un-mo's father was named Nan-tou-mi; originally the Wu-sun had lived with the Ta Yüeh-chih between the Chi-lien [mountains] and Tun-huang; and they had been a small state. The Ta Yüeh-chih attacked and killed Nan-tou-mi, seizing his lands; and his people fled to the Hsiung-nu. An infant K'un-mo had recently been born, and the Pu-chiu Hsi-hou, who was his guardian, took him in his arms and ran away. He laid him in the grass and searched for food for him; and on coming back he saw (SC has the child abandoned, and the Shan-yü hear of...) a wolf suckling the child; furthermore there were crows holding meat in their beaks and hovering at the [child's] side. Believing this to be supernatural, he then carried [the child] back to the Hsiung-nu, and the Shan-yü loved and reared him. When he had come of age, [the Shan-yü] delivered to the K'un-mo his father's people; he had him lead troops, and on several occasions he did so meritoriously. At the time the Yüeh-chih had already been defeated by the Hsiung-

---

23 Fleet, 'The name Kushan', 1914, pp.1000-1010 and Bernshtam, 'К вопросу об усунь-кушан и токарах', 1947, p.44. 'Kushana' is seen as 'Asioi' with an initial aspirate, frequent in Khotanese Saka, a metathesis of vowels, frequent in all Iranian languages, and a suffix 'na' common to Iranian languages.

24 e.g. Gafurov and Litvinskij, История таджикского народа, 1963, p.345.

nu; making for the west they attacked the Sai-wang [or Sai Wang, the possible meaning of this term will be discussed in Chapter 16]. The Sai-wang moved a considerable distance to the South and the Yüeh-chih then occupied his lands. Once the K'un-mo had grown to adult-hood, he asked permission of the Shan-yü to avenge his father's wrongs. He went west, he attacked and defeated the Ta Yüeh-chih, who again fled west, moving into the lands of Ta Hsia. The K'un-mo plundered everyone (remaining) and subsequently lived there. His forces gradually grew stronger, and at the death of the Shan-yü he was no longer willing to attend at the court of the Hsiung-nu and serve them. The Hsiung-nu sent forces to attack him, but they had no success; and with an even greater respect for his supernatural powers they kept their distance.

The HS account differs from the SC in at least 9 respects.
1. The K'un-mo's father's name is given.
2. The Wu-sun's original homeland is given.
3. The K'un-mo's father was killed by the Yüeh-chih, not the Hsiung-nu.
4. The Wu-sun submitted to the Hsiung-nu under Yüeh-chih pressure, not Hsiung-nu pressure.
5. The infant K'un-mo's survival is described in more detail.
6. The young K'un-mo was first given charge of his father's people then proved himself, whereas in the SC it is the other way around.
7. The K'un-mo attacked the Yüeh-chih who attacked the Sai-wang.
8. The K'un-mo went west (against the Yüeh-chih) before the Shan-yü died, whereas in the SC they did so only after the Shan-yü died.
9. The K'un-mo went west then later declared himself independent, whereas in the SC he declared himself independent and then went west.

One scholarly response to the above discrepancies has been the argument that the HS account is later than the SC and incorporates several fabrications. Thus Pulleyblank believes the story of the K'un-mo's father being killed by the Yüeh-chih, and the K'un-mo attacking the Yüeh-chih, is an 'imaginative reconstruction without any genuine historical basis, introduced for dramatic effect', and the story of the Yüeh-chih's attack on the Sai-

Hulsewé and Lowe's translation has been modified at this point, as it misleads readers, not only by inserting a place name where there is none in the Chinese text, but by inserting the wrong place name. Hulsewé and Loewe, *China in Central Asia*, 1979, p.217, have 'The K'un-mo despoiled the population of Ta Hsia, and then remained there in occupation'. The original text is as follows: 大月氏復西走, 徐大夏地, 侵略其

, 因留居. That Ta Hsia could not have been, as Hulsewé and Loewe have it, the object of the K'un-mo's despoiling and occupation is clear. There is nothing in either the SC or HS to indicate that the Wu-sun ever despoiled land south of the Oxos. Indeed all indications are that Ta Hsia south of the Oxos enjoyed some prosperity in Chang Ch'ien's day. The was undoubtedly the groups of Yüeh-chih left behind whom the K'un-mo despoiled, and the land which the Yüeh-chih left, the old Sai territory, which they occupied. Thus in HS 96B 1b, after offering the same account as that given above, Pan Ku added 'For this reason, among the people of Wu-sun there are [elements of] the Sai race and the Ta Yüeh-chih race'. For a better translation see Zürcher, 'The Yüeh-chih and Kaniska', 1968, p.366. For the criticism of Hulsewé and Loewe's translation see Daffina, 'The Hou Han Hsi-yü retranslated', 1982, p.336.
wang is of uncertain historical value. Daffina, in 1969 and 1982 sees not only the HS, but even the SC, account of the Wu-sun, as 'chronologically absurd' and completely unreliable.

Another response has been to explain, as Hulsewé has attempted to do, the differences in terms of the SC account being reconstructed from the HS and some parts of the HS account being dropped in the process.

There are numerous problems with Hulsewé's hypothesis. It is virtually impossible to take the SC as a derivative of the HS when the account in the former is invariably more probable than that in the HS. For example, if the infant was in a guardian's arms, and the Hsiung-nu were a friendly refuge, why did he not take the child immediately to the Hsiung-nu? It is more probable that the Hsiung-nu had been responsible for subjugating the Wu-sun and driving off the Yüh-chih, than it is that the Yüh-chih had defeated the Wu-sun only to be driven off immediately by the Hsiung-nu. It is more probable that Chang Ch'ien would be recommending an alliance with the Wu-sun if they had been unwilling subjects of the Hsiung-nu, than willing subjects. It is more probable that the K'un-mo would prove himself a capable commander before being put in charge of his father's people, than be put in charge before proving himself. Finally, it is more probable that the Yüh-chih were driven westward by the Hsiung-nu, hungry for control of the Tarim Basin, than by the Wu-sun, hungry for revenge on a people who had probably done them no wrong.

There are, however, problems with Pulleyblank's hypothesis too. Though the HS offers information not to be found in the extant SC account, this information need not have all been fabricated or drawn from a post-Chang Ch'ien source. The additional information is usually easily reconcilable with the SC information. Some of the information may have even been drawn from the SC, but the extant version of the SC has dropped it. Thus, though the SC does not name the K'un-mo's father or give the Wu-sun's original homeland, it is clear that the SC is at this point somewhat faulty. The SC reads 'the K'un-mo's father was a small state on the western border of the Hsiung-nu' 

Perhaps the SC originally read 'the K'un-mo's father was Nan-tou-mi; originally the Wu-sun had lived with the Ta Yüeh-chih between the Ch'i-lien mountains and Tun-huang; and they had been a small state'.

Moreover, though the Wu-sun attack on the Yüeh-chih is not mentioned in the SC, there are several allusions in the SC to Wu-sun activity in the west-activity which may have included the attack on the Yüeh-chih to which the HS refers.

Firstly, though the SC has the Hsiung-nu attack the Yüeh-chih this was at a time when the SC makes it clear that the Wu-sun were being used by the Hsiung-nu to attack peoples in the Tarim Basin area:

The Shan-yü then made him [the K'un-mo] the leader of the people whom his father had ruled in former times and ordered him to guard the western forts. K'un-mo gathered together his people, looked after them and led them in attacks on the small settlements in the neighbourhood.

Secondly, by establishing an alliance with the Wu-sun, Chang Ch'ien anticipated that:

'Ta-hsia and the other countries to the west could all be persuaded to come to court and acknowledge themselves as foreign vassals'.

Chang Ch'ien may have anticipated Ta Hsia would follow the Wu-sun to the Han court, as he had heard of the recent Wu-sun conquest of the Yüeh-chih, who had been Ta-hsia's overlords.

Thirdly, when Chang Ch'ien reached the Wu-sun in 115 B.C. he found that they had split into three groups. The K'un-mo's powerful son Ta-lu' with a large force lived separately from the K'un-mo, and his grandson Ts'en-chü he had sent with a large force to live separately, out of Ta-lu's reach. Neither Ta-lu, said to be a powerful man nor his nephew, Ts'en-chü, effectively expelled from his father's court could have easily found new land without confronting the Yüeh-chih.

It might, therefore, be concluded that the SC and HS accounts contradict each other directly on only one point, and that is on whether the K'un-mo's father was killed by the Hsiung-nu or the Yüeh-chih. Here the SC account must have been correct, and the HS altered to

---

32 Watson's translation as 'living in a different part of the realm' is misleading. 'living separately'.
33 Cf.HS 96B 2a.
offer reason why the Wu-sun might have latter attacked the Yüeh-chih (and to this extent Pulleyblank’s detection of fabrication might be justified).

The HS account of the Wu-sun attacking the Yüeh-chih and occupying their lands when they left for Ta Hsia, does not in any way contradict the SC account, but just how it might be reconciled to the SC account is not clear. The problem lies equally with determining where and when the conflict took place and the question of ‘Where’ is best approached through considering the question of ‘When’. The attack must have occurred after the Hsiung-nu’s attack on the Wu-sun and Yüeh-chih, and this attack can be dated with some certainty to 177/6 B.C.\(^{34}\), but how long after?

As the Wu-sun attack on the Yüeh-chih is linked to the death of a Shan-yü, it has been suggested that it took place in 160 B.C., the year Shan-yü Lao-shang died\(^{35}\), but this leaves but a decade for the K’un-mo to grow from infancy to adulthood, and would imply a Yüeh-chih migration to Ta Hsia decades before the Greek sources record the fall of the Greko-Baktrian kingdom\(^ {36}\).

Should the Wu-sun conflict be linked with that Shan-yü’s death which brought such confusion to the Hsiung-nu empire in the year 126 B.C. that Chang Ch’ien was able to escape, the following scenario might be constructed. In about 177 B.C. the Hsiung-nu lunged westward, drove the Yüeh-chih out of the Tarim and subjugated the Wu-sun. The Yüeh-chih then drove the Sai from their homeland just to the north of the Iaxartes, possibly in the Ili valley and continued, without the help of Wu-sun attacks, south across the Ixartes and into the Baktrian Kingdom. In the late 140’s and early 130’s the Wu-sun gained strength and under Hsiung-nu sovereignty attacked many peoples in the Tarim area.

\(^{34}\) The Shan-yü Mao-tun included in a letter sent to the Han Emperor in 176 reference to how he had sent one of his Generals against the Yüeh-chih, and ‘Though the aid of Heaven, the excellence of his fighting men, and the strength of his horses, he has succeeded in wiping out the Yüeh-chih, slaughtering or forcing to submission every member of the tribe. In addition he has conquered the Lou-lan, Wu-sun and Hu-chieh tribes, as well as twenty-six states nearby, so that all of them have become a part of the Hsiung-nu nation’. On the dating of these events to the 177/6 see the articles by Fujita, 1916, Yasuma, 1932 and Kuwabara, 1933, cited in Haloun, ‘Zur Üe-t§i-Frage’, 1937, pp.247-8 and Lohuizen, *The Scythian Period*, 1949, p.32.


in 126 B.C., the year of the Shan-yü's death, did the K'un-mo lead his people across the lands through which the Sai had been driven by the Yueh-chih, and in 126 was occupied by Yüeh-chih, the old Baktrian Kingdom's territories between the Oxos and Iaxartes. The Wu-sun then drove the Yüeh-chih across the Oxos into Ta Hsia proper.

The problem with the above senario is, however, that were the Wu-sun to have displaced the Yüeh-chih from the Sai lands on the upper Iii in 126 B.C., Chang Ch'ien could not have met the Yüeh-chih on the north bank of the Oxos in 128 B.C. Though it is possible that the Wu-sun attacked the Yüeh-chih on the Oxos, after Chang Ch'ien left the region, and that Chang Ch'ien heard of this attack during his second period of captivity among the Hsiung-nu in 126 B.C., this is extremely unlikely. Not only would this scenario deprive the Yüeh-chih of a reason for quitting the Sai lands on the upper Iii, it would present the Wu-sun with a long ride for a very belated 'revenge'.

The argument for dating the Wu-sun displacement of the Yüeh-chih to before Chang Ch'ien's arrival in Ta Hsia is strengthened, moreover, upon reference to the HS account (61 2a) of events leading up to Chang Ch'ien's arrival in Ta Hsia:

'The Ta Yüeh-chih king had been killed by the nomads 𤀆. His wife had been established as king. She subsequently subjugated Ta Hsia and reigned over it'.

As the result of the nomad's killing of the Yüeh-chih King in HS 61 2a is exactly the same as the result of the Wu-sun attack on the Yüeh-chih in HS 61 4b, i.e. the Yüeh-chih attacked Ta Hsia and occupied it (that is, the northern territories of the defunct Baktria Kingdom), the HS compiler must have used Hu, i.e. 'nomads', in 61 2a for Wu-sun. The reason the SC, in a parallel passage, has the Yüeh-chih king killed by the Hsiung-nu, might be exactly the same as the reason the SC does not mention the Wu-sun's attack on the Yüeh-chih in the Wu-sun report- the Wu-sun were at the time subjects of Hsiung-nu. Most of the inconsistencies that scholars have noted are quickly resolved if it is supposed that where the HS, in its account of the events preceding the Wu-sun's defiance of the Hsiung-nu, writes Wu-sun, the SC writes Hsiung-nu. As Chang Ch'ien's did not visit the Wu-sun on his first expedition, and they were at the time, as far as the peoples he did visit were concerned, Hsiung-nu subjects, it would not be surprising should he attribute to the Hsiung-nu, in his narrative of events, actions actually undertaken by the Wu-sun. The HS was compiled with the benefit of many years of contact with the Wu-sun, after the Wu-sun had become independent of the Hsiung-nu. It is not impossible that its compilers might feel

37 Indeed, Hulsewe and Loewe, China in Central Asia, 1979, mistranslated HS 61 5b to suggest the Wu-sun attacked the Yüeh-chih south of the Oxos.
it desirable to replace Hsiung-nu with Wu-sun, where they later learnt Wu-sun, even though subjects of the Hsiung-nu, had actually undertaken the action.

As thirty years is sufficient time for the K'un-mo to grow to manhood, the Wu-sun attack may have taken place not in 158 B.C. nor 126 B.C., but some time in between. Lao Shang died in 158 B.C. and his successor Chun Ch'en, died in the winter of 127/6 B.C. It is thus impossible to link an attack in the 140's or 130's with the death of a Shan-yü. Nevertheless, it is possible to accomodate most other recorded events in the following senario.

In 177 B.C. the Hsiung-nu lunged westward into the north Tarim Basin, subduing the Wu-sun and driving the Yüeh-chih over the T'ien Shan into the Sai lands on the upper Ili and Kirghiz plain. The Sai moved southwards across the Iaxartes and into conflict with the Parthians and Baktrians. In the late 140's or early 130's the now powerful Wu-sun acted as agents of the Hsiung-nu in expelling the Yüeh-chih from the Ili and forced them to follow the Sai across the Iaxartes. The Yüeh-chih then drove the Sai from Baktrian lands, occupied that part of the old Baktrian Empire which was north of the Oxos and secured sovereignty over Baktria proper and the southern part of the K'ang-chü. The Wu-sun meanwhile abandoned their Tarim basin homeland and consolidated for themselves an Ili valley kingdom (incorporating the remnants of the Sai and Yüeh-chih). The Sai had been divided. Some fell onto the Parthian border, some went south into Drangiana, some southeastward, and formed scattered kingdoms in the Hindu-Kush. This was the situation at the time of Chang Ch'ien's stay in Ta Hsia.

The chronology in the SC and HS account of the Wu-sun is, therefore, nowhere as absurd as Daffina suggests. The K'un-mo was born just before his people were overrun by the Hsiung-nu in about 177 B.C. In about 150, at the age of 27, he would have been given control of his people, and on behalf of the Hsiung-nu harrassed the cities of the Tarim Basin. In about 140 he might have led his people over the T'ien Shan and ousted the Yüeh-chih from the old Sai lands. In 115, when Chang Ch'ien visited him, he would have been 62, and his son might have been old enough to have become a powerful and relatively independent prince, and his eldest grandson might well have been old enough to receive the army the K'un-mo gave him as protection.

To return now to the question of the identification of the Wu-sun with the Asioi of Strabo, or Asii of the Prologue to Trogus XLII, one of the grounds most frequently used to support this identification is proven weak. The Wu-sun attack on the Yuëh-chih and 'Reges Tocharum Asiani' cannot be regarded as echoes of the same events. The former was an attack north of the Iaxartes some time before 136 B.C., and the Yuëh-chih, though loosing a king, maintained their independence. The latter, if it is to be read 'The Asiani became kings of the Tochari', could only refer to an attack south of the Oxos, in Baktria proper, some time shortly after 136 B.C.

If the Wu-sun are not to be identified with either the Issedonians or the Asioi, is it to be concluded that the Greek records preserve no mention of this people? Perhaps not. If Wu-sun was not a Chinese rendering of an indigenous concept meaning, as the Chinese characters mean, 'crows grandson(s)', but a rendering of the sound of a self-appellation, Haussig, Pulleyblank, Hulsewé and Loewe may be correct in associating the name 'Wu-sun' with the name of a people living in Ptolemy's 'Ασμίραι' 39. Daffina pointed out that though Ptolemy mentions a mountain 'Ασμίραι (VI.xvi.2), region 'Ασμίραι (VI.xvi.5) and city 'Ασμίραι (VI.xvi.6), he never mentions a people 'Ασμίραι. 40 Though correct, Daffina does concede that Ammianus' mentioning of a people Asmira (XXIII.vi.66), does presuppose a Greek 'Ασμίραι. 41

Ta Yuëh-chih 大月氏. 42

As with the Wu-sun, one of the first questions scholars addressed to the Yuëh-chih was to do with their ethnic affinities.

41 The Wu-sun are not the only people with whom the Asmirai have been identified. Kingsmill, 'Ancient Tibet and its frontagers', 1906, p.32, makes the curious claim that 'The Asmirai are worthy of separate mention, as at one time they occupied a prominent position in the history of Eastern Asia. They are mentioned in the HS (ch.xcvii) as Cheniot', and Haussig, 'Die Beschreibung des Tarimbeckens', 1959, p.164, n.72 suggests that Asmiraia came from the tribal name 'As' & 'mir' (lords) & aia (land), 'Land der Fürsten der As', and calls them an 'Ossetian' people.
42 There has been some controversy over the correct form of the name, whether it should be 月氏, Yueh-ti or 月支 (even 月支).
One of the earliest identifications was that with the Tibetans. The characters 雅乃, being read as 'Goat' or 'Yet', were taken by Klaproth in 1826 and McCrindle in 1885, to be phonetic renderings of the name of a people later known as Ye-ta or Jetes, whom they believed to be Tibetan. In 1904 Franke rejected Klaproth's identification of the tribe with Tibetans, arguing that the Tibetans were known to the Chinese as the Ch'iang from an early date. Though the Chinese did indeed use 'Ch'iang' from an early date to designate a people that might be thought to be the ancestors of the modern Tibetans, Franke's case against the identification with the Tibetans suffers from the same weakness as that in favour of the identification. It is not meaningful to speak of Tibetans in the context of 2nd century B.C. history. A better grounds for identifying the Yüeh-chih with the Tibetans would be the linguistic affinities of the Yüeh-chih language with modern Tibetan, and this is not demonstrable.

The question of ethnic identification most commonly debated is whether the Yüeh-chih were Turkic/Mongoloid or Europoid. There have been numerous grounds upon which modern scholars have argued the Yüeh-chih's Turkic/Mongoloid affinities. The Hsi-hou into which the Chinese sources say the Yueh-chih were divided is a title derived from the Turkic Yabgu. The Rajatarangini (I.170) refers to the later Turkic kings of Gandhara as claiming Kanishka as their ancestor, and refers to other Kushan kings as Turushkas, i.e. Turks. The physical depiction of the Kushanas on coins are said to suggest Turkic or Mongoloid origins. The Yüeh-chih are to be identified with the Tokharoi of Greek sources and Tußara of Indian ones, and as the Indian sources mention Saka and Tußara separately, the Tußara, and thus Yüeh-chih, were not Iranian speaking Saka, but probably Turks.

To each of the arguments in favour of the Yüeh-chih's 'Turkic' identity, there is a ready objection. That the Yüeh-chih used Turkic titles need not imply the Yüeh-chih were Turkic speakers or of the Turkic race, and might imply no more than contact with Turkic speakers. That later sources effectively claimed the Kushans were Turkic may simply

43 Klaproth, Tableaux historique de l'Asie, 1826, p.132; McCrindle, Ancient India as described by Ptolemy, 1885, p.138.
46 Ibid.
48 Narain, 'The early movements of the Sakas and the Pahlavas', 1969, p.64.
imply that the later Turkic speaking Kings of Gandara wanted to be seen as the Kushana's rightful heirs, so portrayed the Kushana's as Turkic. That it might be possible to describe Kanishka as having a pointed cranium, big nose and thick beard, as Kennedy describes him from his depictions, is hardly ground for supposing the Yüeh-chih to be Turkic, even if Kanishka is thought to be a descendant of the Yüeh-chih. That the Indian sources make separate mention of the Saka and Tusara does not necessarily mean the Tusara were the Yüeh-chih and Turkic.

The main rival to the theory of the Yüeh-chih's Turkic/Mongoloid affinities, has been the theory of their Europoid affinities, and just as the Wu-sun have been identified with both Iranian and non-Iranian Europoid nomads, so the Yüeh-chih have been identified with both sorts, the Iranian Saka and the non-Iranian speakers of the 'Tokharian' languages.

Arguments in favour of the Saka identification have been numerous. As the inhabitants of Baktria spoke an Iranian language after, as well as before, the Yüeh-chih conquest, the Yüeh-chih were Iranian-speakers, and thus Saka and as there is no reference to the Sai in SC 123 Chang Ch'ien may have used Yüeh-chih to designate a Saka people. The arguments against the Saka identification have been equally numerous. Though the SC 123 does not mention Sai, the HS does, and makes it clear that the Yüeh-chih were distinct from the Sai.

The debate over whether the Yüeh-chih were Iranian or not, though fraught with as many anthropological, linguistic and philosophical problems as that over whether the Wu-sun were 'Europeoid', has significant implications. As the theory that the Yüeh-chih came from Europoid stock, as opposed to Tibetan, Turkic or Mongoloid, has become more popular, so scholars have been more ready to identify the tribe with a particular 'Scythian' people known from ancient Greek or Latin literature.

50 Cf. Sylvain Levi's observation that in Hemachandra's *Abhidhānachintā-mani*, 959, the Turks seem to use the royal title *Sakhi*, very similar to the Kushana royal title, Shahi. This title was clearly Iranian, and probably borrowed by the Turks to give their rule legitimacy.

51 For example, Kumar, *The early Kusanas*, 1973, pp.5-7 and 14-17, though considering the Kushanas part of the Great Yüeh-chih, did not feel compelled to see Mongolian feature in the depictions of Kushan kings.

52 Lohuizen-de Leeuw, *The Scythian period*, 1949, treats the Yüeh-chih as Saka.

53 e.g. Tam, *Seleucid-Parthian Studies*, 1930, p.110.

On the grounds that the tribal name is sometimes written \(^\text{月氏}\), 'Yüeh-ti', Klaproth identified the people in 1826 with the Yetes of Dzungaria and the Ii, while on the very same grounds the tribe has been identified by DeGuignes in 1756-8, Rémusat in 1829 and Schlegel in 1900 with the 'Getai' and 'Massagetai' of the Greek records\(^{55}\). This latter identification has also been made on geographic grounds by Soviet archaeologists and anthropologists\(^{56}\). The identification cannot, however, be accepted on geographic grounds, as the Massagetai of Herodotos dwelt near the Aral Sea, while the Yüeh-chih of the Chinese sources, dwelt, before their expulsion in c.176 B.C., in the Kan-su corridor. Nor can the identification be accepted on phonetical grounds. The ancient pronunciation of and its variants can not be determined with as much certainty as the above scholars suggest\(^{57}\), and even if a similarity of names was to be detected, it is unlikely that a Central Asian nomadic horde maintained the same self appellation for more than three hundred years. Yüeh-chih, was, moreover, probably a variant of a name applied by Chinese to a certain group of western nomads for centuries before Chang Ch'ien's time.

It has also been argued that there is a phonetic link between the Yüeh-chih and the name of a people controlling the jade trade in the Kan-su in the 3rd century B.C. This name is given as Yü-shih \(^\text{月氏}\) in the 3rd century B.C.


\(^{56}\) e.g.Gafurov and Litvinskij, *История Таджикского народа*, I, p.345; Oshanin, *Anthropological Composition of the Population of Central Asia*, 1964, p.44. The latter is inconsistent. Sometimes he suggests the Massagetai were the western part of the Yüeh-chih, and othertimes, that the latter were an eastern branch of the former.

\(^{57}\) See Konow, *Kharoshthi inscriptions*, 1929, pp.lix-lx for a discussion of the difficulties associated with reconstructing the ancient pronunciation of this name.

\(^{58}\) For references to and discussion of these references see Haloun, 'Das Üe-tsi-Frage', 1937, pp.301-5; Egami, 'Casia regio and Seres', 1959, p.223, and Pulleyblank, 'Chinese and Indo-Europeans', 1966, p.19. For a translation of the relevant passage of the Kuan-tzu see Maverick (ed.), *Economic dialogues in Ancient China*, 1954, pp.121, 155, 156, 177 & 181. Maverick, *ibid.*, p.7, would even seem to suggest the Yü-shih traded jade brought from the Pamirs; 'The Chou, a people originally from the western or upper regions of the Yellow River, had brought with them a love of jade, which was obtained largely in the western mountains, even as far away as the Pamirs'.
The Yüeh-chih have also been identified with such people as the *Seres* 59 or *Issedones* 60, Herodotos' Detached *Basileioi Skythai* 61, Sarmatians 62 and Alans 63.

The Yüeh-chih are, however, most frequently of all identified with the 'Tokharians'. There have been several arguments advanced in support of this identification, and they might be examined in turn.

One argument employed in support of the above identification is that the Wu-sun attack on the Yüeh-chih, recorded in the Chinese texts was the same as the Asioi attack on the the Tokharoi, and thus the identification of the Yüeh-chih with the Tokharoi is the logical corollary of the identification of the Wu-sun with the Asioi. This argument is, however, based upon the assumption that the Wu-sun-Yüeh-chih conflict was the same as the Asioi-Tokharoi conflict, and as the discussion in the section under 'Wu-sun' has demonstrated, this was almost certainly not the case.

A second argument is that the Yüeh-chih and Tokharoi, according to the Chinese and Greek sources respectively, both came from the north Tarim Basin, split into two groups, with one remaining in the Tarim Basin, and another migrating to Ta Hsia or Baktria. This is argued with particular reference to Ptolemy's *Θαγερα*, the Khotanese *taugara*, and the Uighur *Tvgr*, and the Tibetan *Tho-gar*, all taken as references to Tokharians left in the Tarim Basin after Strabo's *Τοξαροι* had left for Baktria, and the HS were the Yüeh-

---

59 Egami, 'Casia regio and Seres', 1959, pp.223-229.
60 Haussig, 'Die Beschreibung des Tarimbeckens bei Ptolemaios', 1959, pp.165-171 & 188.
62 e.g.Sarkisyanz, *Geschichte der orientalischen Völker Russlands*, 1961, p.17 and Sulimirski, 'The forgotten Sarmatians', 1963, pp.279-298. Sulimirski's identifications are, however, completely confused and inconsistent. In the above work he seems at one point to conceive of the Sarmatians as different to the Massagetai, but at another point has the Massagetai defeated by the Huns, an allusion to the Yüeh-chih, and at still another point has Chang Ch'ien try to incite the Sarmatians against the Huns, an equation of the Sarmatians with the Yüeh-chih. Moreover, he has the Chinese annals record the Aorsi (earlier said to be a Sarmatian group and different to the Massagetai) as having 100,000 archers, yet another equation with the Yüeh-chih. Sulimirski thus uses three western terms in three different ways, but seeks to equate them all with a single Chinese term.
chih are said to have divided into a Little Yueh-chih 靼火之， who migrated only as far as southern rim of the Tarim Basin, and the Great Yueh-chih, who migrated all the way to Ta Hsia.\(^{64}\)

The identification of the Yueh-chih with the Tokharians has become popular over the last century and is popular today\(^{65}\), but for several reasons this identification ought not receive unqualified support.

Firstly, that the Yueh-chih were found by Chang Ch'ien to have subjugated Ta Hsia by 126 B.C., and that the Tokharoi are counted by Strabo among those tribes that took Bactria from the Greeks, is not evidence of a direct correspondence between Yueh-chih and Tokharoi, as the Tokharoi were not the only nomads Strabo has invaded Bactria, and the reference in Justin XLII.2 to the Thogarii (or Tokharians) clashing with Artabanos of Parthia in 123 B.C., need not be a reference to the Yueh-chih, but might be a reference to a people being driven ahead of the Yueh-chih.

Secondly, the above arguments are dependent upon the identification of Ptolemy's Thagouroi, the Khotanese ttaguara and the Tugri, as the self-appellation of a people from the Tarim Basin. As has been discussed in the section 'Tokharians' in the previous chapter, the Khotanese and Uighur words, ttaguara and Tugri, even if taken as tribal-names,
probably refer to a people in the Baktrian region in the 8th century A.D., and not the Tarim Basin in the 2nd century B.C. Ptolemy's toponym ἡγουμένη might no more be an indigenous Tarim Basin toponym than is his toponym ἱσαέτων. Ptolemy's source may simply have been labelling the Tarim Basin towns and peoples with names drawn from earlier literary tradition.

Refraining for the moment from accepting the identification of the Yueh-chih with the Tokharians, the discussion might move on to consider one other frequently made identification of the Yueh-chih, that with the Arci of a 'Tokharian' A text. This identification was first made in 1918 by Sieg, and supported in that same year by Müller, and in 1941 by Windekens. Windekens thought the self-appellation of the Tokharian Dialect A speakers was Arči, 'white', that the Yueh-chih and Tokharians belong to the same group of people, and that the Yueh-chih-Tokharians were an Indo-European peoples related to the White Huns. The identification with Arči was rejected in the 1930's by Konow, Haneda and in 1937 by Bailey, the latter doing so on the grounds that it is a form of *ārya*, meaning beggar-monk.

The above objections have not, however, detracted altogether from the attractiveness of the identification of the 'Arči' with the Yueh-chih. Sieg defended his identification in 1937, and Tarn argued that Bailey had not completely eliminated Arsi as a designation of the Yueh-chih as he had not been able to explain the occurrence of the Arsi as the name of a tribe beyond Chorazmia in Pliny VI.xviii. Tarn's only problem was in accommodating the identification of the Yueh-chih with the 'Arči' and the identification he supported so fully of the Yueh-chih with the Tokharians. Rather than choose between the Arsi/Asii and Ttaugara/Tokharian identification of the Yueh-chih, Tarn interpreted 'Reges Tocharum Asiani ' as meaning the Asii were lords of the Tochari before either quitted Kan-su, and that it was this 'combination of Asii and Tochari' which the Chinese knew as the Yueh-chih. It was this identification of the Yueh-chih with the Tokharians, and a Yueh-chih

66 Sieg, 'Ein einheimischer Name fur Toxri', 1918, pp.560ff.;
69 Sieg, 'Und dennoch "Tocharisch" ', 1937, pp.130-139.
70 Tarn, Greeks and Bactrians in India, 1938 (1951), p.285.
71 Ibid., pp.286-7.
ruling group with the Arći and Asii, that was subsequently favoured by Junge, Maenchen-
Helfen and van Lohuizen-de Leeuw⁷².

As has been discussed in the previous chapter under Asioi, the Chinese describe the rise of
the Kushanas in terms of one division of the Yüeh-chih domain, the Kuei-shuang,
conquering the remaining subdivisions, and going on to conquer for themselves an empire.
The Kushanas, or Kuei-shuang, are accordingly quickly seen to be a subdivision of the
Yüeh-chih, in exactly the same way that the Arći and Asii are seen to be a subdivision of
the Tokharians. The Kushana and Asii have accordingly been seen as alternative names for
the ruling Yüeh-chih dynasty⁷³.

From the above discussion it can be seen that the identification of the Yüeh-chih with the
Tokharians has attracted about itself many other identifications and now forms the basis of
most modern models of ancient Central Asian ethnography. This model has, however,
been erected with very little rechecking of the foundations.

The essential point that neither the SC nor HS, which deal at length with the Yüeh-chih,
has one word about the Yüeh-chih chiefs being of a different stock from the rest of the
horde was made by Haloun in 1937 and Bachhofer in 1941⁷⁴. If we are to dismiss these
compromise solutions, and reject the identification of the Yüeh-chih with the Tokharians,
and if we are to believe that the Yüeh-chih left some trace in Greek records, we are left with
one possibility, the identification of the Yüeh-chih with the Asioi.

This equivalence of Asioi and Yüeh-chih, and, as a corollary, Tokharians and Ta Hsia, was
argued as early as 1901 by Marquart. His grounds were as follows. The ancient reading of
might be something approximating Ptolemy's Ἰάτιο, and this tribe is demonstrably
Ptolemy's equivalent of Strabo's more corrupt ᾴσιο. Τόξαριο, moreover, was
argued to be the phonetic equivalent of Ta Hsia⁷⁵. These identifications were supported by
Konow in a series of publications in the 1920's and 1930's, though he did not agree with

reexamined', 1945, pp.71-72; van Lohuizen-de Leeuw, The "Scythian" Period, 1949,
pp.43 & 50.

⁷³ Maenchen-Helfen, 'The Yüeh-chih problem reexamined', 1945, pp.71-81, supported by
Prušek, Chinese Statelets and the Northern barbarians, 1971, p.15. Though he does
not subscribe to the linking of the Wu-sun with the Asii.

⁷⁴ Haloun, 'Zur Üe-tsil-Frage', 1937, p.253 and Bachhofer, 'On Greeks and Šakas in
India', 1941, p.246.

the phonetic equations Marquart had made. Konow stressed historical reasons for supporting the identification, and argued that Trogus's reference to the Asii becoming kings of the Thocari, and the HS account of the Yüeh-chih becoming kings of Ta Hsia were echoes of the same event, the nomad occupation of Baktria. Konow had difficulty, however, accommodating the claims that 'Arsi' and 'Toxri' were names given in various Tarim texts to the speakers of the non-Iranian Indo-European language discovered near Kucha, and was forced to the awkward conclusion that: 'Arsi Toxri was the language of the Asioi-Yüeh-chi who conquered the Tokharians-Ta-hia in the second century B.C.'.

Thus, there would seem to be difficulties with interpreting 'Reges Tocharium Asiani...' an allusion to Arci ruling the Yüeh-chih from the time they left the Tarim Basin, to the Wu-sun conquering the Yüeh-chih either before or after the latter's conquest of Ta Hsia, to the Kushanans conquest of the Yüeh-chih, or the Yüeh-chih's conquest of Ta Hsia. The only way forward may be to interpret these words as not being an allusion to an even of any kind at all, but rather simply being headings standing for subjects dealt with in Trogus' original work, 'The Kings of the Tochari', 'the Asiani' and 'the destruction of the Saraucarcae'. Under these circumstances, without the historical dynamic to test identifications, the identification of the Tochari and Asiani/Asii with any particular Chinese ethnonym becomes extremely hazardous.

Leaving aside then questions of identifications, discussion might turn to Tarn's claim that 'the conquest of the Ta-hia (Bactria proper) was the work of the Yüeh-chi', and that 'the supposed Saca conquest of Greek Bactria proper is a myth'. Tarn rightly observes that Chang Ch'ien seems to have known nothing of a conquest of Ta Hsia preceding the Yüeh-chih conquest, but Chang Ch'ien, who followed behind the Yüeh-chih, cannot be expected to have heard of events in Baktria before the Yüeh-chih's arrival there. Moreover, though the Ta Hsia the Yüeh-chih conquered was clearly the geographical equivalent of Baktria, we can not assume that Ta Hsia was ruled by Greeks at the time of the Yüeh-chih conquest.

---

77 Konow, *ibid*.
78 A suggestion made to the present author by Prof. A.B.Bosworth.
80 Tarn, *ibid*. 
The Chinese accounts of the Yüeh-chih conquest of Ta Hsia requires some further investigation.

When and how did the Yüeh-chih conquer Ta Hsia? The Chinese accounts offer no ready answer. On the one hand, in both the SC and HS Chang Ch'ien is held to have written that the Ta Yüeh-chih conquered the people of Ta Hsia. On the other hand, when referring to the states Chang Ch'ien visited on his first trip and the states to which he sent his deputies on the second trip, the Ta Yüeh-chih and Ta Hsia are always mentioned separately. The Yüeh-chih are said to have their capital north of the Oxos, and Ta Hsia is said to have a flourishing capital, Lan-shih, south of the Oxos. The reconciliation is effected by noting that the Yüeh-chih do not seem to have, in Chang Ch'ien's day, occupied all of Ta Hsia. Indeed, though some editions of the SC say that after defeating Ta Hsia, the Yüeh-chih dwelt there, other editions of the SC and all editions of the HS have 矢 (之) lorded over it.81

The Yüeh-chih must simply have forced the cities of Ta Hsia to recognise their sovereignty and pay a tribute, and then retired to north of the Oxos. Ta Hsia clearly straddled the Oxos, just as the Greko-Baktrian Empire had, but had the Yüeh-chih, in conquering Ta Hsia, conquered the Greko-Baktrian Kingdom?

In 127 B.C. Chang Ch'ien knew only of the Yüeh-chih occupation of the Baktrian territories north of the Oxos, but as HS 96A 14b records, the Yüeh-chih did eventually move south and occupy Ta Hsia:

The state of the Ta Yüeh-chih. The seat of government is at the town of Chien-shih ..., and ...(details on distances and population) and to the west one reaches An-hsi after 49 days' journey; to the south it adjoins Chi-pin. ... (History of the Yüeh-chih's migrations)... Originally Ta Hsia had no major overlord or chief, and minor chiefs were frequently established in the towns. The inhabitants are weak and afraid of fighting, with the result that when the Yüeh-chih migrated there, they made them all into their subjects.

A state without a single ruler and with inhabitants afraid of fighting would hardly seem a fit description of the Greko-Baktrian Kingdom of the Euthydemids or Eukratides. The above description has been explained by noting Justin's comment (XLI.vi.3) that the Baktrians were gradually weakened by their many wars, or by suggesting the Baktrians were weak and kingless because in the Yüeh-chih had met the last of the Greko-Baktrians cities

81 Hulsewe and Loewe, China in Central Asia, 1979, p.209, n.771, curiously prefer the former reading. Daffina, 'The Han Shu Hsi-yii', 1982, p.335, more correctly prefers the latter.
impossible to take, and contented themselves with extracting a tribute, and nominal vassalage, and withdrawn to north of the Oxos. The complete disintegration of the state could not, however, be explained simply by foreign wars or a battlefield defeat. A more probable explanation of the situation in which the Yüeh-chih found Baktria might be that the Greko-Baktrians had, after decades of wars abandoned Baktria to the Saka hordes long before the Yüeh-chih secured Ta Hsia's vassalage. As Enoki concluded in 1959, '...the [Greco] Bactrian kingdom had already been destroyed or cut into pieces when the Yüeh-shih arrived there.'

The view that the Greko-Bactrian kingdom suffered at least two separate nomad invasion in the mid-late 2nd century has recently received support in a study of coin hoards found at the site of Ai Khanoum, at the juncture of the Amu-Darya and the Kocha, and Kunduz, to the south west and nearer to the heart of ancient Bactria. As the Ai Khanoum hoarde contains no issues later than Eucratides I and Apollodotos I (c.155 B.C.) and the Qunduz hoard might be dated between 140 B.C. and 100 B.C., it is probable that in 129 B.C. Chang Chien had been taken note of the circumstances after the first invasion, when the Yüeh-chih occupied the Kochka valley, but before the second, when they moved further south into Bactria proper.

On the situation in Central Asia after the Yüeh-chih invasion of Ta Hsia, HS 96 A 15b offers the following comment: 'There are five Hsi-hou (these are listed as those of Hsiu-mi, Shuang-mi, Kuei-shuang, Hsi-tun, and Kao-fu). All the five Hsi-hou are subject to the Ta Yüeh-chih.'

This passage gives rise to many questions. What was the geographical or political definition of these Hsi-hou? Were they divisions that the Yüeh-chih had always had and brought with themselves to Ta-hsia? Were they divisions in Baktria which the Yüeh-chih

86 Ibid.
adopted?88 Were they divisions made by the Yüeh-chih immediately upon taking Baktria proper?89 Where they divisions made only one hundred years after the occupation of Baktria, on the eve of the Kushan take over?90 Investigation of these questions is beyond the scope of the present work.

Conclusion.

It might be concluded that though SC 123 has been thought to be contaminated by material of a later date, the contamination is minimal and the representation of Chang Ch'ien's report is faithful. It might also be argued that the Wu-sun attack on the Yüeh-chih is not mentioned in the SC, not because it never happened, but because it was not recorded in these terms by Chang Ch'ien. At the time of his first trip, Chang Ch'ien may have seen the Wu-sun as part of the Hsiung-nu. The attack might be dated to c.140 B.C. It might also be concluded that many difficulties have been overlooked in the search for equations between the ethnonyms in the Chinese texts with those in the Greek and Latin texts.

89 e.g. Narain, 'The five Yabgus', 1982, p.175.
90 e.g. Specht, 'Les Indo-Scythes', 1897, pp.158 & 162.
CHAPTER 16.

CHANG CH’IEN AND THE CENTRAL ASIAN SKYTHIANS (2).

Introduction.

Besides the Wu-sun and the Yüeh-chih, Chang Ch’ien mentioned several other Central Asian people/lands: K’ang-chü 桑居, Ta Yuan 大宛, Ta Hsia 大夏 and Yen-ts’ai 茂陵. These states received more detailed attention in the HS’s account of the Western Regions than in the SC’s simple reworking of Chang Ch’ien’s information, and indeed the HS introduced a people not mentioned at all by the SC, but who were purportedly active in Central Asia in Chang Ch’ien’s day, the Sai-wang 萨王. These five terms have received much attention in scholarly studies over the last one hundred years, but this attention has invariably not gone beyond seeking simple phonetic equations between Chinese terms and as many ethnonyms and toponyms known from Indian, Near Eastern, Central Asian, Greek and Latin texts as possible. Though phonetic equations can be very convincing and, more importantly, useful, for developing a better understanding of Central Asian History and the path of literary and oral traditions, and though their evaluation will not be neglected, there will be an emphasis in the discussion to follow on the concepts the terms conjured in the minds of the various han period writers and readers, and correspondences between these conceptions and the concepts which lay behind the terms in the non-Chinese literature.

Sai Wang 萨王.

The question of the ethnic origin of the Sai-wang has been only briefly argued. Lassen and St. Martin believed there was too great a distance between the homeland of the Sai on the upper Yellow River, and the land of the Saka, for the two to be connected¹, but as the Sai are clearly not located by any Chinese writer on the upper Yellow River, but further west, this objection has carried no weight. The phonetic similarities of the names has drawn most scholars to adopt the identification. Though offering different readings of the character,

Klaproth, 'Szu', DeGuignes, 'Su', Rémusat, 'Sai', Julien, 'Sse', and Schott, 'Se' and Franke, 'Sok', all these scholars saw in the name that of the 'Sakai' of Greek texts.

The identification of the Sai with the Saka has been argued on one further ground. Reading Mahabharata VI.xii.10 as 'in Sakadvipa, there is Mount Kumuda, a hill-fortress and the River Caksurvardhanika', reading Ptolemy as locating a Mt Komedai along with the Stone tower in the land of the Sakai north of the Iaxartes, noting that 'dvipa' usually designates land between two bodies of water, Chattopadhyaya concluded in 1975 that Sakadvipa 'appears to denote the land between the Iaxartes and Ili River, where the Chinese writers also locate the Sai'.

There are several problems with this argument. Firstly, though Sakadvipa later had associations in the Mahabharata and Puranas with the north west Saka, it initially seems to have had no such associations and to have been located to the east, not north or west of Meru. Secondly, the Mt.Kumuda, which is undoubtedly to be linked with Ptolemy's Mt Komedai, is not situated in the Sakadvipa, but Kusadvipa. Indeed, it is the Kusadvipa, not Sakadvipa that is mentioned in Mahabharata VI.xii.10. Thirdly, Ptolemy's 'Komedai' is not situated north of the Iaxartes, but rather at the source of the Iaxartes and Oxos, that is, in the Pamirs. Chattopadhyaya's argument offers, therefore, no support to the thesis that the Sai were Saka. It does not, however, detract from the thesis.

Accepting that the Sai were a kind of Saka in the wide sense of the word, the main question scholars have asked is whether the Sai-wang of the Chinese record were Strabo's Σακαραούλοι. The arguments in favour of the identification of the Sai-wang with the Sakaraauloi of Strabo have chiefly been arguments based on the phonetic or possible etymological similarity of the tribal-names. Franke and Herrmann believed *rauka meant 'Kings' in various Iranian dialects, translated 'Sai-wang' as 'the Saka princes or Kings', and suggested the Σακαραούλοι of Strabo, Σακαραούκαι of Lukian, Saraucae of the

---

2 See Franke, *Kenntnis der Türkvolker und Skythien Zentralasien*, 1904, p.46. De Groot, *Chinesische Urkunden zur Geschichte Asiens*, II, 1926, p.25 arrived at a phonetic rendering of Saka by a very different method. Reconstructing Σ as Σ, he believed the name could be read as 'Sak-ke' or 'Sak-ka'.


4 Clark, 'Sakadvipa', 1919, pp.222-3. Przyluski, 'Nouveau aspects d'histoire des Scythes', 1937, p.213, considered Sakadvipa to designate the Indus delta, and used this designation to support an argument in favour of an early Saka presence in the Indus valley. Przyluski does not, however, attempt to justify this designation, and no justification seems possible.
Prologue to Trogus, Sarangaes of Pliny and Σαράνγας of Ptolemy were all direct equivalents of the Chinese. Similarly, Konow saw the Chinese term as rendering an indigenous concept similar to that rendered by the Indian term 'Saka-murunda', 'Saka lords'. While the identification of the Sai-wang with the Sakarauloi has subsequently been adopted by such scholars as Haussig, Gafurov, Litvinskij, Sankrityana and Bivar, other scholars have rejected it. The arguments of these other scholars tend to fall into three groups.

The first group of arguments are those highlighting the weakness of the phonetic links. Some scholars have objected on the grounds that the conjected form *Saka rawaka is nowhere attested in Persian or Indian literature. Others have pointed out that the name does not always appear as a compound. Sometimes simply Sai are mentioned, and sometimes the expression Sai-chung of the Sai race' is found. The 'Wang' is accordingly more likely to mean 'king' or 'kings' than be part of a phonetic transcription. Indeed, 'Wang' may have been serving as a balance in the text of HS 96A 10b which is structured as follows:

Rapson and Herrmann have suggested that the 'Wang' refers to a particular Saka King, but the first Saka Kings to be named in Chinese texts lived many decades after the events here described, and as the 'Wang' is not here named, it almost certainly does not refer to an

6 Konow, 'Indoskythische Beitrage', 1916, p.791, *Kharoshthi inscriptions*, 1929, pp.xx-xxi, and 'Notes on Indo-Scythian Chronolgy', 1933, pp.7-8. This identification is rejected by Bagchi, 'Ancient Indian History', 1943, pp.39-40 on the grounds that the Saka and Murunda were not different parts of the same ethnonym, but two different ethnonyms.
7 Haussig, 'Die Beschreibung des Tarimbeckens', 1959, pp.171 & 177, though he sometimes seems to see this group as one driven from the Iaxartes by the Yueh-chih and other times as a ruling group of the Yueh-chih; Gafurov and Litvinskij, *История Таджикской ССР*, 1963, p.345; Sankrityana, *History of Central Asia*, 1964, p.9; Bivar, 'The Political History of Iran under the Arsacids', 1983, p.36.
individual\(^{10}\). The 'Wang' may well assist in designating a particular group of Sai, which after the Sai's general dispersal followed the main Sai chief. Humbach's analogy with the 'Basileioi Skythai' of the Ukraine might not be as useless as Hulsewé and Loewe think\(^{11}\).

An indigenous Iranian concept was clearly what gave birth to both the Greek 'Basileioi Skythai' (if not to the Indian 'Saka-murunda' as Konow suggested), so might well have given birth to 'Sai-wang'. It might be noted that those Sai who did not get all the way to Baktria and Chi-pin but established kingdoms referred to in HS 96A 10b and 19a,b as Hsiu-hsün and Chüan-tu, were called Sai, but not Sai-wang.

The second group of arguments are those which stress the different origins of the two peoples. Thus in 1957 Narain argued that:

> The Sai of the Upper Iii, mentioned in Chinese sources, were another Scythian tribe; they should not be confused with the Scythians of the Jaxartes valley or other areas west of them...Strabo explicitly refers to the Sakarauloi and other peoples as coming from the country which 'adjoins that of the Sacae' and therefore the Sacae must be different from the Sakarauloi (Sacaraucæ) or Asiani\(^{12}\).

This argument suffers from a dependence upon superficial readings of the Chinese and Greek texts. The Chinese sources do not specifically locate the Sai in the upper Iii region, and the Greek sources do not say Sakarauloi came from the Iaxartes valley. Indeed, as has been discussed in the previous chapter under 'Sakarauloi', the Chinese and Greek sources would seem to locate the Sai and Sakarauloi north of the upper Iaxartes.

The third, and most important group of arguments against the identification of the Sai-wang and the Sakarauloi are those stressing the different destinations of the Sai and the Sakarauloi. Thus, Maenchen-Helfen, Narain, and Pulleyblank argued that the Sai can not

\(^{10}\) Rapson, 'The Scythian and Parthian Invaders', 1922, p.511 went even further than seeing the reference to Sai-wang as meaning 'Scythian kings', and thought it may mean 'the Scythian king, without his tribesmen', that is, after the dispersal of his tribe, the king went himself to Chi-pin, which he identifies with Kapiça, and there became king. Herrmann, 'Sakai', 1920, pp.1802, dates the Sai-wang's migration to after 100 B.C. and identifies the Chi-pin chieftain, Yin-mo-fu of HS 96A 11b, with this Sai-wang. As Yin-mo-fu was a contemporary of the Emperor Yuan-ti, 48-33 B.C., Herrman is correct to note that his identification with the Sai-wang would only be possible if the Sai-wang's journey into Chi-pin were dated after 100 B.C., but at as late a date as the 40's B.C. is extremely unlikely, Konow, Kharoshti Inscriptions, 1929, p.xxv, is probably correct to reject the identification.

\(^{11}\) Humbach, Kusan und Hephtaliten, 1961, p.7, cited and dismissed as useless by Hulsewé and Loewe, China in Central Asia, 1979, p.105.

be identified with the Sakarauloi as the former went south to Chi-pin (which they identified on dubious grounds with Kashmir- see later discussion) and the latter went south west to Sogdiana and the Parthian frontier. Mukherjee has offered the most interesting argument to date in favour of conceiving of a direct Scythian migration over the Himalaya's. Philostratos, in his life of Apollonios (III.20) wrote:

'he (the legendary King Ganges) also repulsed the Scythians who once invaded this land (of Phraotes, near Taxila) across the Caucasus'.

This passage has been used by Mukherjee to support the proposition that the Sai did move directly across the Himalayas into Chi-pin. Against these arguments numerous objections might be raised.

Firstly, in reply to Mukherjee it might be noted that though the sage Apollonios is said to have travelled around north India, though Philostratos seems to preserve several notices on genuine Indian thought, custom and places, and though Apollonios may indeed have gone to India, it is unnecessary to insist on the historicity of Philostratos' Phraotes, as some scholars have done. Though the above passage might possibly represents exactly that which Mukherjee suggests it represents, it is also possible, given Philostratos' residency in Syria and wide reading, that it is an allusion to the Median Phraotes who Herodotos has fight Scythians from beyond the Caucasus in the 7th century B.C. Philostratos' story may then be another example of the momentum of the stories associated with the 7th century Scythian crossing of the Caucasus. Mukherjee's arguments can not then be accepted without reservation.

A second objection is the great difficulty a nomadic horde would have had in crossing a Kashmir pass. Narain conceded this difficulty but argued that the journey:

'must have covered considerable time and been achieved by stages, for whatever chronology we accept it is quiet certain that the earliest known date of a Saka king


15 See Basham (ed.), The Date of Kaniska, 1968, pp.210 & 424-5.

16 See Chapter 1.

in India [Maues] is at least several decades later than 160 B.C., when the Sai were forced to leave the Upper Ili\(^\text{18}\)

Such a gradual penetration of Kashmir does not, however, fit well the description of the crossing found in the Chinese sources, nor does it overcome the problem that it is extremely unlikely that nomads could have crossed in sufficiently large numbers to conquer for themselves an Indian Kingdom.

A third objection to the above arguments might be that the HS suggests the Sai's migration was a simple one stage movement. The HS often mentions the Sai or Sai-wang. There is mention made of their migration under Yüeh-chih pressure (HS 61 4b; 96A 10b), the assimilation of their remnants by the Wu-sun (HS 61 4b and 96B 1b), their crossing of the 'Hsien-tu' (96B 1b), their entry into Chi-pin (96A 10b and 19a) and their splitting into such states as Hsiu-hsün (96A 10b and 19a) and Chüan-tu (96A 10b and 19b). These states are described as being to the north-west of Shu-lo, as being originally of the Sai race, and as having a way of life and clothing similar to the Wu-sun, i.e. being nomadic. As Shu-lo is definitely Kashgar, Hsiu-hsün and Chüan-tu might be located in the Pamir or Alai region\(^\text{19}\). Though the existence of these Sai states has been taken by Narain as evidence that the Sai took a straight southerly route from the Ili to Kashmir, it is not impossible that it evinces a fragmentation which may have sent some Sai south-westward.

A fourth objection is that although the HS 61 4b and 96A 10b have invariably been interpreted as meaning the Sai went south at the same time the Yüeh-chih went west, that is at the time the Hsiung-nu defeated the Yüeh-chih, and as meaning the Sai went south to Chi-pin from the first place the Yüeh-chih drove them, that is, the T'ien Shan region\(^\text{20}\), there is another, far more logical interpretation of the passage. It has been argued

\(\text{20}\) Such an interpretation is implicit, for example, in Hulsewé and Loewe's translation of the second of these passages as 'When formerly the Hsiung-nu had defeated the Ta Yüeh-chih, the latter moved West and established themselves as masters of Ta Hsia; it was in these circumstances that the king of Sai moved South and established himself as master of Chi-pin'. This translation suggests what followed the colon was not subsequent to, but simultaneous with, that related before it. This is not implied in the Chinese. HS 61 4b: 月氏已為匈奴所破，西擊塞王，塞王南走遠徙，月氏居其地。

HS 96A 10b: 月氏破大月氏，大月氏西居大夏，而塞王南居罽賓。
convincingly by Karlgren and Konow that the place from which the Sai moved south into
Chi-pin was not the place from which the Yüeh-chih first drove the Sai, but the place in
which the Yüeh-chih finally came to rest, i.e. Ta Hsia. As Konow, using a translation
provided by Karlgren reads the HS 96A 10b passage:
'When the Hiung-nu beat the Ta Yüe-chi, the Ta Yüe-chi went west and became
rulers of the Ta-hia, and (the former rulers of the Ta-hia, who were now expelled,
i.e. the Sai-wang) the Sai-kings, went south and became rulers over Chi-pin' 

It is indeed, as Konow notes, just such an interpretation which Sü Sung offered in A.D.
1800, when he wrote in his commentary that 'The Sai-wang were the kings of Ta-hia.'

A fifth objection to the different destination argument might be that though such eminent
scholars as Levi, Chauvannes, Pelliot, Bagchi and Pulleyblank have identified Chi-pin with
Kashmir, and though the Chi-pin of some later Chinese texts can indisputably be
identified with Kashmir, Franke, Konow, Herzfeld and Petech have argued convincingly
that in Han times Chi-pin designated a Saka empire north east of Arachosia, south of the
Hindu-Kush and west of the Indus. This would mean that the Sai might have migrated to
Chi-pin, not through Kashmir, but via Baktria.

It is possible that a Scythian people living on the Ilıı, having been driven by the Yüeh-chih
across the Iaxartes some time in the 160's B.C., appeared to the Greeks as the
'Sakarauloi', who from Sogdiana harassed Parthia and Baktria. When the Wu-sun drove
the Yüeh-chih into Sogdiana sometime in the 130's, the Scythians were driven even deeper

21 Konow, 'Notes on Indo-Scythian Chronology', 1933, p.10.
22 Ibid. This conclusion was adopted by Bachhofer, 'On Greeks and Śaka in India', 1941,
p.245.
23 Konow, ibid. Konow, pp.12 & 19, even went so far as to suggest that the so-called
Old Saka era of the Kushana's was calculated from c.145 B.C., the date the Sakas
finally overthrew the Greko-Baktrian rulers.
24 Levi and Chauvannes, 'Le Kipin, situation et historique', 1895, pp.371-384;
Chauvannes, Les pay d'occident d'aprè le Wei-lìo, 1905, p.538; Pelliot, 'Tokharian et
Koutchéen', 1934, p.39; Bagchi, 'Ancient Indian History', 1943, pp.33-35 and 'Kipin
and Kashmir', 1944, pp.42-53; Pulleyblank, 'The consonantal system of Old
25 Franke, Kenntnis der Turkvolker und Skythen Zentralasiens, 1904, pp.15 & 59ff.;
Konow, Kharosshi Inscriptions, 1929, pp.xxiii-xxv; Herzfeld, 'Sakastan', 1935,
pp.20-21; Tarn, Greeks in Bactria and India, 1938 (1951), pp.277-279; Petech, North
India according to the Sui-ching-chu, 1950, pp.63-80, concluding on p.79 that 'the
name Chi-pin is originally unconnected with Kashmir; in the dynastic histories from the
1st century B.C. to the end of the 5th century A.D. it indicates the Indian territories of
the great political power of the North-West, whatever it was at the time of writing
(Saka, Kushan, Hepthalite); in the Buddhist tradition, from the beginning (2nd century
A.D.) till the times of Hsüan-tsang, Chi-pin is Kashmir.'
into Parthia, where they are recorded as overrunning the Parthia of Phraates II, and the Baktria of the last Eucratid, and when, shortly before Chang Ch’ien’s arrival in Ta Hsia, the Yüeh-chih conquered Ta Hsia, they must have driven the Sai from Baktria. The Yüeh-chih at first established their capital on the north side of the Oxos, but being in control of the Baktrian lands to the south, the Sai went south into Drangiana. This event accounts for Justin’s reference to the Saraucae being annihilated and Greek references to a Sakastene in Drangiana. From Drangiana some Saka veered east and occupied the lands south of the Hindu-Kush, which was labelled Chi-pin by the Han Chinese.

The above scenario leaves two questions unanswered. If the Sai are to be identified with the Saka, why is there no mention of the Sai in the SC and why does the HS 96 B 2a have the Sai cross the ‘Hsien-tu’?

The absence of any reference to the Sai in the SC has lead many scholars to suspect that though there was a Sai migration into Chi-pin, Chang Ch’ien never mentioned it, and it occurred well after Chang Ch’ien’s day. There are several other possible explanations for the discrepancy between the HS and the SC.

Firstly, Chang Ch’ien mentioned the Sai in his report, but Ssu-ma Ch’ien did not, for the sake of brevity, include the references in his history. It is, however, improbable that Pan Ku passed over Ssu-ma Ch’ien’s convenient account of Chang Ch’ien’s speech, and looked at the original record of the speech, and improbable that Ssu-ma Ch’ien could have totally avoided mentioning the Sai, if Chang Ch’ien had mentioned them.

Secondly, Chang Ch’ien did not mention the Sai in his report in 126 B.C., but the Sai were mentioned by Chang Ch’ien in his report of c.114 B.C., and Pan Ku simply placed this information in the context of Chang Ch’ien’s first report. If, however, this information was in Chang Ch’ien’s second report, Ssu-ma Ch’ien would probably have incorporated it into his account of Chang Ch’ien’s second report.

Herrmann, ‘Sakai’, 1920, pp.1782, 1800, 1802 & 1805; De Groot, Chinesische Urkunden, II, 1926, pp.25 and 86-87. Thomas, ‘Sakastana’, 1906, p.181-464 might have used this textual problem to support his case in favour of a very early Saka penetration of India, arguing that Chang Ch’ien did not mention the Saka migration because it occurred long before, not after, his day, and was only learnt of later, but fails to do so. Unfamiliar with the Chinese material, Thomas (p.187 n.1) prefers to abstain from evaluating it and to simply conclude that ‘There seems to be no real proof that the Sse of the Chinese, though the original pronunciation was Sek or Sok (...) were our Sakas’.
Thirdly, neither Chang Ch'ien nor Ssu-ma Ch'ien had heard of the Sai, but that the Sai migration was reported by one or more of the envoys who followed Chang Ch'ien, a report Ssu-ma Ch'ien never saw or never used, but which Pan-ku did see, and felt free to incorporate into the Chang Ch'ien section of his history. It is, indeed, not improbable that another envoy might record what Chang Ch'ien failed to record. Chang Ch'ien followed behind the Yüeh-chih to the west, and had never travelled further than Ta Hsia, which by the time of his sojourn had been vacated by the Sai. Subsequent envoys, on the other hand, went seeking information in all directions, and clearly went as far as Chi-pin. This seems to be the most useful explanation of the discrepancy. There is no need to assume that the migration was fiction, or of a post-Chang Ch'ien date.

The HS reference to the 'Hsien-tu' may simply be explained as anachronistic. A 'hanging pass' in the Pamirs was frequently used by post-Chang Ch'ien envoys heading for Chi-pin, and it was assumed as some stage that the route taken by later envoys was that used by the Scythians encountered south of the Hindu-Kush.

K'ang-chü

The name K'ang-chü has been linked on phonetical, geographical and historical grounds with a wide range of ethnonyms and toponyms.

The first is with the Kashgar region, and identification proposed by Kingsmill on what seem to be phonetic grounds, but Hirth dealt this identification a quick blow by pointing to the description in the HS of the road from Tun-huang west along the southern slopes of the T'ien Shan to Su-lo (the name by which Kashgar is usually known in Chinese texts)

continues, 'you cross the Ts'ung-ling (the Pamirs), whence you come out to Ta Yuan, K'ang-chü and An-ts'ai.28.

The second is with Sogdiana, usually either on the grounds that the K'ang-chü were the same as the Kaxa-yai or Exubai of Ptolemy VI.xiv.11 and these Ptolemy seems to locate in Sogdiana29, or on the grounds that K'ang-chü is derived from a 'Tocharian' word for 'Stone', and that 'Stone country' designates Sarmakand30. Sogdiana was, however, usually referred to by Han period scholars as Li-i and Su-i, and by Wei, Sung and Chou period scholars as Su-t'e. Moreover, as Shiratori pointed out in 1928, not only is Li-i clearly a corruption of Su-i, and Su-i (*Siw-ok/iek) clearly an attempted phonetic rendering of Sugdak, but the HHS 88 8-9 described Li-i as rich land producing excellent horses, cattle, sheep and grapes, and belonging to the K'ang-chü.31 The description of Li-i fits well Sogdiana, so famous in medieval times for its luxuriousness, and the description of Li-i as subject to the nomadic K'ang-chü would seem to suggest the K'ang-chü themselves were not Sogdians32.

The third is with Khorasmia, usually on the grounds that the K'ang-chu were the Avestan Kangha, and the Avesta seems to locate these people in Khorasmia, but also on the

---

28 Kingsmill, 'Dr F.Hirth and the Hiung-nu', 1901-2, p.140 made the following extraordinary remarks: 'K'angku first appears in Sz'ma Ts'ien, and is there, and, in the early Chinese authors, invariably, Kashgar. In the eleventh century the descendents of a Turk called Seljuk established an empire which finally became conterminous with Ferghana and extended to the Byzantine realm. This country is, by the Chinese, called the state of K'angku. Seljuk or his son seems to have crossed the Jaxartes about A.D.1000 and first established his seat of government at the city of Kashgar, which hence gave its name to the kingdom which soon reached to the Oxus'. Hirth replied to Kingsmill in his 'Mr Kingsmill and the Hiung-nu', 1909, pp.34-35. The text of HS 96A (1b) is as follows:北 道 西 蘭 帝 羅 率 出 大 庭 延 康 華 來 轶。


31 For references to and a discussion of these scholars usages see Shiratori, 'A study on Su-t'e, 1928, p.95 and 'The geography of the Western Region', 1956, p.76; Enoki, 'Sogdiana and the Hsiung-nu', 1955, pp.51-53.

32 Shiratori, 'A study on Su-t'e', 1928, p.95. Enoki, ibid.

33 Shiratori, ibid.
grounds that a coin found in Khorasmia seems to refer to 'Kanga'\textsuperscript{34}. Khorasmia, however, is clearly included in the territory of the Yen-ts'ai. The Yen-ts'ai lived by the Great Marsh, probably the Oxos delta and Aral.

The fourth is with the region north-east of the Iaxartes, between the Talas and Chu river valleys\textsuperscript{35}. If Chang Ch'ien's Kang-chü was between the Talas and Chu rivers, that is, north of Ferghana, it is unclear why Chang Ch'ien, whose mission it was to contact the Ta Yueh-chih, would have gone from Ferghana to the Yüeh-chih on the Oxos via a people to the north, and it is unclear how the Wu-sun could have made appearance at the siege of the Ferghana capital in 101 B.C.

The fifth, and most plausible, identification is with the middle Iaxartes region, from Sogdiana in the south, and Khorasmia in the west to the Talas river valley in the north east. It is to roughly this region such scholars as Gafurov, Litvinskij and Daffina seem to be alluding when offering their geographical identification of the K'ang-chü\textsuperscript{36}. In support of this identification it might be noted that the Talas river appears from \textit{Han Shu 70} to be included within the K'ang-chü territory in 42/41 B.C.\textsuperscript{37} Herrmann would seem to base much the same identification upon the phonetic equivalence with \textit{Kapatai}, whom Ptolemy (VI.xiii.3) located among the Saka north of the Iaxartes;

''The Sakai dwelling along the Iaxartes are called Karatai and Komaroi; those (living) in the entire mountain region, Komedai; those along the Askatankas Massagetai, those in between, Grinaioi and Toornai.''


\textsuperscript{36} Gafurov and Litvinskij, История Таджикского народа, 1963, p.348; Litvinskij, 'Джунский могильник и некоторые аспекты Кангюско-
Sarmatische Farnah', 1972, pp. 251-53) and 'Das K'ang-chü-Sarmatische Farnah II', 1976, esp. p.67. Litvinskij wanted to use a Khotan Saka word 'kanga', 'skin' or 'pelt' to give 'The people in the leather cloth' as the sense in K'ang-chü); Daffina, 'The Han Shu Hsi Yü', 1982, pp.323-324.


\textsuperscript{38} Herrmann, \textit{Das Land der Seide}, 1938, p.141.
This geographical identification is more compatible with the SC's and HS's localisation of the state, than any of the other identifications, but does not sufficiently stress one important feature of the Chinese descriptions: the seat of K'ang-chü power was not fixed.

All specific geographical identification of the Kang-chü fail to take account of the description of the K'ang-chü state given in HS 96A 15b:

The seat of the king's government in winter is in [Lo]-yüeh-ni-[ti]...to the town of Pei-t'ien. It is distant by 12300 li from Ch'ang-an, and is not subject to the protector general. One reaches [Lo]-yüeh-ni-[ti] after a journey of seven days on horseback, and it is a distance of 9104 li, within the realm, to the king's summer residence...The way of life is identical with that of the Tā Yüeh-chih. In the east [the inhabitants] were constrained to serve the Hsiung-nu'

From this passage it is clear, as Shiratori argues, that K'ang-chü was 'an itinerant country', that is, 'a nomadic tribe moving about in pursuit of grass and water'. The winter and summer residences were the towns in which the nomad court lodged themselves, when the tribe migrated.

There have been several attempts at explaining the place names found in this text. Shiratori argued that the name Pei-t'ien, which he considered the name of the K'ang-chü capital, might be phonetically linked with the name of the Turkic peoples called Pechenegs, and that Lo-yüeh-ni (or $L$) $\text{Luk-ot-tok}$ plus 'ti' for place, might come from the Turkish 'ulu ottok', 'Great village', but Shiratori view of 2nd century B.C. Central Asia as Turkish has been largely, and justifiably, rejected, and the etymologies he offers are in no way compelling. Wang Kuo-wei, identified Lo-yüeh-ni with Yu-ni, one of the K'ang-chü petty kingdoms, but Pelliot has pointed out that and had very different ancient readings. Pulleyblank tried to link Lo-yüeh-ni-ti with the hydronym 'Iaxartes', but the 'ti' in the above Chinese term was almost certainly meant to be read, not phonetically, but

---

39 Shiratori, 'A Study on Su-tö', 1928, pp.84-90. Shiratori translates the above passage as follows: 'The king of K'ang-kü resides in the land of Lo-yüeh-ni in winter. Pei-t'ien City is 12,300 li away from Chang-an. It does not belong to the Governor-General. To reach the land of Yüeh-ni, one goes seven days on horseback. To Fan-nei where the monarch resides in summer, it is 9,104 li...The people, with the same custom as the Ta-yüeh-chih, are subject to the Hsiung-nu on the east'. Daffina, 'The Han Shu Hsi Yu', 1982, p.326, also takes Fan-nei to be a place name.

40 Shiratori, ibid, pp.87-89. Similarly Shiratori identified the K'ang-chü with the Turkic speaking Kangar of the later 7th early 8th century Okhon texts. See Thomsen, Inscriptions de l’Orkhon, 1896, p.105 and Kljashtornyj, ‘КЯНГОСКАЯ ЭТНО-ТОПОНИМИКА В ОРХОНСКИХ ТЕКСТАХ’, 1951, pp.54-63.

41 Wang Kuo-wei is cited and his comment discussed by Pelliot, 'L'édition collective des œuvres de Wang Kuo-wei', 1929, p.151.
as the idea 'region'. Hulsewé and Loewe suggested that if ' within the realm' is an error for a place name 'P'o-nei', this might have something to do with the tribal name 'Parni', but it is unlikely that a name attributed to a band of nomads that left the Aral region at the beginning of the 3rd century B.C. could have anything to do with the name of a town in Central Asia in the late 2nd century B.C. There has, therefore, been no satisfactory identification of any of the K'ang-chü place names to date.

If the term K'ang-chü did then designate a nomadic people there is the possibility that the term might designate the same group of people as a term in the classical Greek sources. In 1888 Gutschmid thought they might be identified with the Sakarauloi. The Sakarauloi have been identified with the Sai-wang, but this need not count against their further identification with the K'ang-chü. As Chang Ch'ien did not himself name the Sai-wang, it is conceivable that he conceived of the Sai-wang/Sakarauloi under the name K'ang-chü, and that it was only after the further dispersal of this people that the Chinese saw them in terms of at least two very different people. That which does count against the identification is the fact that the later writers nowhere link the Sai with the K'ang-chü, nor does any writer refer to K'ang-chü south of the Oxos, or fleeing, as the Sai did, before the Yüeh-chih. Indeed, Chang Ch'ien was passed on to the Yüeh-chih by the K'ang-chü. The identification of the Chinese ethnynym with a Greek one is, therefore, hazardous.

For all the discussion of where the K'ang-chü state was, and with what region or tribe named in western sources it might be identified, there has been surprisingly little discussion of two references to K'ang-chü in pre-Chang Ch'ien contexts. The first of these references is to be found in Ssu-ma Hsiang-ju's address to the peoples of Pa and Shu after they were mal-treated by the Han commander T'ang Meng in 130 B.C., recorded in SC 117 (p.3044): 此幸居西域, 重譯請朝, 稽首來享.

The second of the references is to be found in Tung Chung-shu's address to Emperor Wu as recorded in HS 56 (p.2511): 此太平之致也, 夜郎、哀牢, 皆方萬里, 謹德歸誠.
This address, recommending the recruitment of one filial scholar from each commandery, a recommendation put into effect in 134 B.C., may have been made sometime in the years 136-134.

Though it is possible that 'K'ang-chü' was the phonetic rendering of a Central Asian tribal-name, first heard by Chang Ch'ien, it is improbable that news of this tribe was brought to China for the first time by Chang Ch'ien, and that the above addresses are reworkings of original addresses, which were made after Chang Ch'ien's and to which later news, such as embassies from the K'ang-chü, was added. The supposed interpolation is not to be found in the record of just one address, but of two, and that which is supposed to have taken from Chang Ch'ien's report for interpolation is not that which features most prominently in this report (the Yüeh-chih feature much more prominently). The references cannot then be dismissed as anachronisms. How then do we explain the apparent familiarity of some Chinese with the term 'K'ang-chü' five to ten years before Chang Ch'ien's return?

There would seem to be two possible ways of explaining the familiarity evidenced by these references. Either the people called K'ang-chü in these addresses were identical with those Chang Ch'ien called K'ang-chü, or they were different.

If the former, then the references may evince either that there was pre-Chang Ch'ien contact between China and a people dwelling as far west as the Iaxartes, as Shih Chih-mien would suggest or that the K'ang-chü in the 130's dwelt not on the Iaxartes but on the western border of China, as Pulleyblank suggests. There are difficulties with both these suggestions. If the K'ang-chü of the addresses were living on the Iaxartes it is difficult to image how they could manage to send, let alone why they would want to send, gifts to the Han court at a time when the road in between was controlled by Hsiung-nu. If the K'ang-chü of the address were living in closer proximity to China, it is difficult to conceive how they could have migrated through the Hsiung-nu held Tarim basin and occupied the Iaxartes before Chang Ch'ien encountered them in 129 B.C., and how, if they had

46 The interpolation explanation is also rejected by Hervouet, ibid., who writes 'c'est une solution que seule une contradiction absolue avec des données historiques peut faire envisager...'.
47 Cited Hulsewé and Loewe, China in Central Asia, 1979, p.124 n.248.
managed this, Chang Ch'ien, who had been resident in the Tarim Basin throughout the 130's, could have failed to note this.

Hervouet would overcome the above difficulties by suggesting that the Chinese in Ch'in Shih-huang's day had, as Tung Chung-shu suggested, had contact with a real western people called the K'ang-chü, and the Emperor received from them a gift of horses, but Ssu-ma Siang-ju was speaking hyperbolically when referring to the Han court recently receiving K'ang-chü envoys, and was, in fact, simply alluding to the same very ancient embassy to which Tung Chung-shu alluded. Thus, the K'ang-chü which Chang Ch'ien met, and those that Tung Chung-chu alluded to as sending horses to Ch'in Shih Huang, may have been the same people, but Ssu-ma Hsiang-ju was simply trying to stress China's strength when suggesting the court had only recently received K'ang-chü envoys. The suggestion that Ssu-ma Hsiang-ju may have been alluding to that same K'ang-chü mission, which Tung Chung-shu dated to the time of Ch'in Shih Huang is very plausible, but the suggestion that the people designated by the term K'ang-chü in this early popular story, and those designated by this term in Chang Ch'ien's work were the same, is not so plausible.

If Chang Ch'ien's K'ang-chü were different from those alluded to in the above addresses, then it may be, as Hulsewé and Loewe suggest, that Ssu-ma Hsiang-ju and Tung Chung-shu were referring to a 'topic or area which featured in 'everyday talk before it had found its way into official writings'. The implications of such an interpretation seems to escape Hulsewé and Loewe, but if the term 'K'ang-chü' was commonly used to designate a people in the distant west before Chang Ch'ien set out on his expedition, then it is possible that it is not the phonetic sound of the characters in the name which is important, but the meaning of the characters, 'dwelling in happiness'. This name may have consistently designated the western people in the known world (much like the Greek 'Hyperborean', Indian 'Uttarakuru' and Chinese 'White people' designated a furthestmost people) until Chang Ch'ien applied the term to a Scythian people on the Iaxartes and this usage became the standard.

49 Hervouet, 'Ssense ma Siang-ju', 1964, p.89.
50 Though Hulsewé and Loewe, China in Central Asia, 1979, p.124 n.298, do not explicitly say that they conceive of this pre-Chang Ch'ien "everyday" usage as being different from Chang Ch'ien's official usage.
51 On 'Hyperboreans' see Chapters 1 and 3. On 'Uttarakuru' see Chapter 15, 'Tokharoi'. On 'White people' see the references to the Shan-hai-ching, Lü-shih-ch'un-ch'iu and Ichou-shu in Maenchken-Helfen, 'Svetadvipa', 1939, p.166.
Ta Yuan 大宛 and Ta Hsia 大夏.

The two states of Ta Yuan and Ta Hsia feature prominently in Chang Ch'ien's account, the former as the state to which Chang Ch'ien travelled after his escape from the Hsiung-nu, the latter as the last state he visited in person, when finally he caught up with the Yüeh-chih on the Oxos. There has been considerable debate over the exact geographical definition of these states, and over the identification possible, especially on phonetic grounds, with the names of states and people known from western sources.

Ta Hsia is invariably translated into English as 'Bactria', but there has been some disagreement on whether Ta Hsia designated the Baktrian Empire as delimited at the height of Greek rule, the Baktrian homeland proper, or just eastern Baktria. Chang Ch'ien's description of Ta Hsia, though detailed enough to perceive in it the commercially orientated city culture of the Baktrians, offers only one geographical delimiter- the Oxos. In the SC 123 the Yüeh-chih are said to have conquered Ta Hsia, but ruled it from a capital north of the Oxos. The HS 96A 14b continues the story, by giving a brief account of the Yüeh-chih occupation of Ta Hsia itself. As Ta Hsia was not used in the SC or HS to designate the lands north of the Oxos and as Chi-pin is used to designate lands south of the Hindu-Kush, Ta Hsia clearly did not designate all lands conquered by the Greko-Baktrians, and as it is not possible to discern a separate East and West Baktria, it is probable that Chang Ch'ien's Ta Hsia was simply the Baktria homeland. Ta Yuan's geographic identification has been a matter for far greater debate than Ta Hsia's. Ta Yuan has been identified most commonly with either Sogdiana or Ferghana.

Ta Yuan's identification with Sogdiana has been fiercely argued by Pulleyblank on several grounds. Ta Yuan is described in the SC and HS as having many cities, and its citizens are said to enjoy a settled life. This is felt to be an appropriate description of Sogdiana, but of no land further east. The capital of Ta Yuan is, moreover, given in HS 96A 17b as Kuei-shuang (-ni) and this is thought to be very close in pronunciation to the town Kushaniya, a little to the west of Sarmarkand and known to the Chinese as Ch'ü-shuang-ni-chia. This

---

52 e.g. Mukherjee, 'Ta-hsia and the problem concerning the advent of nomad peoples in Greek Bactria', 1969, pp.395-400 and Daffina, 'The return of the dead', 1972, pp.87-92.
54 Ibid.
identification is, however, based upon the assumptions that Ferghana could not have possessed cities in this period, and that Kushanija could not be anything other than Kuei-shuang. Both assumptions are of dubious value. Ferghana was agriculturally highly developed in ancient times so probably had numerous towns, while any number of cities in Central Asia may have received names similar to Kushanija during the period in which the Kushans ruled the region.

Ta Yuan's identification with the rich Ferghana valley on the upper course of the Iaxartes has been argued upon several grounds. On the one hand, Ferghana roughly fits the geographical demands of the SC and HS passages, and was probably as cultivated as Sogdiana. On the other hand, as Daffina argues, in Wei-shu 102, 11b, 8 and Pei-shu 97, 13b, 1, Ta-yüan is called Lo-na, a short form of P'lo-na, a land visited by Tung Yuan in A.D. 437/38 and from which the Northern Wei received envoys in 439/440. P'lo-na, *p'ua-lak-na and the Arab 'Farghana' are probably both attempts to represent an indigenous name *Parkana. This identification is undoubtedly the most useful.

Besides the above geographical identifications, several ethnic identifications posited on the grounds of phonetic identity. Ta Hsia has been variously identified with the Tokharians, and the Dahai. The people of Ta Yuan have been variously identified with the 'Phrunoi', and with the Tokharoi (*Taxwar). These phonetic identifications have, however, been conceived and transmitted with very little attention to the history of the terms Ta Hsia and Ta Yuan in Chinese literature. A study of the way these terms would seem to have been used in pre-Chang Ch'ien literature suggests that centuries before Chang Ch'ien applied these terms to states beyond the Tarim Basin they were used to designate mythical places on the perimeter of Chinese world.

56 See Chapter 14, note 85.
Franke and Haloun, in 1919 and 1926 respectively, investigated in depth the many different ways the Chinese used the term Ta Hsia\textsuperscript{60}. These ways included regions near the Gobi, Kan-su, Shan-si, L'ung-men and a mythical land to which the Yellow Emperor once travelled\textsuperscript{61}. The chief difference between Franke and Haloun's understanding of the term Ta Hsia is that whereas Franke seems to believe there had been a state on the Chinese periphery to which the term originally applied, Haloun believes, on better grounds, that the term originated as the label for a purely mythographic concept and that it designated mythical lands visited by Chinese kings long before it designated any real lands. Though no study has appeared on the subject of Ta Yuan, there are references to Ta Yuan lying on a very ancient westbound road\textsuperscript{62}, so it is probable that Ta Hsia and Ta Yuan feature in the same mythography from a very early date.

As Ta Hsia and Ta Yuan were both placed on the traditional route taken by the Yellow Emperor to the west, as Ta Ch'in was used to designate a fabulous land in later Taoist


\textsuperscript{61} In the \textit{Tso-chuan} Chao I, Ta Hsia is the name of the earthly refuge (modern-day south west Shansi) of the Shih-ch'en constellation. In \textit{Chou-li} 22, 5b15a, \textit{Tso-chuan} Siang 29, \textit{Chuang-tse} 10 (3), 17a, \textit{Huai-nan-tse} 13, 3b, \textit{Li-chi} 10/II, 34; 12, 10, and in slightly different forms elsewhere Ta Hsia is the name of a dance form. In the 3rd century B.C. \textit{Chou-shu} 59, it is the name of a fabulous northern people. In the 2nd century B.C. \textit{Huai-nan-tse} 4, 4b-5a, it is the name of a fabulous people to the north. In \textit{Lü shi Ch'un Ch'iu}, ch.25 vol.I, p.49 the Yellow Emperor went west through Ta-hsia in search of the bamboo suitable to make musical pipes with perfect pitch. Cf. Needham, \textit{Science and Civilisation in China} IV, 1, 1962, Sect.26, p.178.

\textsuperscript{62} See \textit{Hai Nei Shih Chou Chü} p.1a on the mythography of the oceanic islands, attributed to Tung-fang Shuo\textsuperscript{\textregistered}, a Han, but written in the 4th or 5th century A.D. See Needham, \textit{Science and Civilisation}, V, pt.2, section 33, 1974, p.122 for the following translation: 'Formerly, in Ch'in Shih Huang Ti's time, when the bodies of many men unrighteously and untimely killed were lying about in Ferghana and along the roads (that led there), birds resembling crows or ravens appeared carrying this plant (of deathlessness) in their bills, and placed it on the faces of those corpses so that they immediately sat up and were restored to life'. This story is repeated in the \textit{Chin Lou Tzu} Ch.5, p.16a, b, by Hsiao I, emperor Liang Yuan Ti, c.550 A.D.
literature\textsuperscript{63}, and as Chang Ch'ien clearly discussed in his report the geographical location of the unquestionably mythological 'Jo shui'\textsuperscript{63,64} and 'Hsi Wang Mu'\textsuperscript{63,64}, it is possible that Chang Ch'ien, once beyond the reach of the Hsiung-nu and in the cultivated lands of Ferghana, Baktria and the Near East, drew heavily upon pre-existing mythographic names. It is even possible that Chang Ch'ien left China either with the conviction that beyond the Shifting sands of the Takla Makan he would find the fabulous lands of Ta Hsia, Ta Yuan and Ta Ch'in, or with the knowledge that beyond the Shifting sands, the Emperor would expect him to find these lands. Chang Ch'ien's work, like that of so many other ancient writers, reveals as much about the writer's expectations and education, as about Central Asian ethnography and geography.

**Yen-ts'ai 艮泰.**

There has been little debate over the ethnic affinities of the Yen-ts'ai. Dwelling further west than any of the other tribes mentioned by Chang Ch'ien, modern scholars have been nearly unanimous in regarding them as an Iranian-speaking people\textsuperscript{65}. There has, however, been much debate over which other ethnonyms and toponyms the name 'Yen-ts'ai might be connected. Numerous connections have been recommended.

\textsuperscript{63}See the *Tai-ch'ing chin-yi shen-tan ching* discussed in Maspero, 'Un texte taoist sur l'Orient Romain', 1950, pp.95-100. It has even been suggested by such scholars as Watson, 'Iran and China', 1983, p.537, that it was the later Taoist ideas of a western paradise of the immortals, preceded over by the Hsi-wang-mu of the Mu-t'ien-tzu Chuan, that paved the way for the later success in China of the doctrine of Amitabha Buddha and his western paradise. Though Maspero, *Taoism and Chinese Religion*, 1981, pp.191-6, discusses both the paradise of the Taoists and the paradise of Amitabha without suggesting belief in the former encouraged acceptance of the latter, and though such a relationship between the two concepts is not demonstrable, it is a possibility.

\textsuperscript{64}Kingsmill, 'Intercourse of China with eastern Turkestan', 1876, p.9, believed these names were attached to very specific places and identified Yo-shui with the Hamun or lake Seistan, and saw 'Hsi-wang-mu' as a corruption of Sumera. These identifications, besides being incredibly facile are totally unnecessary. The Chinese concepts were very ancient and need no localisation.

\textsuperscript{65}The only exceptions are Shiratori and Ch'en Chung-mien, cited in Enoki, 'Sogdiana and the Hsiung-nu', 1955, p.49 n.25.
One of the earliest identifications was Kingsmill's identification of the tribal-name, on the most extraordinarily perverse phonetical grounds, with Samarkand. This identification was soundly rejected by Hirth in 1910.

The identification which was to have the greatest impact on modern scholarship was that with the Aorsoi of the Greek literature, introduced by Hirth and Guschmid in 1885. There are two grounds on which this identification has been made: phonetic and geographical. 'Yen-ts'ai', the ancient reading of which is thought to be closer to the possible modern variant reading 'An-ts'ai', is thought to render phonetically the same indigenous tribal-name which the Greeks rendered 'Aorsoi'. An excellent example of the Chinese using the syllable 'An' to represent the sound 'Ar' is the Chinese use of 'An-hsi' for 'Arsak', or Parthia. The Chinese texts would, moreover, seem to locate the Yen-ts'ai in the north Caspian-Aral region, and this is thought to correspond closely with the probable domain of the Aorsi in the late 2nd and 1st century B.C.

The 'Yen-ts'ai-Aorsi' equation has been extended with several further identifications. These include identifications of dubious value, such as those, upon geographic grounds, with Ptolemy's Asiatic Sarmatians and the Kipchak and, upon phonetic grounds, with

---

66 In 1882 Kingsmill, 'The Intercourse of China with Eastern Turkestan', p.80 took Tsai-im-li-kan to be a faulty reference to Tsai-im-li-kan, which he believed a phonetic rendering of 'Samarkand'. Kingsmill repeated this argument in 'Dr F.Hirth and the Hsiung Nu', 1901-2, p.137.

67 Hirth, 'Mr Kingsmill and the Hsiung-nu', 1910, pp.35-37. Kingsmill, alluded to SC 123 2b, but in this passage the allusion is almost certainly not to Samarkand. The Li-kan which Kingsmill includes in the phonetic transcription of 'Samarkand', though difficult to identify exactly, is certainly to be identified with a land further west. For an overview of identifications of Li-kan (Media, Hyrkania, Syria, the Seleukid Empire, Alexandria in Egypt and Rome) see Hulsewé and Loewe, China in Central Asia, 1979, p.117 n.275 and Leslie and Gardiner, 'Chinese knowledge', 1982, p.290-297.


Herodotos' Massagetai\textsuperscript{71}, and two identifications worthy of serious discussion. The first of these is that with the \textit{Alani} of the Latin writers. The second is that with the \textit{Ho-su} of the HS.

The '\textit{Alani}' have been identified with the Yen-ts'ai upon reference to, firstly, HHS 118 p.13, 'The country of Yen-ts'ai has changed its name into A-lan-liau', and secondly, the Wei-lio 102, p.32, 'The country of Yen-ts'ai is called A-lan'\textsuperscript{72}. Chauvannes and Hirth agreed in seeing A-lan-liau as the combination of two ethnonyms, A-lan and Liau\textsuperscript{73}. Shiratori went further in arguing that 'Liau' was an attempt to render in Chinese a tribal-name based on an indigenous name for the Volga, which Ptolemy called Rau, and Mordavians call Rau or Raw, and that the 'Liau' were thus inhabitants of the Volga and might be identified with the Boudinoi of Herodotos\textsuperscript{74}. Setting aside the problems associated with identifying the 'Liau' of the HHS, discussion might return to the question of the relationship between the Yen-ts'ai and the A-lan.

The relationship between the Yen-ts'ai and the A-lan has been thought by Hirth, to be simple identity. To support this interpretation of the above passages Hirth refers to Pliny IV.80:

\begin{quote}
\textit{alias Getae, Daci, Romanis dicti, alias Sarmatae, Graecis Sauromatae, eorumque Hamaxobii aut Aorsi, alias Scythae degeneres et a servis orti aut Trogodytae, mox Alani et Rhoxalani}
\end{quote}

believing the \textit{alias} to refer not only to the \textit{Scythae degeneres} but to the \textit{Alani} as well\textsuperscript{75}. The Latin will not support such an interpretation. The \textit{mox} before \textit{Alani} clearly indicating that the Alani came after, that is, were different from, the Aorsi. Indeed, the tribal name \textit{'Alau orpa}, found in Ptolemy VI.xiv.9, would seem to suggest that \textit{Alan} and \textit{Aorsi} were originally two separate tribes, but as the distinction between the tribes diminished, so the names were fused.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{71} e.g. Marquart believed this to be an attempt to render the original name of the Massagetai, a.w.*masja-ka, a.p.*maijaka, skt. *matsja-ka, 'Fish eaters'. See Marquart, \textit{Geschichte von Eran II}, 1905, p.240 and 'Skizzen zur geschichtlichen völkerkunde des Mittelasien und Siberien', 1920, p.292 n.3. Cf. De Groot, \textit{Chinesische Urkunden II}, 1926, p.15.
\item \textsuperscript{72} Own translations of ¥ $ ^$ £ ^ $ ^ $ and ¥ $ ^$ £ ^ $ ^ $.
\item \textsuperscript{73} Chauvannes, 'Les pay d'occident d'après le Wei-Lio', 1905, p.559 n.1 and 'Les pay d'occident d'après le Heou Han chou', 1907, p.195, n.2; Hirth, 'Mr Kingsmill and the Hiung-nu', 1910, pp.39-41.
\item \textsuperscript{74} Shiratori, 'The Geography of the Western Region', 1956, pp.132-133.
\item \textsuperscript{75} e.g. Junge, \textit{Saka-Studien}, 1939, p.77.
\end{itemize}
It is probable then that the Yen-ts'ai changed their name to 'A-lan' as a result of the latter's absorption of the former. But what was the nature of this 'absorption'? Teggart proposed that the 'Yen-ts'ai were called 'A-lan' as a result of their conquest by the Alans, imagining that only conquest by, not confederation with the more westerly Alans, could account for the Chinese in the east applying the new name to the tribe76, and to support the case in favour of conquest refers to Ammianus Marcellinus XXXI.ii.13:

'and by repeated victories they (the Halani ), wore down the peoples whom they met and like the Persians incorporated them under their own national name'.

Though the original location of the Yen-ts'ai/Aorsi and A-lan/Alans is a matter of some debate, Enoki's arguments in favour of the conquest thesis are strong.

The second of the more popular identifications is that with the Ho-su, from whom the Hsiung-nu rival Shan-yü, Chih-chih, after his victory over the Wu-sun and K'ang-chü (c.42 B.C) is said in HS 70 7b to have demanded tribute. This identification has been proposed on two grounds77. The first ground is that the scholiast Yen Shi-ku referred to Hu Kuang in the 2nd century A.D. as having said that:

'about a thousand li north of K'ang-chü there is a country called Yen-ts'ai, another name of which is Ho-su, and concludes that Yen-ts'ai and Ho-su are identical'.

The second ground is that the original pronunciation of Ho-su has been thought to be *Hap-so, and this to be rendering of the same tribal-name Pliny offered in VI.38 as 'Abzoae', 'Abarzoae', 'Aorsi' and 'Yen-ts'ai' are all thought to be related.

In 1968 Pulleyblank, taking Yen-ts'ai, Ho-su and Aorsi to be equivalents, noted that at the time of Chih-chih's campaign the Ho-su were not counted by HS 70 7b as a dependency of the K'ang-chü, but in the HHS 118 13, probably as reported by Pan Yung in c.125 B.C., the Ho-su were counted as a dependency of the K'ang-chü78. Pulleyblank does not, however, explain, how a people once seemingly independent of the K'ang-chü, could become a K'ang-chü dependency, and once a K'ang-chü dependency, could become the A-
lan (-liao) of the Wei-shu. As the Wei-shu clearly implied the A-lan-liao absorbed the Yen-ts'ai, and were not at first identical with them, and assuming Ho-su and Yen-ts'ai express roughly the same concept, the following question might be addressed to the above texts. Did the Ho-su break away from the K'ang-chü only to be conquered by Alans or did the Alans force the Ho-su to change their allegiance from the K'ang-chü to themselves? The discussion of these questions must be deemed beyond the scope of this thesis.

The third identification, and that which has been most debated, is that with the Su-te of the Wei-shu. Hirth took the description of the Hsiung-nu conquest of the Su-te in the Wei-shu, to be an echo of the Huns conquest of the Alans near Sugdak in the Crimea, a conquest which occurred in c.454 A.D. when Hernac, Attila's youngest son and successor, withdrew to 'Scythia Minor'. He saw the Hsiung-nu as Huns and the Su-te as Alans. As the Alans are believed to be the descendants of the Aorsi, who are the equivalent of the Yen-ts'ai, he considered the Su-te to be the same as the Yen-ts'ai. This Wei-shu passage he translated as follows:

'The country of Suk-tak lies in the west of the Ts'ung-ling. It is the ancient An-ts'ai and is also called Wen-na-sha. It lies on a big sea [ts'e] in the north-west of K'ang-kü [Sogdiana] and is 16,000 li distant from Tai. Since the time when the Hiung-nu killed their king and took possession of their country up to their king Hu-ni three generations have elapsed. The merchants of this country often went to the country of Liang for trade, and at the capture of Ku-tsang they were all made prisoners. In the beginning of the reign of Kau-tsung [452-466 A.D.] the king of Suk-tak sent ambassadors to ask for their ransom, which was granted by cabinet order. From this time onward they sent no more tribute missions to our court.'

Hirth's identification of the Yen-ts'ai with Su-te was adopted by Uchida in 1936 and Egami in 1948, but was rejected in 1924 and 1926 by Shiratori, who identified the Su-te (ancient *siuk-d'ek) and the Hsiung-nu with the Hephthalites. Maenchen-Helfen presented an even more detailed and cogent rejection of the identification in 1944-45 and in 1955 Enoki made a close investigation of the Wei-shu 102 7a, Pei-shu 97 9b and Chou-shu 50 6b/7 in order to offer the rejection still firmer ground. The Chou-shu, indeed, Enoki translates as:

80 Hirth, 'Mr Kingsmill and the Hiung-nu', 1910, p.43. This translation was greatly improved by Enoki in his article, 'Sogdiana and the Hiung-nu', 1955, p.44.
82 Shiratori, 'A study of Su-te', 1928 (a translation of an article which first appeared in 1924) pp.94-100.
'The country of Su-t'e is situated to the west of Ts'ung-ling (Pamirs). It is probably what was An-ts'ai (=Yen-ts'ai) in ancient times...' and concludes that: 'we can see that the identity of Su-t'e and Yen-ts'ai was not an established fact, but the opinion of the editor of the Wei-shu'. Enoki further argues that though initially two very different concepts, the Wei-shu statement on Su-t'e was clearly copied from either the SC or HS account of the Yen-ts'ai.

Though most discussion of the Yen-ts'ai has focused on the problem of identifying them with one or other people in ancient Greek, Latin and Chinese texts, there has been some discussion of the problem of identifying the body of water by which they are said to dwell. This body of water is described, purportedly by Chang Ch'ien, as: 大澤 無星 盡乃北 a large marsh without any banks, probably that which is called the North Sea'. This passage has most commonly been interpreted in a very literal way and the marsh has been identified with that at the delta of the Oxos, and the Sea has been identified with the Aral. Some scholars have, however, seen the possibility that 大澤 and 北海 represent more nebulous ideas than the Oxos delta and the Aral Sea, and suggest that the 'Ta tse' designates some combination of the Black Sea, Caspian and Aral, and the 'Pei-hai' and imagined northern extension. Thus, Shiratori argued that: 'in the mind of contemporary historians the Aral, the Caspian and Black Sea were quite without distinction; instead of them, there was imagined one continuous expanse of water...'

Shiratori pointed to the Pei-shu ch.97, where one of the four divisions of the world is said to be 'between the seas and from the marsh southward', and as this land between the seas was clearly Syria, and as Syria lay south of both the Black Sea and the Caspian, the marsh here might not be meant to designate one but both of these seas.

In 1888 Gutschmid translated 無星 as 'der keine Ufer hat' and believed; 'dass hier Verwechslung des Aralsees mit der Maiotis vorliegt, wie sie auch den Alexanderhistorikern passiert ist. Die Gleichsetzung dieses Meeres mit dem Nordmeer erinnert allzu merkwürdig an die von Patrocles aufgebrachten und von Eratosthenes in die Wissenschaft eingeführte Lehre von dem nach Norden offenen

---

84 Enoki, ibid., pp.46047.
86 These identifications were made as early as Kingsmill, 'The intercourse of China with eastern Turkestan', 1879, p.7 n.10 and as late as Daffina, 'La migrazion', 1969, pp.61-62.
88 河海之間，水澤以南，為一域 Shiratori, ibid., pp.134-6.
Kaspischen Meer und seiner Verbindung mit dem nördlichen Ocean, um an blossen Zufall zu glauben.\textsuperscript{89}

Hirth, like Gutschmid, noted the correspondence between Chang Ch’ien’s view of Central Asian water systems and the Hellenistic view, and like Gutschmid did not believe this could be coincidental. Hirth was, however, the first to suggest that Chang Ch’ien had actually been influenced by the Greek conception\textsuperscript{90}. Thus he wrote in 1910 that:

“This may have been a popular error among the ancients long before Ptolemy, repeated also at the court of the Indoscythians, where Greek traditions had been taken over from Bactria, and where Chang K’ien in 127 B.C. collected his notices of western countries subsequently reproduced in the Shi-ki’,

and

“Chang K’ien’s report on An-ts’ai is in my opinion the oldest example of the introduction into the Chinese literature of a piece of classical lore, to wit, the story of the 萨珊 with its vast extension to the north and its connection with here "the North Sea."\textsuperscript{91}

Hirth’s thoughts were echoed by de Groot in 1926 and Enoki in 1955\textsuperscript{92}, but have otherwise seemed to go unnoticed.

In support of the thesis that Chang Ch’ien may have borrowed the above hydrological concepts from the Greeks, Hirth makes several points. Firstly, that the Yüeh-chih, among whom Chang Ch’ien spent some time, used Greek legends on their coins and were thus in contact with either Greeks or Greek ideas. Secondly, that Chang Ch’ien borrowed the term 希, p’u-t’au, ‘the grape’, from the Greek δεξάμενα, ‘bunch of grapes’\textsuperscript{93}. Neither of these arguments is particularly strong. The persistence of coins with Greek legends need evince no more than contact with Greek things, that is to say, with old Greek coins. Indeed, the legends on the Yüeh-chih coins were plainly simply copies of legends on Greek coins, and

\textsuperscript{89} Gutschmid, \textit{Geschichte Trans}, 1888, p.84.
\textsuperscript{91} Hirth, ‘Mr Kingsmill and the Hiung-nu’, 1910, pp.38 & 44.
\textsuperscript{92} De Groot, \textit{Chinesische Urkunden} II, 1926, pp.15-16: ‘Das Tsang K’ien den See des Massagetenlandes für den nördlichen Ozean hielt, ist keineswegs verwunderlich, wo bekanntlich die Griechen zu Strabons Zeit und sogar noch beträchtlich später das Kaspische Meer allgemein also eine Einbuchtung des nördlichen Ozeans betrachteten’, and Enoki, ‘Sogdiana and the Hsiung-nu’, 1955, p.49: ‘The extensive swamp on which Yen-ts’ai was situated must either be the Aral or the Caspian Sea or the two seas combined. In those days the Chinese were not able to distinguish the Caspian from the Aral Sea and they thought that the Aral Sea extended northward, as well as westward, for an unlimited distance’ and on p.56: ‘They thought that the Aral Sea, or the Aral Sea combined with the Caspian and Black Seas, extended northward, as well as westward, without end and that it was connected with Pei-hai (North Sea) or the Arctic Ocean’.
\textsuperscript{93} Hirth, ‘Mr Kingsmill and the Hiung-nu’, 1910, p.49.
these copies gradually degenerated into abstraction. The term p'u-t'au, moreover, probably came from an indigenous Iranian word for grape, *budawa, not βότρυχ. Two good arguments can, however, be made in favour of the suggestion that Chang Ch'ien may have been in contact with Greek ideas. The first is that Chang Ch'ien is said to have reported on the curious horizontal script used in An-hsi, possibly Greek or Aramaic, and thus possibly suggesting some contact with literate Greeks or Parthians. Secondly, Chang Ch'ien seems to have spoken to old men of Parthia about such concepts as the River of Weak Water and the Hsi Wang-mu. Thirdly, that Chang Ch'ien spent a whole year not, it seems, at the Yüeh-chih court north of the Oxos, but in Ta Hsia, south of the Oxos.

Though there is very little material by which to reconstruct the ancient Chinese notion of a northern Ocean, a Pei hai is mentioned in one passage of the Wei-lüeh compiled mid-third century A.D. by Yü Huan (lost but quoted in Pei Sung-chih's commentary on the San-kuo-chih, 429 A.D.) in this text mention is made of the Yen-ts'ai, K'ang-chü, Wu-sun, and several other western states, including the Ting-ling. The Ting-ling are described as living north of the K'ang-chü, west of the Wu-sun, and south of the Pei-hai. From these directions it is clear that the Pei-hai here represents something more extensive that the Aral, which probably lay to the west of the Ting-ling.

Neither Gutschmid, Hirth or any other modern scholar has, however, noted the possible link between Chang Ch'ien's reference to the Yen-ts'ai dwelling by a marsh, and Dareios' reference to Saka dwelling by a marsh. The Achaemenid concept of a northern marsh was probably influential in the development of the Greek concept of a Maiotian-Caspian-Aral marsh, so may have also had an influence on Parthian and Baktrian conceptions. Chang Ch'ien's hydrological concept might, therefore, have been influenced by either the indigenous West Asian concept or the Greek concept.

Conclusion.

From the above discussion the following conclusions may be reached.

Firstly, it is probable that though Chang Ch'ien did not mention the Sai or Sai-wang, the later Han writers who refer to the movement of a Sai horde were referring to the movements of a Saka horde driven before the Yüeh-chih. This Saka horde broke up into several sections, some of which settled in the Alai mountains, but the main one, the 'Royal horde', went on to Baktria and Parthia, where the Greeks called them 'Sakarauloi', from there to Drangiana and Arakhosia, where the Greeks later referred to a Sakastan, and from there west to just south of the Hindu-Kush, where they established a kingdom the Han Chinese called Ch'i-pin.

Secondly, it is probable that the names K'ang-chü, Ta Hsia and Ta Yuan were all drawn from a long tradition of mythography, and ethnic identifications based on phonetic similarities are useless. Chang Ch'ien used these names to designate a Scythian horde settled on the Iaxartes, Baktria and Ferghana respectively. It was no coincidence that the most sedentary of the two Central Asian states visited by Chang Ch'ien should be given the names of the states visited, in ancient Chinese legends, by such personages as the Yellow Emperor, Yü, and Ch'in Shih Huang. Chang Ch'ien, for all his dealings with the nomads of Central Asia, was clearly a product of Han civilisation. His report evidences great ethnocentricity. Foreign states are given names plucked from native Chinese traditions and it is implied that they had been contacted earlier, perhaps even civilised, by legendary Chinese rulers. Whether this ethnocentricity was a product of Chang Ch'ien's own disposition, or of the Emperor's expectations, is, however, unclear.

Thirdly, Yen-ts'ai were undoubtedly the nomads the western sources called the Aorsi, a phonetic link between the two names even being possible. Chang Ch'ien's description of the marsh by which the Yen-ts'ai are said to live, and which is said to be called the North Sea was not, however, simply a description of the Oxos delta, Aral, Caspian or even Sea of Azov. It was a description of a Greek or Iranian concept picked up in Baktria. This possible link takes our discussion full circle back to the discussion of 7th century Greek hydrological concepts in Chapter 1. A tradition in the way ancients conceived of Central Asian hydrology might then be traced from 7th century Greece and 6th century Persia through the Hellenistic Near East to Han dynasty China.
CONCLUSION.

The preceding 16 chapters do not constitute a history of the Iranian speaking nomads who roamed the lands between the Black Sea and the Tarim Basin from the 7th to the 2nd century B.C., here referred to as the eastern Scythians. They might, however, constitute a history of the ancient literary conceptions of eastern Scythian ethnography from the 7th to the 2nd century B.C. The present writer's contribution to the study of this history might be summarised as follows.

Though such early Greek poets as Homer and Hesiod are usually thought to have had knowledge of north Pontic tribes, though Aristeas is usually thought to have recorded the westward migration of Central Asian tribes, and though Herodotos offered a meaningful ethnography of peoples from the Pontos to Central Asia, a comparison of the material presented by the above writers with that presented in Urartian, Assyrian and Babylonian documents presents the possibility that the early poets were speaking only of nomads in Asia Minor, Aristeas travelled only to the Caucasus and Herodotos transferred tribal-names and histories from a seventh century Caucasian context to a wider Eurasian context (Chapter 1 & 2). Similarly, though the origin of the 'Sauromatian' culture of the lower Don is usually traced back to the Volga region, the name 'Sauromatai' is better traced back to a seventh century Caucasian context (Chapter 2).

Though Hellanikos' work on Scythians is often thought to have been derived from Herodotos work or from original researches it was probably derived primarily from Hekataios' work. Though Hellanikos' work is usually thought to have been of little significance, it had a significant influence, not only on the work of his student Damastes, but on the work of much later Greek writers (Chapter 3).

Though Hippokrates' work on the northern nomads seems to be derived from Herodotos', it was probably derived primarily from Hekataios' and from original researches. Though the beginning of Sauromatai-Sarmatian the displacement of the Scythians from the lands west of the Don is usually dated to the beginning of the 3rd century B.C., Hippokrates' work suggests a Sauromatai presence west of the Don as early as the late 5th century B.C. (Chapter 4).

Though lack of sources is usually believed to prohibit writing the history of the Kuban region in the early 4th century, Polyainos' story of the war between the Maiotian princess
Tirgatao and the Bosporan King Satyros, the Spartokid inscriptions listing tribal subjects and Xenophon's comments upon Maiotians and Scythians offer three different perspectives (Khersonesian, Bosporan and mainland Greek) on the gradual expansion of the Bosporans and Sauromatai into the Kuban region (Chapter 5).

Though Ktesias' work on the eastern Scythians is usually dismissed as too difficult to reconstruct and in any case of little use, it is possible to trace stories on the early history of eastern Scythians in the works of Diodoros, Polyainos, Justin and Jordanes back through Deinon's romantic history to Ktesias, and to detect in this Ktesian material tales originating from Assyrian and Persian contacts with Caucasian and Central Asian Scythians (Chapter 6).

Though Eudoxos' work on Scythians is often thought to have been derived from Herodotos' and from new information, it was derived primarily from Hekataios' work and though Eudoxos' and (Ps.) Skylax's references to Syrmatai have been taken as recently received news on a Finnic people east of, or a Sauromatai people west of, the Don, they go back to a late 6th century record of a Sauromatai presence west of the Don (Chapter 7).

Though Ephoros' work on Scythians is often thought to have been derived from the work of Herodotos alone, it was derived also from the work of Hekataios, influenced by the work of such contemporaries as Plato and Isokrates, and responded to changing conditions in the steppes. With an increasing Sauromatai presence west of the Don, Ephoros transferred the whole Hekataian catalogue to the west of the Don and filled the gaps left east of the river with Herodotan tribes (Chapter 8).

Though Aristotle introduced several geographic concepts which appear radically new, an 'Araxes' flowing from an eastern extremity of the Caucasus and sending one branch into a two part single inland Sea and another into the Maiotis, the concepts are explicable as modifications of older models. Though Aristotles' ethnographic concepts generally seem to be derived from Hekataios', his colleagues Herakleides and Theophrastos would seem to be incorporating newly received information when alluding to Sauromatai/Sarmatians west of the Maiotis (Chapter 10).

Though Alexander's campaigns brought the Greek world into direct contact with Central Asian tribes, the history, ethnography and geography of the lands between the Black Sea
and the Pamirs was conceived by Alexander and described by Aristoboulos, Ptolemy, Kleitarkhos and Polykleitos in Hekataian, Ktesian and Aristotelian terms (Chapter 10).

Though Diodoros' account of the war between the Bosporan princess Satyros and Eumelos has usually been thought to be of Bosporan origin, it was probably derived, through Douris, from a Khersonesian record. Though Eumelos' allies are usually thought to be local Kuban peoples, they were probably a newly arrived 'Sarmatian' people, the Sirakoi (Chapter 11).

Though such Seleukid generals as Patrokles and Demodamos actually explored various regions of Central Asia, their reports were heavily influenced by old Ionian literary conceptions and forms, and though such Alexandrian scholars as Hekataios of Abdera, Amometos, Kallimarkhos, and Apollonios of Rhodes had at their disposal many reports and surveys, their writing on Scythians were heavily influenced by earlier literary tradition (Chapter 12).

Though Trogus' and Strabo's accounts of the establishment and expansion of the Parthian and Greko-Baktrian kingdoms in the 3rd century, and the nomad invasions of these kingdoms in the 2nd century, are usually believed to have been derived from two different sources, they were derived from a single original source, the work of Apollodoros of Artemita. Apollodoros would also seem to have been responsible for the entry into ancient literary tradition of such new ethnographic terms as Parnoi, Apasiakai, Phrounoi, Seres, Tokharoi, Sakarauloi and Asioi (Chapter 13 & 14).

Though Shih-chi ch.123 has been thought to be contaminated by material of a later date, the contamination is minimal. Though the Chinese material dealing with the 'Western regions' in the 2nd century B.C. goes back to the report of Chang Ch’ien, who actually travelled through these regions, and though this material offers valuable insights into the history of Central Asia in this period, it is possible to detect in Chang Ch’ien's ethnonyms the influence of preconceptions and Chinese literary traditions and in his hydrological concepts the possible influence of Greek or Near Eastern conceptions (Chapter 15 & 16).

Though the above contributions to the study of the history of ancient literary conceptions of eastern Scythian ethnography from the 7th to the 2nd century B.C. might be considered significant in themselves, the present writer hopes that the methodology employed in this thesis might be seen to be a still more significant contribution to this study. Throughout this
thesis it has been argued that if we are to study the history and ethnography of eastern Scythians, we need to examine closely the geographic and ethnographic conceptions and preconceptions of those writers we are bound to use in undertaking the study. As these writers were members not of the Scythian world, but of the literate societies on the periphery of this world, to examine their geographic and ethnographic conceptions, we need to reconstruct many lost works, investigate a whole range of mythological, philosophical and scientific concepts, and to trace innumerable literary traditions. As the period of history with which this present work is concerned was a period in which the Greek, Persian and Chinese geographical horizon expanded very rapidly, to trace literary traditions we need to investigate the interreaction of preconceptions with information.

To see the ancient writers dealt with in the preceding 16 chapters as simply modifying pre-existing conceptions of Scythian ethnography is not to diminish their credibility. To see them simply as agents in conceptual interreactions is not to diminish their works' value. Modified preexisting conceptions are exactly that which constitutes contemporary knowledge, and the desire to see the known in the unknown is common to all humans. The interreaction of preconceptions with information is exactly that which constitutes the process of understanding, and the extraordinary momentum of preconceptions in collision with information is observable in all process of understanding.
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