

MEDISM: THE ORIGIN AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE TERM

To designate collaborating with Persia, the Greeks employed the verb *Μηδίζω* 'side with the Medes' or the noun *Μηδισμός* 'leaning toward the Medes, Medism', both derived from *Μῆδος*. Since this seemingly inappropriate terminology has attracted only limited consideration,¹ a thorough discussion of its usage in Greek literature may help to clarify Greek relations with the Achaemenid empire throughout the classical period. After a brief preliminary discussion I consider the more problematic aspects of this *terminus technicus*.

It may be observed initially that such terms characterized the political relationships within the Greek world, and were encouraged by the struggle of each *polis* to maintain its independence and preserve its distinctive cultural qualities. For example, such terms as 'Atticizing' (Thuc. iii 62.2, 64.5) and 'Laconizing' (X. *Hell.* iv 4.2) arise during the contention for leadership in the Greek world in the late fifth and early fourth centuries. Besides political conspiracy with another state, these terms also expressed the peculiar behavior or dialect of that *polis*, just as '*Ἑλληνίζω* and *βαρβαρίζω* meant to speak or act like Greeks or like barbarians.² Similarly 'Medism' embodied social and cultural aspects in its indictment of activity in the interests of Persia. Inherent in the term was the implication that collaborators with the Great King had rejected the peculiar manner of life characteristic of the Greek world in favor of the corrupting life-style of the East. Thucydides' account of the Medizing activity of Pausanias at Byzantium furnishes the classic illustration of this accusation (i 95, 128-34). In the aftermath of the Persian Wars, the victor of Plataea was charged with tyrannical conduct and conspiracy with Persia—he is said to have dressed and entertained in the Persian fashion, sought the hand of the Persian king's daughter, and travelled with a foreign bodyguard of Medes and Egyptians.³ All of these allegations evoke the opulence that surrounded the courts of the Persian-supported tyrants and satraps. This gave Medism a specially derogatory and odious connotation which sharply distinguished it from charges of partisanship among the various internal factions within the Greek world. Greeks guilty of intrigue with Persia could be represented as betrayers of Hellas itself (Hdt. vi 49 *προδόντες τὴν Ἑλλάδα*), not just of their particular *polis*.

Nevertheless, Medism does not appear to have provoked any special legislation as a crime of the highest order. In Attica it is most frequently linked with *προδοσία*, 'treason': there is no specific reference to Medism in the impeachment law (*νόμος εἰσαγγελτικός*), so men accused of

¹ There is not even a laconic entry in the normally exhaustive Pauly-Wissowa, such as may be found by F. Kiechle, 'Medismos', in *Lexikon der alten Welt* (Stuttgart 1965) 1884, or H. Gugel, 'Medismos', in *Kleine Pauly* iii 1133. D. Gillis' recent study *Collaboration with the Persians*, Historia Einzels. xxxiv (Wiesbaden 1979) passes over the problem without comment.

Abbreviations for Iranian materials follow those utilized by R. Schmitt in *Kratylos* xxv (1980) 1-16; cuneiform texts are cited according to *The Chicago Assyrian Dictionary*. Other abbreviations used in this essay are as follows: ANET=J. Pritchard, *Ancient Near Eastern Texts*³ (Princeton 1969); CIS=*Corpus inscriptionum semiticarum*; Kent=R. G. Kent, *Old Persian: Grammar, Texts, Lexicon* (New Haven 1953); RES=*Répertoire d'épigraphie sémitique*.

The present study represents a revised version of the initial chapter of my dissertation *Medism: Greek Collaboration with Achaemenid Persia* (Michigan 1979). I am grateful to C. G. Starr, M. W. Stolper, G. L. Windfuhr, T. Cuyler Young, L. Koenen, J. H. Johnson and M. C. Root, who provided helpful advice on a number of

specific matters. For the initial stimulus to explore Greek-Persian relations, I am indebted to the late G. G. Cameron.

² LSJ s.v. *Ἀττικίζω*, *Ἀττικισμός*, *Λακωνίζω*, *Λακωνισμός* and cf. *Ἰωνίζω*, *Βοιωτίζω*, *Θεσσαλίζω*, and *Λυδίζω*. These *-ίζω* verbs derived from nouns are called by A. Debrunner, *Griechische Wortbildungslehre* (Heidelberg 1917) 136-8, 'imitativa', as they generally have the meaning 'to be like x'. See also n. 10 below.

³ See also the traditions for the Medizing of Demaratus of Sparta and Themistocles (e.g., Plut. *Them.* 29; Ath. i 29f). Even after the conquest of Persia by Alexander the Great, the adoption of Persian language or dress created ill feelings among his Macedonian forces (Duris of Samos *FGrH* 76 F 14; Arr. *An.* vii 6.2-3, 8.2; and cf. Plut. *De Alex. fort.* i 8=*Mor.* 329f-330a). For discussion see E. Badian, *JHS* lxxxv (1965) 160-1 and A. B. Bosworth, *JHS* c (1980) 1-21. As C. G. Starr observes, such attitudes are not a late development as the Greek association of luxury with the Orient is at least as old as Archilochus (19 West) in the seventh century (*IA* ii [1975] 58-9).

Medism will, like Themistocles, have been formally charged with treason.⁴ *Εἰσαγγελία* was an *ἄγων τιμητός*, but treason was commonly punished by banishment or death, confiscation of all property, and prohibition of burial in Attica.⁵ The word *προδοσία* itself appears to have been liberally applied to various kinds of behavior considered detrimental to the state. During the classical era it was the most frequent charge against Greek generals. Pritchett's analysis of seventy such trials concluded that 'the charge of prodoxia seems to have been brought whenever a general failed to carry out the instructions of the demos'.⁶ It could thus convey inadequate effort or failure, such as passive acquiescence before the invading forces of a foreign enemy (*cf.* Hdt. viii 73), as well as overt treason.

The earliest evidence for the application of a comparable procedure against Medizers is contained in some fragmentary inscriptions of the Delian League.⁷ At Teos, local regulations prescribed punishment by death for anyone guilty of betrayal of the city or collusion with brigands, pirates, barbarians or other Hellenes. Subversive activity with Greeks is not distinguished from that with non-Greeks, presumably in this case the Persians. In the slightly later Athenian regulations concerning Erythrae, those guilty of collaboration with the Persian-supported tyrants are subject to punishment by death, along with all sympathizing members of the family, and confiscation of all their property. In neither of these instances is there any suggestion that Medizers were distinguished by legal statute or penalty from other subversive members of the state.

I. ORIGINS OF GREEK TERMINOLOGY

We may now proceed to the most puzzling aspect of this terminology: Why did the Greeks denote activity on behalf of Persia in the late sixth and fifth centuries by the term *Μηδίζω* when the Medes had themselves become subjects of Persia before Cyrus' conquest of Ionia?⁸ Two attempts have been made to resolve this difficulty.

J. L. Myres suggested that 'Medism' represented a revival of an earlier term used to describe Ionian politics after the collapse of Assyria in 609 and before the peace between Lydia and the Medes in 585. According to his hypothesis, Greek settlements on the western coast of Asia Minor and the nearby islands of the Aegean had consorted with the Median kingdom at this time in an effort to protect their eastern interests and connections. This experience initiated the Greek tendency to designate all Iranians as Medes and led to the consequent misunderstanding about the later Achaemenid Persian empire.⁹ As Myres realized, this was mere supposition. The real

⁴ R. J. Bonner and G. Smith, *The Administration of Justice from Homer to Aristotle* i (Chicago 1930) 294–309, followed by P. J. Rhodes, *The Athenian Boule* (Oxford 1972) 162–71, argued that the only significant changes in the law before 411 were the inclusion of the boule and assembly in the judicial process by Cleisthenes and the exclusion of the Areopagus by Ephialtes. These changes are considered only a revision of the law from Solon's time. For a more recent discussion of the Attic impeachment procedure see M. H. Hansen, *Eisangelia* (Odense 1975), with Rhodes, *JHS* xcix (1979) 103–14 and Hansen, *c.* (1980) 89–95. Although *προδοσία* is brought into conjunction with *Μηδίζω* or *Μηδισμός* only once in Herodotus (vii 30), it is connected with cooperation with Persia in about half of its 34 occurrences. J. H. Schreiner's argument, *C&M* xxxi (1972) 84–97, that ostracism began as an attempt to combat Medism is not convincing: see R. Thomsen, *The Origin of Ostracism* (Copenhagen 1972) for other possible interpretations. For Themistocles *cf.* Thuc. i 138.6.

⁵ See T. Thalheim, 'κακοῦργοι', *RE* x (1919) 1529; Hansen, *Eisangelia* 33–6.

⁶ W. K. Pritchett, *The Greek State at War* ii (Berkeley 1974) 27; *cf.* J. T. Roberts, *Accountability in Athenian Government* (Madison, Wisconsin 1982).

⁷ ML 30 and 40, lines 32–8, which are badly worn and difficult to read. The dates are approximately 470 for the Teian fragments and perhaps 453–2 for that of the Erythrae stele. Any indication of a trial or legal procedure is lacking in the case of the Medizing Athenian councilor Lycidas (Hdt. ix 5), who was stoned to death with his family. This 'lynching' may be attributed to the threatening circumstances of the time. For discussion see H. How and J. Wells, *A Commentary on Herodotus* ii 288 and C. Hignett, *Xerxes' Invasion of Greece* (Oxford 1963) 281.

⁸ A query raised recently again by A. Momigliano, *Alien Wisdom: The Limits of Hellenization* (London 1975) 124.

⁹ J. L. Myres, 'Μηδίζειν: Μηδισμός', *Greek Poetry and Life: Essays Presented to Gilbert Murray* (Oxford

crisis of the Asiatic Greeks does not appear to have developed until the reign of Croesus (Hdt. i 6, 26–8).¹⁰ The previous raids and campaigns of the Lydian Kings against Ionia are depicted as sporadic and of limited scope and success (i 15–25). It is therefore hard to identify a historical context for Greek sympathy with Medes before Cyrus, a fact which is a substantial obstacle to accepting Myres' explanation.

An alternative proposal advocated by E. J. Jonkers attributes the use of *Μηδίζω* for conspiracy with Persia to the Greek world's lack of perception of internal political developments within the Orient.¹¹ He suggests that for Greeks living between 550 and 490 the *coup d'état* of Cyrus would have been of secondary importance. As a result of primitive communication, the Greeks only slowly became cognizant of the real significance of the transition of power from the Medes to Cyrus. Hence their gradual adoption of *Πέρσαι* alongside *Μῆδοι* until eventually it altogether replaced the older and now anachronistic ethnic term. Allegedly contributing to this misapprehension of Iranian politics was the prominence of Medes in military operations against Greeks. The initial reduction of Ionia and Caria under Cyrus was conducted by the Median generals, Mazares and Harpagus (Hdt. i 156–77). In addition, a possible descendant of the latter served as a general in Mysia and was responsible for the defeat and capture of Histiaeus of Miletus during the Ionian revolt (vi 28).¹² Moreover, the first penetration of the Persian fleet into the Aegean, the subjection of a number of the Greek settlements in the Cyclades and the Euboean cities of Carystus and Eretria, as well as the campaign against Athens at Marathon, were all under the command of Datis the Mede (vi 94–101, 118–19). Diodorus even preserves a tradition (x 27), probably derived from Ephorus, that Datis attempted to persuade the Athenians that their city was his by right of inheritance on the basis of the Greek myth of Medos, claiming that as a Mede

1936) 97–105 and *PEQ* lxxxv (1953) 8–9. His view is concisely stated in J. B. Bury and R. Meiggs, *A History of Greece*⁴ (London 1975) 144: 'That the Greeks of Ionia had been long accustomed to regard Media as a resort against Lydia and to intrigue with the Median kings is shown by the word *medism*. For if such intriguing had first come into fashion after the rise of Persia and the fall of Lydia, the name chosen to designate it would naturally have been *persism*'.

¹⁰ For Ionian relations with Lydia see A. J. Graham, *JHS* xci (1971) 41–2 and G. Harris, *Ionia under Persia: 547–477 BC—A Political History* (Diss. Northwestern 1971) 16–17. These encounters do not appear to have provoked a terminology with the same implications inherent in Medism. The term *Λυδίζω* appears in the sixth century (Hipponax 92.1 West, but apparently with the meaning 'to speak Lydian' (O. Masson, *Les fragments du poète Hipponax* [Paris 1962] 151, M. L. West, *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus* [Berlin/N.Y. 1974] 145). See *Ar. Eq.* 533 for a comedy by Magnes of this name. A possible political connotation is given by the *Suda*, s.v. *Λυδίζω*: τὰ τῶν Λυδῶν φρονῶ, but without any reference. As M. Stolper suggests to me, the late appearance of political connotations in these terms suggests they were modelled after the earlier meaning of 'Medism' and are to be distinguished in this respect from similar terms of the archaic period.

It has been argued that the Greeks must have known the Medes before the ninth century, based on the assumed chronology for the *ā > ē(η) sound change; see S. Mazzarino, *Fra Oriente e Occidente* (Florence 1947) 96–7 and 341 n. 269–71, E. Benveniste in *La Persia e il mondo greco-romano* (Rome 1966) 480 and E. Laroche in *Mélanges de linguistique et de philologie grecques offerts à Pierre Chantraine* (Paris 1972) 89–90. According to this hypothesis, the Ionic–Attic *Μῆδοι* would have been

Μᾶδοι if the event had been later. For some severe criticisms of this argument see O. Szemerényi in *Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft und Kulturkunde: Gedenkschrift für Wilhelm Brandenstein* (Innsbruck 1968) 142–6 and M. Lejeune, *Phonétique historique du mycénien et du Grec ancien* (Paris 1972) 235 n. 2. As they observe, the view is filled with historical difficulties. The earliest reference to the Medes is in 837 as *KUR a-ma-da-a-a* in the annals of the Assyrian king Shalmaneser III: see L. D. Levine in *Iranian Civilization and Culture*, ed. C. J. Adams (Montreal 1972) 39–45 and *Iran* xi (1973) 1–27, xii (1974) 99–124. Sennecherib (704–681 BC) even speaks of 'the distant Medes, whose name no one among the kings, my fathers, had (ever) heard' (Luckenbill, *AR* ii no. 238). Greek tradition is aware of the Median chief *Δηρόκης*, perhaps the (Akk.) *Dayaukku*, mentioned in the annals of Sargon II (721–705), but dependent on later sources. See R. Schmitt, *AÖAW* cx (1973) 137–47 and P. R. Helm, *Iran* xix (1981) 85–90. No object recognizable as an Iranian import for this period has been identified on the Greek mainland according to O. W. Muscarella, *J. Anc. Near Eastern Soc. Columbia* ix (1977) 31–57.

¹¹ E. J. Jonkers, 'Μῆδοι, τὰ Μηδικά, Μηδισμός', *Studia varia Carolo Guilielmo Vollgraff* (Amsterdam 1948) 78–83; cf. R. W. Macan, *Herodotus IV–VI* i 350.

¹² Herodotus (vi 28) describes him as an *ἀνὴρ Πέρσης*, but the similarity in name with the earlier Median Harpagus and the fact that a descendant of a *Ἀρπάγος* was a dynast in Lycia at the end of the fifth century (ML 93. 5) support such an identification. The transformation of Medes into Persians is illustrated by Datis, who becomes a 'Persian' in the later sources (schol. *Ar. Pax* 289), as does Mardonius (Nepos, *Paus.* i.2). For Datis the Mede see now D. M. Lewis, *JHS* c (1980) 194–5.

he was one of his descendants. Finally, Persians were said to have dressed and armed themselves in the customary Median fashion (Hdt. i 135, vii 62 and *cf.* vi 112). All of these factors are said to help explain Greek confusion about the Iranian world.

These views depend on a premise which needs to be examined carefully, namely that the shift in terminology from 'Mede' to 'Persian' reveals initial Greek imperceptiveness about the essential character of the Achaemenid empire. Since Myres and Jonkers gave only brief consideration to the documentation for this change in nomenclature, a more thorough discussion of the basis for this transition is needed before we attempt to delineate the forces which produced it.

First, there is conclusive evidence that the term 'Mede' was consistently employed from Cyrus' time to one even several decades after the campaign of Xerxes. While the conquest of western Asia by Cyrus inaugurated a new era for Asiatic Greeks in the sixth century, Xenophanes of Colophon still regarded the new menace as that of 'the Mede' (*fr.* 18 Diehl). Shortly after this fateful event, when Ibycus of Rhegium visited the luxurious court of the tyrant Polycrates of Samos, he made reference to 'Cyras the general of the Medians' (PMG 320 Page *Κυράρας ὁ Μηδείων στραταγός*). Even though the ancient philologists understood this as an allusion to the former Median king Cyaxares (*Κυαξάρης*), who died in 585, the ruler designated seems more likely to be Cyrus (*Κύρος*).¹³ Additional evidence for the period preceding the Persian Wars consists only of traditions from later writers whose testimony may be influenced by their own time.¹⁴ For the decade between Marathon and Xerxes' campaign contemporary evidence indicates that the earlier terminology was sustained. In the prayers to Zeus and Apollo in the *Theognidea* for protection of Megara, the threat specified comes from 'Medes' (764, 775). Although these cannot be poems of the sixth-century elegist Theognis, they have been attributed to a fearful Megarian poet at the dawn of the Persian invasions.¹⁵ Much more impressive are the recently discovered Athenian ostraca from the Kerameikos deposit assigned to the 480s. Of the 760 cast against Kallias, son of Kratios, four call him 'the Mede' (*ὁ Μῆδος*).¹⁶ These contemporary sherds provide some support for the prevailing assumption that one criterion for ascribing texts to the period of the Persian Wars is the presence of *Μῆδος* and absence of *Πέρσαι*.¹⁷ Any clear break in this pattern begins only in the decade following Xerxes' campaign.

The first clear expression of this transition appears with Aeschylus' tragedy entitled *The*

¹³ C. M. Bowra, *Greek Lyric Poetry* (Oxford 1961) 264, and R. Drews, *The Greek Accounts of Eastern History* (Cambridge, Mass. 1973) 7.

¹⁴ Bacchylides' (31.28) reference in 468 to the earlier capture of Sardis by the *Περσᾶν*, probably reflects later terminology. On the other hand, apocryphal correspondence between Anaximenes of Miletus and Pythagoras (D. L. ii 5, viii 49) still speaks of *ὁ Μῆδων βασιλεύς* and the *Μῆδων*. For a discussion of the unreliability of Diogenes see R. Hope, *The Book of Diogenes Laertius* (New York 1930) 93–7. It is difficult to determine in such cases if the writers are modernizing or archaizing.

¹⁵ E. L. Highbarger, *TAPA* lxviii (1937) 98–111, preferred the period just before Marathon in 490, while F. Jacoby, *Theognis* (Berlin 1931) argued for the time just before Xerxes' campaign. A. R. Burn is almost alone in still contending for a date immediately after Cyrus' conquest of Ionia (*The Lyric Age of Greece* [London 1960] 263). See also West (n. 10) 65.

¹⁶ Thomsen (n. 4) 97. Although D. M. Lewis, *ZPE* xiv (1974) 1–4, has argued for a date in the 470s, this still places the ostraca in proximity to the Persian Wars. For Kallias see H. A. Shapiro, *Hesp.* li (1982) 69–73.

¹⁷ According to F. Jacoby, *Hesp.* xiv (1945) 185 n. 207, this is an 'old superstition' which can be traced back to Wilamowitz in 1889. The theory is not unfounded. Of the epigrams attributed to Simonides, *Μῆδοι* appear in those assigned to Marathon (21 Page), Thermopylae (23 Page; *cf.* Hdt. vii 228), Artemisium (24 Page), Salamis (13 Page; *cf.* Plut. *Hdt. Mal.* 36), Plataea (17 Page = Thuc. i 132) and Cimon's Eurymedon campaign (46 Page). In another, the foreign invaders are called the 'barbarous-tongued nations of the Medes' (14 Page). Exceptions to this principle were regarded by Jacoby as later literary revisions, as in the Athenian epigram celebrating Marathon where *Περσῶν* occurs (ML 26). This ethnic is generally regarded as a later addition to a Salamis monument, either directly after the event (N. G. L. Hammond, *JHS* lxxxviii [1968] 27) or a decade or so later (ML pp. 54–7). Other epigraphic exceptions are either regarded as later revisions (ML 12), or dependent on restorations derived from subsequent literary authorities (ML 24). The enemy at Marathon is also designated 'Medes' by Aeschylus, *epigr.* 2 Page. For discussion of epigrams cited above see D. L. Page, *Further Greek Epigrams* (Cambridge 1981) 186–302.

Persians, presented at the Great Dionysia in 472. Throughout the play the Great King's forces are constantly addressed as *Πέρσαι* with only scattered references to the *Μῆδοι*.¹⁸ It was also at approximately this time in the fifth century that the first of an impressive list of literary works entitled *Περσικά* began to appear. The earliest is possibly that of Dionysius of Miletus, although the title may be just a later description of a work attributed to him called *Affairs after Darius* (*τὰ μετὰ Δαρείου*).¹⁹ Later in the fifth century, Herodotus (vii 150) and Hellanicus of Lesbos (*FGrH* 4 F 59) are the first Greeks to make reference to Perses, the eponymous ancestor of the Persians.²⁰ These works obviously do not mark the initial recognition of the Persians: at least as early as Hecataeus of Miletus (*FGrH* 1 F 281–5) the Greeks registered intimate knowledge about Persian cities and customs. What they do suggest is that the term has taken on far greater significance than it had previously, eventually during the course of the fifth century overshadowing the former dominant term of 'Medes'. Although it is not surprising, it should nevertheless be emphasized that all these works were the products of East Greeks living on the borders of the Hellenic world and in a position to make contact with the new imperial power from Iran.

For several decades after the Persian Wars, 'Mede' continues occasionally to appear with its old generic value. It is still the *Μῆδοι* who are defeated by Cimon at Eurymedon in about 466 (Simon. 46 Page), embroiled with Greek ships at Egypt between 464 and 454 (ML 34), receptive to exiles from Erythrae in 453 (ML 40), and the object of Cimon's final campaign at Cyprus in 451 (Simon. 45 Page; cf. D.S. xi 62.3 and Aeschin. iii 183). Afterwards the usage is far more limited and restricted. In the late fifth century, Choerilus of Samos was the author of a work named *Μηδικά* as well as his epic poem *Περσικά*, indicating that the two Iranian peoples were not only clearly distinguished, but also of separate interest (*FGrH* 696 F 33). Perhaps a trace of the older meaning can still be seen in the work of the fourth-century Athenian comic poet Theopompus, who refers to the far distant 'Median lands' (*Μήδων γαίαν*) and wrote a comedy named *The Mede* (17. 29–30 Edmonds). However, after the middle of the fifth century 'Mede' as an idiomatic term was normally part of the fossilized and stock language reserved for allusions to, and descriptions of, the earlier period of conflict with Persia. This helps to explain why Herodotus can occasionally use the term for the enemy encountered at Marathon (vi 109, 120; ix 46), Thermopylae (vii 207, 226), Salamis (viii 75, 80) and Plataea (ix 17, 44, 46, 77), rather than the more common expression 'Persian'.²¹

As a corollary, the hostilities were summarized by the expressions 'Median War' (*ὁ Μηδικὸς πόλεμος*) or *τὰ Μηδικά* which first appear during the fifth century in Herodotus (ix 64) and Thucydides (15 times) and are regularly employed by almost all Greek writers thereafter. It is not until the fourth century that any attempt was made to alter and update the anachronistic phrase according to the then current terminology. Even after the brief appearance of *τὸν Περσικόν <πόλεμον>* in Plato (*Laws* 642d) and Isocrates (*De Pace* 37, 90; *Areop.* 75, cf. *Arch.* 42; *Panath.* 49; *Plat.* 57), Aristotle and later writers persist in employing the older but more familiar terminology.²² Another later impediment to changing the traditional name for the conflict was

¹⁸ A. *Pers.* 236 mentions *Μῆδοι*, 765 a *Μῆδος*, who is either a mythical eponymous ancestor of the royal house (A. J. Podlecki, *The Persians by Aeschylus* [Englewood Cliffs, N. J. 1970] 92) or perhaps Cyaxares (H. D. Broadhead, *The Persae by Aeschylus* [Cambridge 1960] 192, 279), and 791 refers to 'the Median (expedition)'—*τὸ Μηδικόν*.

¹⁹ The little that is known of this figure is almost totally contained in the Suda, s.v. *Διονύσιος Μιλήσιος*. Drews' attempt to resurrect him, (n. 13) 20–2, should be balanced with the more skeptical L. Pearson, *Early Ionian Historians* (Oxford 1939) 27, 110, as the tradition appears to be conflated with testimonies of other authors named Dionysius. For Greek literature concern-

ing Persia see the listing of R. Cantarella in *La Persia e il mondo greco-romano* (Rome 1966) 489–504, esp. 498 n. 49 for the *Persica*.

²⁰ See How and Wells (n. 7) ii 189 and Pearson (n. 19) 203–5. In the second century, Agatharchides of Cnidus rejected the mythological explanation on the basis of the accent, which was *Πέρσας* not *Περσᾶς* (*On the Red Sea* 6 = GGM i 113).

²¹ Macan attributed 'Mede' as a general designation for the Persian forces in Herodotus' account to one of his 'sources' (*Hdt.* IV–VI i 285 and *Hdt.* VII–IX i.2 429).

²² Drews' attempt to demonstrate that the early *Persica* were primarily 'histories of the Persian Wars' ([n. 13] 31 and 159 n. 46) is not very convincing. Although

the fact that the Roman war against Perseus king of Macedon (179–168) was also called τὸν Περσικὸν πόλεμον (Plb. iii 38). Subsequent writers were, therefore, largely restricted to using the old but unambiguous terminology. Thus, while Plutarch can on occasion use τὰ Περσικά (*Mor.* 832e; *Brut.* 31.5), he resorts to the older language much more frequently. The idiom's resilience is also reflected in the second-century Greek sophists of Roman times who still speak of the 'Medic War' when rehearsing Athens' glorious past (e.g., *Aristid. Or.* i 252). Even today, while English writers prefer to speak of the 'Persian Wars', the French preserve the original language with their expression 'guerres médiques'.

It is significant that no similar transformation took place with regard to the Greek use of *Μηδίζω* / *Μηδισμός*. In the fifth century, the term last appears in connection with the trial of Anaxagoras of Clazomenae for impiety (sometime before the Peloponnesian War, but dependent on a questionable later tradition).²³ Thereafter it is frequently mentioned by fourth-century politicians and orators, but only within the context of the earlier fifth-century conflict. The sole exception is the tradition in Plutarch concerning Agesilaus, king of Sparta (*Ages.* 23.2 = *Art.* 21.2 = *Apoph. Lac.* 213b). In response to a critic of Spartan negotiations with Persia during the early fourth century, who claimed that they had 'Medized' (*Μηδίζειν*), the king is said to have replied that the Medes had rather 'Laconicized' (*μᾶλλον τοὺς Μήδους Λακωνίζειν*). As this apologetic quip suggests, throughout the classical period there is no evidence of *Περσίζω* replacing the earlier term or assuming any connotations of treasonable behavior. As with the adverb *Περσισί* (*Hdt.* viii 85; ix 110), the verb *Περσίζειν* seems to have maintained its cultural denotations, implying the adoption of the Persian language and culture (*X. An.* iv 5.34; cf. *Arr. An.* vii 6.3; *Str.* xi 11.8). It is not until the Hellenistic and Roman period that it occurs meaning behavior sympathetic to Persia (*Str.* xiv 2.17, 657 C; cf. *D.S.* xxx 5a and the expression *συμμαχοῦντες τοῖς Πέρσiais* in xvii 25.6). This is especially striking and ironic for the period after the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War when Greek diplomacy with Achaemenid Persia was at its height,²⁴ but the problem diminishes when we take into account the total scope of Greek involvement with the eastern empire during the late fifth and early fourth centuries.

II. NEAR EASTERN PARALLELS

We may now return to our basic problem and attempt to determine the circumstances which prompted the Greeks to regard the early Achaemenid kingdom initially as Median and only afterwards as Persian. As observed previously, Myres' attempt to find the origin of the term 'Medism' in the period before Cyrus is to be rejected because there is no historical situation to account for such a political byword. Nor is Jonkers' ascription of the term to limitations in Greek knowledge of the East an adequate explanation. Even in the sixth century Aegean Greeks must have had sufficient contacts and connections with those involved in commerce, mercenary activity and travel in the eastern world to provide reasonably accurate information about any major events on the distant Iranian scene.²⁵ Both arguments are also seriously weakened by the failure to place the Greek perception of the rise of Cyrus in the context of that of other cultures

some of the surviving fragments include references to the Persian Wars, the total number of the remaining fragments is too few and their contents too diverse for such a surmise. Choerilus' late-fifth-century epic *Persica* cannot be used as a paradigm for the earlier *Persica* as it was an entirely different literary genre.

²³ D.L. ii 12 cites as his authority the third-century *Lives* of Satyrus. Different charges are listed by other writers apparently for two trials, a prosecution by Thucydides son of Melesias and another later by Cleon. J. A. Davison, *CQ* iii (1953) 39–45, who accepts both accounts, dates the earlier trial to 456/5. R. Meiggs, *The*

Athenian Empire (Oxford 1972) 435–6, suggests 450. See, however, K. J. Dover, *Talanta* vii (1975), J. Mansfeld, *Mnem.*⁴ xxxii (1979), xxxiii (1980).

²⁴ Note the comment of M. Cary, *CAH* vi (1927) 56: 'In the fourth century, the crime of "medism" became respectable in Greece, and it remained in honour so long as the Mede remained to medize with.' See also D. M. Lewis, *Sparta and Persia* (Leiden 1978).

²⁵ Chester G. Starr, *Political Intelligence in Classical Greece*, *Mnemos.* supp. xxxi (Leiden 1974) provides a concise discussion of this neglected topic.

and peoples of the eastern Mediterranean. While the sources for the Levant can hardly equal or parallel the extensive Greek evidence, they do provide a broader perspective from which to evaluate Greek comprehension of Iranian affairs.

(i) *Israel*

Since the Jews were directly involved in the events surrounding Cyrus' conquest of Babylon and were major beneficiaries of the liberal Achaemenid policy, their testimony is of fundamental importance. Unfortunately Jewish literature for the Persian period is riddled with numerous problems of date and provenance. In spite of these limitations, some relevant conclusions can be drawn. Although a precise chronology is not attainable, the references to the Medes and Persians appear to come from two distinct periods. The first, in which the Medes are mentioned but the Persians are conspicuous by their absence, can be assigned to the Neo-Babylonian era in the sixth century. The earliest of these references is perhaps the listing of the Madai (Heb. *Māday*) as the descendants of Japheth in the Table of Nations (*Gen. x 2 = I Chron. i 5*), a passage generally attributed to the priestly re-editing of the Pentateuch. The importance of this reference is that the Medes are grouped with Anatolian peoples and intimately connected with the Greeks, who are catalogued alongside of them (Heb. *umāday w'γāwān*).²⁶ Since the Persians are not included in these genealogical listings, the Table probably belongs to the first half of the century and reflects the impact of the downfall of Nineveh at the hands of the Babylonians and Cyaxares the Mede in 612.

A series of prophetic references probably from the same period predicts the fall of Babylon at the hands of the Medes and Elamites (*Isa. xiii 17; xxi 2*) or more generally of all the forces of 'the king(s) of Media' (*Jer. li 11, 28*. The Heb. is plural [*malekē māday*], but the Greek is singular [*LXX = xxviii. 11, 28 Βασιλέως Μήδων*]). Whether these passages originated early in the reign of Nabonidus (556–39), or were rather *vaticinia post eventum*, remains disputable.²⁷ Nonetheless, they do suggest that even after Cyrus' subjection of Media he was regarded as the royal successor, not destroyer, of the Median Kingdom. The only possible reference to Persia in this period is Ezekiel's listing of the *Pāras* among the allies of Tyre and Gog (*xxvii 10, xxxviii 5*). However, these appear to be grouped with North African peoples and may be an unidentified African tribe.²⁸ In any case, the sixth-century Israelite designations for the early Achaemenid empire are consistent with the Greek sources of the same period in their exclusive use of 'Mede'.

Furthermore, by the end of the fifth century there is a shift in terminology in the post-exilic Jewish sources from 'Media' to 'Persia', just as in the Greek evidence. Throughout the books of Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, Daniel and Esther, the Achaemenid kingdom is represented as

²⁶ Media makes an earlier appearance in the OT as one of the regions where the Assyrians resettled the captive Israelites after the fall of Samaria in 721 (*II Ki. xvii 6, xviii 11*). The sons of Javan are listed in *Gen. x 4* (cf. *I Chron. i 7*) as Elishah, Tarshish, the Kittim, and the Dodanim (*LXX, 'Ρόδιοι*), generally identified with locations in Western Anatolia and Cyprus, while the last seems to clearly refer to Rhodes. G. von Rad, *Genesis* (London 1963) 140, interestingly suggests that the Table may be contemporaneous with Anaximander's famous map of the world.

²⁷ G. Cameron at one time attempted to demonstrate that the language of these prophecies indicated a date between 561 and 550, but he later indicated to me that he thought the matter was best kept open. See the summary of his early paper, 'Media in the Old Testament', *JAOS* li (1931) 370. In contrast C. C. Torrey, *JAOS* lxvi (1946) 7, argued that the passages were interpolations of the third century, but I prefer a period closer to the events.

²⁸ W. Eichrodt, *Ezekiel* (Philadelphia 1970) 380–1; cf. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel* (Neukirchen/Vluyn 1969) 644. Lud is problematic; it may refer to Lydia, which supplied mercenaries to Egypt during the Saite dynasty (M. J. Mellink, 'Lud, Ludim', *IDB* iii [1962] 1978–9), but it appears elsewhere with Put (*Isa. 66. 19*, Heb. *pwł* is normally emended to *pwł* as the *LXX* reads *phoud*), so it may be a misreading for *lubim*, 'Libya' (*Nah. iii 9*). In the Table of Nations, Lud is a descendant of both Ham (*Gen. x 13*) and Shem (*x 22*), and the Ludim appear in the prophets with other African peoples (*Ezek. xxx 5*) as archers (*Jer. xlvi 9*), so it is possible that there were two peoples known as Lud who must be distinguished from each other. The older identification of Put (Old Persian *Putaya*) with Punt should be laid to rest; see G. Cameron, *JNES* ii (1943) 308. *Jud. ii 23* appears to locate Put and Lud in Asia Minor as among the peoples conquered by Nebuchadnezzar, but this Hellenistic treatise is filled with anachronisms and difficulties, so need not be given serious consideration.

Persian, although in coalition with Media as the political and administrative center of the empire, as indicated by the familiar phrase 'Medes and Persians' (*Dan.* v 23; vi 8, 12, 15; viii 20) or 'Persia and Media' (*Esth.* i 3, 14, 18, 19; but *cf.* x 2). When precisely this change from sixth-century nomenclature took place is difficult to ascertain. Although these writings purport to contain traditions contemporaneous with Cyrus and his immediate successors, it is generally agreed that they reached their final form much later. Their authors also tend to operate with propagandistic intent and, at times, reflect a muddled understanding of the earlier period. For example, Daniel presents the puzzling figure of Darius the Mede as the son of Ahasuerus and predecessor of Cyrus (v 31 [vi 1]; and ix 1).²⁹ This reverses completely the known historical order of the Achaemenid kings, with Ahasuerus (= Xerxes) as the father of Darius, and Darius occupying the throne before Cyrus!

This tendency to distort earlier affairs creates some reservation about the historical authenticity of Cyrus' representation as the 'king of Persia' contained in these books (*II Chron.* xxxvi 22–23; *Ez.* i 1; *Dan.* x 1). Even the inclusion of this title in Ezra's documented account of Cyrus' edict for the rebuilding of the Jerusalem temple cannot escape suspicion. While the Hebrew version explicitly calls him 'king of Persia' (i 2–4), the Aramaic version has only 'King Cyrus' (vi 3–5). It therefore seems likely that the title is not part of the official language of the decree, but a later anachronistic alteration.³⁰ The same shift in nomenclature observed in Greece may then be maintained for Israel. This provides a good basis for doubting Jonkers' argument that the early Greek usage of 'Mede' was the result of lack of information or interest. Other evidence points in the same direction.

(ii) Egypt

Since Egypt did not come under Achaemenid control until the campaign of Cambyses in 525, it might be assumed that Egyptians designated the imperial power as Persia from the very beginning. Yet the native nomenclature for the Iranian conquerors appears to have been 'Mede' consistently throughout Egypt's history. Of course Egyptians were not unaware of the Persian origins of the Achaemenid rulers. In the official hieroglyphic royal inscriptions of Darius, the supremacy of Persia is made clear, although, like Cambyses, he adopts the traditional pharaonic title 'King of Upper and Lower Egypt'.³¹ The trilingual cuneiform inscription on the colossal statue of Darius set up at the temple of Atum at Heliopolis also proclaims him as the 'Persian man who seized Egypt'.³² But native Egyptians serving in the Achaemenid administration employ

²⁹ H. H. Rowley, *Darius the Mede and the Four World Empires of the Book of Daniel* (Cardiff 1935) persuasively contended that Darius the Mede was a product of confused traditions, unrelated to any historical personage. P.-R. Berger in *ZfA* lxiv (1975) 192–234 argues for some genuine sixth-century elements in the Book of Daniel, but see L. F. Hartman and A. A. Di Lella, *The Book of Daniel* (Garden City, N.Y. 1978) 35–6, 50, and K. Koch, 'Dareios, der Meder', in *The Word of the Lord Shall Go Forth: Essays in Honor of David Noel Freedman*, ed. C. L. Meyers and M. O'Connor (Winona Lake, Indiana 1983) 287–99 for more recent discussion.

³⁰ E. J. Bickerman, *JBL* lxv (1946) 254–6, argued that the Persian titulary for the west was 'king of Persia', and defended the reliability of Ezra's account. In his opinion, both versions are genuine: the Hebrew is the oral proclamation of the herald; the Aramaic the official written decree. In contrast Torrey (n. 27) 11 viewed these passages as third century traditions and assigned the transition to 'Persian kings' to the reign of Artaxerxes I.

³¹ The lists of the subject peoples of the empire place Persia first and Media second in the Canal stelae

inscriptions from Maskhūta, Shallūfa, and Kubri (Suez) = nos 8–10 in G. Posener, *La première domination perse en Égypte*, Inst. français d'arch. or., bibl. d'étude xi (Cairo 1936); *cf.* the Apis stelae (nos 3–5). In the sculptures of Cambyses and Darius from the Serapeum stelae and the temple at Hibis, the Iranian rulers are depicted as Egyptian pharaohs (no. 31) performing the traditional religious rites. See M. C. Root, *The King and Kingship in Achaemenid Art*, Acta Iranica xix (Leiden 1979) 123–8. The Wadi Hammamat hieroglyphic inscriptions of Atiyawahy (Posener nos 24–30) and Ariyawrata (31–4), the governors of Coptos, from the end of Darius' reign to the 17th year of Artaxerxes I, designate them 'Persian' officials.

³² F. Vallat, *CDAFI* iv (1974) 161–70. The phrase is absent in the hieroglyphic inscriptions of the statue (J. Yoyotte, *JA* cclx [1972] 253–66) that was discovered on the Apadana mound at Susa, perhaps brought there by Xerxes after his punitive Egyptian expedition. See W. Hinz, *AMI* viii (1975) 120–1. M. Roaf, *CDAFI* iv (1974) 73–8, points out the peculiar Persian character of the statue and differences with New Kingdom reliefs, although it clearly reflects Egyptian workmanship.

only the archaic terms 'foreigners' and 'Asiatics' for the Iranians.³³ The ethnic term 'Persian' does not appear even to have been part of the native Egyptian vocabulary.

After the successful revolt against Persia in 404, the native rulers of the XXVIII–XXX Dynasties are described in the Demotic Chronicle as those 'who came after the Medes'.³⁴ Even when Artaxerxes III Ochus reconquered Egypt in 343, the traditional terminology was retained: he is described as the 'ruler of foreigners' or 'ruler of Asiatics'.³⁵ Corroboration for this general use of 'Mede' in Egypt during the Second Persian Occupation is contained in the Minaean inscription from Beraqish (South Arabia), which alludes to a struggle between the Medes (*Mdy*) and Egypt.³⁶ This information emanated from Minaean merchants returning from trading enterprises in Egypt, whence they must have derived the term. In the Ptolemaic and Roman periods demotic references to this era also designate it as the period of the Median rulers. Although a different terminology is reflected in the pseudoethnic Πέρσης τῆς ἐπιγονῆς that appears in Ptolemaic Greek documents, it had minimal influence on Egyptian usage of 'Mede'.³⁷

³³ As on the statue of Udjahorresnet, the chief physician of Cambyses, and on the stele of Ahmose, general for the Egyptian satrap in the time of Darius (Posener [n. 31] no. 1b, lines 11–12, 18–19; cf. no. 6, line 5; see A. B. Lloyd, *JEA* lxxviii [1982] 166–80). Aramaic papyri from the Elephantine military colony include a number of bearers of Babylonian and Persian names (e.g., E. Kraeling, *The Brooklyn Museum Aramaic Papyri* [New Haven 1953] nos 3, 4.24; A. E. Cowley, *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century BC* [Oxford 1923] no. 5). Ethnic designations appear infrequently, as in Kraeling no. 5.17, which mentions a witness named 'Atarparan b. Nisai, the Mede', whose home must have been Nisaya, a district in Media (*DB* I 58). See also G. R. Driver, *Aramaic Documents* (Oxford 1957) for the important administrative documents of the Egyptian satrap in the late fifth century and W. Spiegelberg, *SPAW* (1928) 604–22 for the demotic correspondence of the Khnum priests of Elephantine with the satrap Pherendates in the time of Darius I. For discussion of the papyri see B. Porten, *Archives from Elephantine* (Berkeley 1968) and E. Bresciani, *SCO* vii (1958) 132–88. The Asiatic/African bifurcation was traditional in Egypt, as is noted by G. Posener, 'Sur l'orientation et l'ordre des points cardinaux chez des Egyptiens', in *Göttinger Vorträge vom Ägyptologischen Kolloquium der Akademie* (Göttingen 1965) 69–78.

³⁴ See W. Spiegelberg, *Die sogenannte demotische Chronik des Pap. 215* (Leipzig 1914). For discussion of the Ptolemaic date and nature of this document see E. Meyer, *SPAW* (1915) 296–9 and J. H. Johnson, *Enchoria* iv (1974) 1–17.

³⁵ As in the funerary inscriptions of Petosiris at Tuna el-Gebel and those of Smatawyntefnakht; see Lloyd (n. 33) 177–8.

³⁶ *RES* 3022=G. Garbini, *Iscrizioni Minee = Seminario di Semitistica Recherche* x (Ist. Or. Napoli 1974) no. 247. The Egyptian connections of the Minaeans also are reflected in the designation of their colony at Dedan (al-^cUlā) as Ma'in of Muṣrān. For further discussion of the chronology of the Minaean kingdom and its contacts with the Levant see my discussion in 'Dedanite and Minaean (South Arabian) Inscriptions from the Hismā', in *Annual of the Department of Antiquities, Jordan* (1983). The pre-Islamic Safaitic texts from North Arabia even utilize 'Mede' to designate the Iranian successors to the Achaemenids, the Parthians and Sassanids, in their conflicts with Rome. See *CIS* v 4448

and F. V. Winnett, *Safaitic Inscriptions from Jordan* (Toronto 1957) nos 78, 88. The attempt of S. Smith in *Archaeologica Orientalia in Memoriam Ernst Herzfeld*, (Locust Valley, N.Y. 1952) 206 n. 1, to find 'Persian' in the occurrences of *frs* in pre-Islamic inscriptions is puzzling since it is frequently attested in Old Aramaic and Hebrew texts as 'horse(man)'. See C. F. Jean and J. Hoftijzer, *Dictionnaire des inscriptions sémitiques de l'Ouest* (Leiden 1960) 237. For the pre-Islamic texts see G. L. Harding, *An Index and Concordance of Pre-Islamic Names and Inscriptions* (Toronto 1971) 465 and G. Ryckmans, *AOF* xiv (1941) 54–6. The only occurrence of *frs* as 'Persia' in pre-Islamic texts that I am aware of is in a third-century AD inscription from Yemen. See J. Ryckmans, *Le Muséon* lxxx (1967) 508–12.

³⁷ The origins of the expression 'Persian, born in Egypt', are greatly disputed. During Ptolemaic and Roman times the meaning of the term evolved from a description of social position to a designation of secondary legal status. J. F. Oates, *YCS* xviii (1963) 1–129, argues that the term was selected because of its odious connotations. E. Boswinkel and P. W. Pestman, *Les archives privées de Dionysios, fils de Kephales* (P. L. Bat. 22) (Leiden 1982) 56–63, suggest it arose in a military milieu and originally meant 'son of a Persian (soldier)'. The demotic expression of *Wynn ms n Kmj*, 'Ionian born in Egypt' (e.g., *P. dem. Ryl.* 21) has been cited as the comparable Egyptian phrase, but note the demotic expression *Mtj ms n Kmj* in *P. dem. Lille* i no. 1 (243 BC). In contrast, the Greek expression Μῆδος τῆς ἐπιγονῆς occurs only once (*P. Tebt.* 815, fr. 2, R iii 53–4 [228/221 BC]) and in the context of numerous Πέρσης τῆς ἐπιγονῆς and other epithets. See E. Bresciani, *PP* xxvii (1972) 123–8. The only occurrences of *Prs* in demotic are in official Ptolemaic documents or in the context of Ptolemaic propaganda: see D. Lorton, *JEA* lvii (1971) 160–4 and the demotic ostrakon recently published by E. Bresciani in *Das ptolemäische Ägypten*, ed. H. Maehler and V. M. Strocka (Mainz 1978) 31–7. Native Egyptian documents utilize a different terminology: see *P. Vindob.* D 10000 and K.-T. Zauzich, *Papyrus Erzherzog Rainer* (Vienna 1983) 165–74 for the use of 'Mede' in a third-century fragment of the prophetic book of the Lamb to Bocchoris (a reference I owe to L. Koenen) and the second-century derogatory reference to the Medes in the hieroglyphic texts of the Horus myth from Edfu: E. Chassinat, *Le temple d'Edfou* vi=Mém. inst. français d'arch. or. xxxi (Cairo 1931),

The term 'Mede' may even be echoed in Coptic *MATOI*, which had the derivative meaning of 'soldier', perhaps based on the demotic *mtj/mdw* and the earlier military occupation.³⁸ It can then be concluded that the Egyptians employed the same terminology for the Achaemenid rulers from Cambyses to Artaxerxes III, with no traces of any reassessment even in Ptolemaic/Roman times.

Although this incessant use of 'Mede' is in striking contrast to the shifts in nomenclature for the Achaemenids in Greece and Israel, it is not surprising in the case of Egypt, where ethnic terms are rather general in character. Such permanence for ethnic designations resulting from initial contact is not uncommon in either the ancient or modern world, but it was particularly typical of ancient Egypt. This phenomenon is reflected in the ancient Near Eastern terminology for the Greeks themselves. The popular designation for the Hellenic peoples throughout ancient times in Egypt, as in Mesopotamian and Semitic cultures, was *Iawani*, 'Ionian'.³⁹ As with the term 'Mede', the conservative Egyptians retained this designation for the Greeks even in the Byzantine period. In similar fashion, the general use of 'Mede' by Egyptians for the Achaemenid empire could be attributed to their initial contact with the Median empire before Cyrus, when they were aligned with Assyria against the Babylonian–Median coalition of Nabopolassar and Cyaxares in the late seventh century.⁴⁰ This possibility offers some support to Myres' contention for the use of Mede in the Greek world, but it does not explain other aspects of the problem.

What is not accounted for by his interpretation is the universal use in the Levant of 'Median' for the early Achaemenid empire and the change in terminology that took place in the Greek and Jewish cultures of the fifth century. The prolific use of 'Mede' in the eastern Mediterranean also places in doubt the hypothesis of Jonkers that the widespread phenomenon can be explained by a failure to perceive the distinct break between the old Median kingdom and the Persians under Cyrus. The fact that the first appearance of 'Persian' for the Achaemenid empire in Greece and Israel is at least a half century after Cyrus' accession presents a serious difficulty for these views. An explanation is more likely to be found within the political developments that saw the rise of Cyrus and the Achaemenid empire.⁴¹ Even from the limited and scanty Persian and non-Persian sources at our disposal for the events of the late sixth and early fifth centuries enough light can be cast on the problem to find an explanation for the terminology in the actual nature of the early Achaemenid dynasty.

214–15 with H. Kees, *NAWG* (1930) 346–7. Greek references to Medes during the Ptolemaic period are rare (e.g. *P. Lon.* vii 2052), whereas Persians are frequently mentioned. See M. Launey, *Recherches sur les armées hellénistiques* i (Paris 1949) 563–80 for discussion. In sum, Greek ethnics are normally precise for this period, while Egyptian ethnics are general and ambiguous.

³⁸ A. H. Gardiner, *Ancient Egyptian Onomasticon* (London 1947) i 81–2; W. Erichsen, *Demotisches Glossar* (Copenhagen 1954) 185; W. E. Crum, *A Coptic Dictionary* (Oxford 1939) 190. However, J. H. Johnson prefers to derive the Coptic word *MATOI* ('soldier') from Egyptian *md3yw*, an ethnic term for the Nubian people employed during the New Kingdom in the army and as 'policemen'. Afterwards, the term was used to designate even native Egyptians as 'police'. See Gardiner i 74 for the texts.

³⁹ H. Bengtson, 'Die 'Ionier' in der Überlieferung des Alten Orients', *Philol.* xcii (1937) 148–55 = *Kl. Schr.* (Munich 1974) 76–82, and Sethe, *NAGW* (1916) 131–3. The archaic hieroglyphic *h3w-nbut* (roughly meaning 'around the baskets', a metaphor for the

Mediterranean islanders) was also applied to the Greeks during the Ptolemaic period (Gardiner [n. 38]i 206–7). The attempt of P. Montet, *RA* xxviii (1947) 129–44, to derive *Hau-Nebwet* from 'Ἐλλοί and *vaūs* and trace Greek presence in Egypt back to the early third millennium is filled with multiple linguistic and historical improbabilities, as is observed by J. Vercoutter, *RA* xlvi (1947) 125–58 and xlviii (1949) 107–209.

⁴⁰ B.M. 21901. Text and translation in D. J. Wiseman, *Chronicles of Chaldaean Kings (626–556 BC) in the British Museum* (London 1956) 55. The same explanation for the Greek use of 'Mede' is offered by J. Duchesne-Guillemin in 'Media', *Kleine Pauly* iii 1128: 'Da die Griechen zuerst mit Medern unter Iranier in Berührung kamen nannten sie oft die Iranier Meder'. Cf. Bengtson, *Kl. Schr.* (n. 39) 82 n. 41. What this view fails to explain is the supplanting of 'Mede' as a general term for Iranians in Greece.

⁴¹ J. Harmatta, *AAntHung* xix (1971) 3, notes that the internal Iranian politics of Cyrus' era are generally neglected in standard treatments of the period. See P. R. Helm, *Iran* xix (1981) 85–90 for a recent statement concerning Median history.

III. ACHAEMENID KINGSHIP FROM CYRUS TO DARIUS

The problem in previous discussions of *Μηδίζω* has been the assumption that when Cyrus marched against Lydia, he must clearly be viewed as a Persian king, recently triumphant over the Medes. Although this seems to be confirmed by the Babylonian Chronicle for the reign of Nabonidus, which calls Cyrus 'king of Persia' (^m*Ku-raš šar kur Par-su*),⁴² it is now known that this was an old dynastic title for one of the political dependencies of the Median kingdom. In the Assyrian annals for the year 639, the grandfather of Cyrus, who bore the same name, is described as 'Kuras, the king of Parsumaš', but in his own cylinder-seal impressions from Persepolis he is merely 'Cyrus of Anshan, son of Teispes'.⁴³ The royal title of Cyrus the Great at this time merely reflects his position as one of the vassal kings of the Median coalition formed more than a century earlier as a result of Assyrian pressure from the west and the threatening Scythians in the north. But with the rising tide of events that witnessed the subjection of the Median king Astyages, the fall of Croesus' Lydian kingdom, and the conquest of Babylon, Cyrus could boast: 'I am Cyrus, king of the world, great king, legitimate king, king of Babylon, king of Sumer and Akkad, king of the four rims (of the earth)'.⁴⁴ Just as Cambyses and Darius adopted the traditional titles of the native Egyptian rulers, Cyrus assumed the appropriate Babylonian titulary. Both here and elsewhere, however, his formula included a few simple phrases which identified him as the king of Anshan, an Achaemenid. The previous titular emphasis on Parsa is overshadowed, implicit now only in the name of the older Elamite province of Anshan where Pasargadae was located.⁴⁵ The lengthy Babylonian title then reflects a determined effort by Cyrus to convince his new subjects that he was not just a petty kinglet of a formerly subservient province of the Median kingdom, but the royal successor to the great dynasties of Mesopotamia. This propaganda and preoccupation with legitimacy were obviously prompted by the insecurity a mere former vassal king felt in assuming the rule of the eminent kingdoms of the past.

Although the simple title 'king of Media' does not appear in the Achaemenid royal inscriptions, there is substantial evidence that Cyrus also adopted the standard royal formulae of the Median kings after his defeat of Astyages in 550. Several years later, in the Harran inscriptions of king Nabonidus of Babylon, Cyrus is depicted as the legitimate successor to the Median throne. These texts indicate that the Babylonian monarch received ambassadors from the 'king of Egypt, the city of the Medes, and the land of the Arabs'.⁴⁶ The strange expression, 'the city of the Medes', has been assigned to the period 'immediately after the victory of Cyrus, who had perhaps not secured or assumed his official titles',⁴⁷ but it can more plausibly be dated

⁴² B.M. 35382 = Nabonidus Chronicle ii 15. For text and translation see A. K. Grayson, *Assyrian and Babylonian Chronicles* (Locust Valley, N.Y. 1975) 107. Kent has suggested that the geographical designation *Pārsa* 'seems to have been imposed by an outside source' (p. 9). More recently, G. Windfuhr, *Acta Iranica* v = *Hommages et opera minora, monumentum H. S. Nyberg* ii (Leiden 1975) 466–8, has associated *Parsua* with a westward movement from the Iranian province of *Parthawa* (*Parsu/awa*).

⁴³ E. Weidner, *AOF* vii (1931–2) 1–7; R. T. Hallock, *Persepolis Fortification Tablets* (Chicago 1969) nos 692–5, 2033, which he discusses in *Seals and Sealing in the Ancient Near East*, ed. M. Gibson and R. D. Biggs (Malibu 1977) 127. Although Herodotus provides the genealogy of Cyrus (i 107; vii 11), Cyrus is not mentioned as a member of the old royal dynasty of Anshan.

⁴⁴ Cyrus Cylinder = *ANET* 316, where Cyrus claims to be from 'a family (which) always (exercised) kingship'.

⁴⁵ At Murghab: 'I am Cyrus the (Great) King, an Achaemenian' (Kent, *CMA*, *CMB*, *CMC*); Ur: 'Cyrus, Great King, . . . King of the universe, king of Anshan' (*UET* i 194); Babylon: 'Cyrus, king of Anshan' (v R 35). For Anshan see n. 43; the use of the archaic term in Mesopotamia must have helped to establish his legitimacy as the new ruler. J. Hansman, *Iran* x (1972) 101–25, has recently identified the area near Maliyūn in southwest Iran as the city of Anshan.

⁴⁶ C. J. Gadd, 'The Harran Inscriptions of Nabonidus', *AS* viii (1958) 35–92 = *ANET* 562. The text of Gadd for H2 i 42 reads *šar (Māt?) mi-šir (ālu) ma-da-a-a (māt) a-ra-bi*, 'the king(s?) of the land(?) of Egypt, the city of the Medes, the land of the Arabs'. On the possibility that 'king' (*šar*) refers to all three names, Gadd notes, 'To extend the idea of "king" over the two following descriptions would be contrary to Babylonian usage' (76 n. 3). For further discussion see I. Eph'al, *The Ancient Arabs* (Leiden 1982) 180–91.

⁴⁷ Gadd (n. 46) 77.

after the 13th year of the reign of Nabonidus, i.e. between 543 and 539.⁴⁸ 'The city of the Medes' then seems obviously to refer to the Median capital of Ecbatana, the political center of Cyrus' regime or a synecdoche for the entire Median kingdom.⁴⁹ Although the Nabonidus Chronicle records that Cyrus plundered the Median city in his campaign against Astyages and then returned to Anshan,⁵⁰ later evidence indicates that Ecbatana was used as the administrative headquarters for his kingdom (*Ez.* vi 1–2; cf. *Ar. Ach.* 64) and as a summer residence (*Hdt.* i 153; *X. Cyr.* viii 6.22; *Str.* xvi 1.16, 743 C). In any case, the Harran inscriptions provide a clear expression that from the contemporary Babylonian perspective the recent political developments in the Iranian sphere were not interpreted as the inauguration of a distinctively different ruling power.

The same conclusion can be deduced from the Achaemenid royal titles used in Old Persian inscriptions. Their precise relationship to those employed by Median kings obviously cannot be determined with any certainty in the absence of Median dynastic documents. Nonetheless, linguistic evidence suggests that the Achaemenid kings borrowed their official royal titles directly from the Median dialect. An analysis of the names in Achaemenid inscriptions shows that Old Persian generally follows the southwestern dialect rather than Median, but there are notable exceptions.⁵¹ For example, the OP phrase 'great king' (*xšāyaθiya vazrka*) is generally thought to be derived from Median, based on the presence of Median *θ* before the suffix *-iya-* in the OP term for 'king' rather than southwest Iranian *š* (the expected OP form would have been **xšāyašiya*). In similar fashion, the southwestern dialect should have possessed a form **vadarka* for 'great' with *d* corresponding to the *z* of other Iranian dialects. The presence of these isoglosses implies that the OP phrase 'Great King' (and perhaps 'King of Kings') was borrowed from the Median royal titulary. As the expression that distinguished the suzerain from the vassal kings within the empire, it became the popular designation for the Persian king even in the Greek world.

The intimate relationship between the Achaemenid kings and their Iranian predecessors is further demonstrated by the extensive borrowing from the official nomenclature of the Median government for the administrative and bureaucratic structure of the Persian empire.⁵² Such loanwords are to be taken as more than a mere linguistic veneer which was the product of a common heritage. Median influence at the royal court is portrayed in the reliefs at Persepolis and the administrative documents of the empire, where numerous Median names appear.⁵³ In the

⁴⁸ H. Tadmor, *Assyriological Studies* xvi (Chicago 1965) 351–64. For another chronological interpretation see W. G. Lambert, *Proceedings of the 5th Seminar for Arabian Studies* (1972) 53–64.

⁴⁹ *Contra* W. Röellig, *ZfA* lvi = n.f. xxii (1964) 229.

⁵⁰ Nabonidus Chronicle ii 3 = Grayson (n. 42) 106. Cyrus was in Ecbatana in 537 (Olmstead, *HPE* 57–8). According to Herodotus, Ecbatana was also the capital city of Cambyses (iii 64).

⁵¹ The standard treatment of the relationship between Median and OP is M. Mayrhofer, 'Die Rekonstruktion des Medischen', *AÖAW* cv (1968) 1–23. Not all Iranian scholars accept his hypothesis. I. Gershevitch, *TPhS* (1964) 1–29, prefers to explain the differences on the basis of internal dialects and points out a number of ordinary non-technical 'Median' words in OP. P. Lecoq, *Acta Iranica* ii (1974) 55–62 also argues in favor of pronunciation variants rather than Median loanwords, viewing the language of the OP inscriptions as a sort of unspoken *koine* utilized by western Iranians. However, he accepts 'great king' as Median in origin (58). The title 'great king' appears first with the Hittites, as it is completely absent in Sumerian titulary. It first occurs in Akkadian with Shamshi-Adad I, and continues in use to Assurbanipal. In Babylon, both Kurigalzu and Nabonidus used the title *šarru rabū*. For

discussion and references see M. J. Seux, *Epithètes royales akkadiennes et sumériennes* (Paris 1967) 298–300. Harmatta (n. 41) 12 believes the traditional Achaemenid royal title was dropped by Cyrus after his subjugation of the Medes in 550 and M. A. Dandamaev suggests that Cyrus assumed the royal title of the Median kings in *Persien unter den ersten Achämeniden* (6. Jahrhundert v. Chr.) (Wiesbaden 1976) 94. For the propaganda aspects of this terminology see G. Cameron in *The Idea of History in the Ancient Near East*, ed. R. C. Dentan (New Haven 1955) 82–4, and C. Nylander's essay, 'Achaemenid Imperial Art', in *Power and Propaganda: A Symposium on Ancient Empires*, ed. M. T. Larsen (Uppsala 1980) 345–59.

⁵² Harmatta (n. 41) 11 provides a convenient list of Median terms borrowed by the Persians for state organization and administration. For the Median derivation of 'satrapy' (**xšāθrapā-*, rather than OP *xšācapāvan*) see M. Mayrhofer, *Donum Indogermanicum Festgabe für Anton Scherer* (Heidelberg 1971) 48 and *Fouilles de Xanthos* vi (Paris 1979) 181–5; cf. R. Schmitt in *Studies in Greek, Italic, and Indo-European Linguistics offered to L. R. Palmer*, ed. A. D. Morpurgo and W. Reid (Innsbruck 1976) 373–90.

⁵³ Iranian and Greek sources suggest the prominence of Medes in the Achaemenid court. See M. Mayrhofer,

OP royal inscriptions, Media always follows Persia, and in Babylon Xerxes is even occasionally designated the 'king of Medo-Persia' (*Par-su Ma-da-a-a*).⁵⁴ These relations must form the basis for the later Jewish phrase 'Medes and Persians'. All this evidence supports the hypothesis that under Cyrus the existing bureaucracy of the Median Kingdom was maintained *en bloc*.

Cyrus' own connections with the Median aristocracy are attested in the later Greek accounts of the rise of the Achaemenid empire. Although he frequently is called 'Cyrus the Persian', he is also represented as the offspring of a Median princess named Mandane, the daughter of Astyages (Hdt. i 107–8; X. *Cyr.* i 2.1, *cf.* A. *Pers.* 766–73).⁵⁵ Her marriage to Cambyses, Cyrus' father, was obviously part of a dynastic alliance between the royal houses of Ecbatana and Parsa. With such ancestors Cyrus had the opportunity for intimate association with Median aristocracy and the development of power within the kingdom. Although many of the details in the Greek tradition of his rise may be distorted by legendary accretions and romantic embellishments, Herodotus' basic account appears trustworthy. For example, his description of the conspiracy and treachery of Harpagus, the commander of the Median army, whose troops deserted to Cyrus and assisted in the capture of the Median king (i 123–8), is confirmed, at least in outline, by the statement in the Babylonian Chronicle that 'the army of Ishtumegu (Astyages) revolted against him and in fetters they de[livered him] to Cyrus'.⁵⁶ In addition, disaffected members of the non-Deiocid Median aristocracy may have provided another source of political support for the rebellion and contributed to Cyrus' elevation.⁵⁷ Such widespread sympathy among the governing class would have made the transfer of power to Cyrus less traumatic for the remaining population of the Median kingdom.

There is then no reason for the outside world to have greeted the news of these events as anything other than an internal dynastic transition within the Median royal house, with the grandson replacing his grandfather on the throne. When Cyrus appeared on the eastern horizon of the Greek world in about 547, he could legitimately be viewed as the new Median king, 'the great king, the king of kings', the successor of Astyages. If the official title of Cyrus was 'king of Persia', it has left no trace in the contemporary literary and epigraphic evidence.⁵⁸ As we have

Onomastica Persepolitana (Vienna 1973) for Median names, but *cf.* R. Zadok, *Israel Or. Stud.* vii (1977) 111–12, who notes that Iranian names in Babylon have only 'Median' forms and that Herodotus designates as Persian individuals with names that have 'Median' features; this leads him to express reservation about Mayrhofer's linguistic criteria for 'Median'. The attempt to distinguish Persians and Medes in Achaemenid art on the basis of different costume by W. Hinz, *Altiranische Funde und Forschungen* (Berlin 1969) 63–93, and H. von Gall, *AMI* v (1972) 261–83, has received some harsh criticism from Roaf (n. 32) 94–103 and J. M. Cook, *The Persian Empire* (London 1983) 230, who point out that Persians frequently adopted the Median dress (Hdt. i 135; vii 62). But Root (n. 31) 282 observes that the alternating costume perhaps suggests 'the harmonious interaction of the two functional aspects—rather than the interaction of Medes and Persians', i.e. ethnicity is not the theme in the artistic portrayal of the officialdom.

⁵⁴ See the listing of Achaemenid royal titles by C. Nylander, *Orientalia Suecana* xvi (1967) 157–66; *cf.* P. Lecoq, *Acta Iranica* iii (1979) 55–6. The Babylonian title varies for Xerxes including 'King of the city of Persia, city of Media, Babylon and the Lands'. Babylon was dropped from the titulary in 481; see G. Cameron, *AJSL* lviii (1941) 323–4 and R. Schmitt, *AAntHung* xxv (1977) 91–9 for discussion.

⁵⁵ Ctesias (*ap.* Nicolaus of Damascus, *FGrH* 324 F

66) departs from this tradition, giving Cyrus a humble origin as the son of a shepherd and outlaw, but it is generally agreed that this is the product of the propaganda circulated at the court of Artaxerxes II for the purpose of discrediting Cyrus the Younger, a descendant of another branch of the Achaemenid family. See A. Cizek, *AC* xlv (1975) 547, but *cf.* M. Mallowan, *Iran* x (1972) 3, who prefers to trace the dissension between the two Achaemenid branches back to the court of Darius I.

⁵⁶ Nabonidus Chronicle ii 2–4 = Grayson (n. 42) 106. Harmatta (n. 41) 14–15, suggests there was a clash between the military aristocracy and the state bureaucracy, the former supported by the Deiocid dynasty and the latter siding with Cyrus, which conflicts with this reference.

⁵⁷ Since Astyages was without male issue (Hdt. i 109), Cyrus could have been viewed popularly in Media as the heir apparent to the throne and may have taken the hand of a Median princess after the defeat of Astyages to add to his legitimacy in the eyes of the Median populace (*cf.* X. *Cyr.* iii 5.19). R. Frye, *The Heritage of Persia* (New York 1963) 110 suggests the continuation between the Median and Achaemenid state was virtually complete, 'with only Cyrus replacing Astyages'.

⁵⁸ From its singular occurrence in the Babylonian Chronicle, Olmstead (*HPE* 38) suggested that Cyrus 'had just revived the title' of King of Parsa, but it is 'king

seen, throughout the eastern Mediterranean in the sixth century, the Iranian invaders under Cyrus and Cambyses were known as 'Medes'.⁵⁹ Even in Herodotus, who normally carefully distinguished between Medes and Persians, the only title Cyrus is given is 'king of the Medes'. This occurs first when Croesus makes inquiry at the oracle of Delphi, and the Pythia in her response proleptically calls him βασιλεὺς Μήδοισι (i 55). The second time is at the close of his career, in his final and fatal campaign against Queen Tomyris of the Massagetae, when her herald is said to have addressed the aged Cyrus as ὦ βασιλεῦ Μήδων (i 206). The same title occurs occasionally for Xerxes in the description of his campaign against Greece (vii 136; viii 5, 114; ix 7; cf. iv 197). Such references must reflect the initial period of Greek contacts with the Achaemenid empire, perhaps preserved in the traditions he utilized. A fragmentary Phoenician inscription from a sarcophagus recently discovered at Byblos, dated to the early fifth century, refers to . . . [. . . *mdy 'dn mlkm* . . .], which may be rendered ' . . . [the king of the] Medes, lord of kings'.⁶⁰ Both the ethnic and phraseology of this title are in striking agreement with the pattern found throughout the western provinces and neighbors of the Achaemenid empire. In sum, the primary and ancillary evidence all points to the representation of Cyrus and his immediate successors as Median kings.

The earliest expression of the absolute Persian character of the Achaemenid dynasty is in the official inscriptions of Darius I (522–486). In contrast to his predecessors, there is a distinct emphasis on the ethnicity of the ruler and the position of Parsa as the principal component of the culturally diverse empire. Darius proclaims himself 'king of Persia' (*DB I 2 Kent*), just like Cyrus, but what was previously tacit and implicit now is the focal point. He boasts that as 'a Persian, the son of a Persian' (*DNa 13–14*), the defender and protector of the 'Persian people' (*DPe 21–2*), he has fought against distant peoples (*DNa 43–7*), bringing into subjection the land of Egypt (*DZc*).⁶¹ Such statements may have been derived, of course, from the conventional language established by Cyrus or Cambyses, their peculiarity a product of the perhaps accidental fact that the royal inscriptions for Darius outnumber those of all the other Achaemenid kings put together. But it seems more likely that this concern is associated with the unusual circumstances that surrounded his accession to the throne.

In the monumental Bisitun inscriptions, Darius recorded the controversial events by which he became ruler, providing in some detail the role he played in the removal from the throne of the Magian Gaumata, who he claimed had reigned for seven months as a usurper and an impostor of Bardiya, the son of Cyrus and brother of Cambyses (*DB I 26–61*). As an adjunct, the names of six conspirators who had assisted Darius in the slaying of the pretender are added later,

of Anshan' that is regularly employed in the Babylonian context (see n. 45). There is also no evidence to support Bickerman's suggestion that this was the western titulary of the Achaemenid kings (n. 30), as its absence in Phoenician inscriptions (n. 59) and Thracian OP texts makes clear (DGh=M. Mayrhofer, *Supplement zur Sammlung der altpersischen Inschriften*, SÖAWWien. cccviii [1978] 16; cf. Hdt. iv 87, 91). The chronology for the period is vexed. The conventional date of 550 for the defeat of Astyages has been challenged by R. Drews, *Historia* xviii (1969) 1–11, who prefers a date of 554/3 for the event. The date of 547 for the fall of Sardis is also not secure; see the discussion in Grayson (n. 42) 107 and 282. Mallowan (n. 55) 6, prefers a date of '545 BC or possibly a year or two later'.

⁵⁹ Myres (n. 9) 97 minimized this fact by stressing that Cyrus' title appeared only once (Hdt. i 206), ignoring the other passages cited in the text above.

⁶⁰ The inscription (Byblos 13) was found in 1955 and has been frequently discussed. See J. Starcky, *MUB* xlv (1969) 259–73; W. Röllig, *Neue Ephemeris f. Semit. Epigr.* ii (Wiesbaden 1974) 1–15; I. Schiffman, *Riv. studi*

fenic iv (1976) 171–7; F. M. Cross, *IEJ* xxix (1979) 40–4. Starcky dated it to 400, but most would now date it a century earlier. All but Röllig restore the broken line as [*mlk]prš wmdy*, 'king of the Persians and the Medes'. Röllig observes that the letter before *mdy* can be read as *m* or *k*, the latter of which seems more likely. The other reading is dependent on the biblical phrase (*Est.* i 14, 18; x 2; *Dan.* viii 20) appearing in literature from the fourth century or later and not contemporaneous with the inscription. The phrase '*don m'lakim*', based on the Akkadian *bēl šarrāni* (Seux [n. 51] 318–19), is the Aramaic equivalent of OP 'great king, king of kings' (see W. Huss, *ZDPV* xciii [1977] 139). The Median/Achaemenid royal titles were probably all imitations of those of Assyrian kings, as was suggested by O. G. von Wesenkonk, *Oriental Studies in Honor of C. E. Pavry* (London 1933) 488–90.

⁶¹ The 'seizure' of Egypt by a 'Persian man' is also emphasized in the cuneiform inscriptions from the recently discovered statue of Darius at Suza (*DSab* and n. 32 above).

each specifically designated 'a Persian' (IV 80–8). In this fashion, Darius claimed to have restored the power that had been stripped from his family, which was in fact a collateral branch of the Achaemenid clan, foreign to that of Cyrus (I 3–11), whose vast achievements are ignored completely in the great trilingual rock inscription (IV 50–2). This need not be interpreted as a reflection of the bitterness which later existed between the two separate lines and flared up on more than one occasion.⁶² What it does suggest is that the new monarch did not have the same attachment to the Median camp as Cyrus and that his policy toward the subject peoples of the empire would be different. The tumultuous revolts which Darius encountered in the initial years of his reign must have given impetus to the concentrated effort he made in the reorganization and consolidation of the empire. In addition to his renowned administrative and financial achievements, symbolized by the magnificent royal capitals at Susa and Persepolis, Darius' innovative genius has been detected behind other aspects of Achaemenid rule.⁶³ Although Cyrus' liberal and tolerant policy toward subject peoples was not completely abandoned, the breakdown of the *pax Achaemenica* which Cyrus sought to establish produced new demands for the young ruler. As a result, Darius attempted to weld the heterogeneous peoples of the empire together under Persian supremacy and gave the Achaemenid king his strictly Persian identity and character.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

We may now briefly recapitulate the relevance of these matters for the origin of the term 'Medism'. After the defeat of Astyages by Cyrus in 550, the royal traditions and organization of the Median state appear to have been maintained without interruption under the early Achaemenid dynasty. This continuity is indicated by the Nabonidus inscriptions from the Harran where Cyrus' regime is still embraced under the Median appellation, in the adoption of Median royal titles by Cyrus, and the employment of the characteristic terminology of the Median bureaucracy. Any traumatic dynastic break in the Median kingdom is excluded by the familial connections which existed between Cyrus and the royal house at Ecbatanna.

There is then no reason to assign with Myres the emergence of the term *Μηδίζω* / *Μηδισμός* to the period before Cyrus or view it with Jonkers as the result of Greek

⁶² As argued by Mallowan (n. 55) 3. Darius' marriages to Atossa and Artystone, the daughters of Cyrus (Hdt. iii 88; vii 2), do not suggest any bitterness between the two 'rival' branches. The old view that the two Achaemenid families of Cyrus II and Darius I were located at Anshan and Parsa respectively is now discredited by evidence that they are different names for the same site (see n. 45). Far more attractive is T. Cuyler Young's suggestion to me that there was a significant anti-Persian/pro-Median element in the revolt of Gaumāta. It should be noted that the Old Babylonian Bisitun text describes the rebel Gaumāta as 'a certain Mede': i 15 = E. N. von Voigtlander, *The Bisitun Inscription of Darius the Great, Babylonian Version* (London 1978). J. A. S. Evans, *Herodotus* (Boston 1982) 57, presents a similar view of the revolt. The propaganda aspects of Bisitun have been emphasized by Dandamaev, (n. 51) 1–90, who views Darius as the usurper and Gaumāta (Bardiya) as the legitimate heir of Cambyses; cf. E. Bickerman and H. Tadmor, *Athenaeum* lvi (1978) 239–61, C. Herrenschmidt, *Annales (ESC)* xxxvii (1982) 813–23 and Cook (n. 53) 44–57. In contrast, J. Wiesehöfer, *Der Aufstand Gaumāta und die Anfänge Dareios I* (Bonn 1978), characterizes Gaumāta as a pretender and emphasizes the religious and social

dimensions of the rebellion. On the problem of succession in Iranian kingship see R. Frye, *AAntHung* xxv (1977) 75–82. Another expression of Median unrest is the revolt of Fravartish, who claimed to be a descendent of Cyaxares and was supported by the Median palace guard of Darius; the largest number of enemy casualties and prisoners of any in the Bisitun inscription are recorded for this rebellion: perhaps as many as 34,425 dead and 18,000 captured (but the Aramaic Elephantine copy has 108,010, as Cook notes in his discussion of the battle; cf. *DB II*, 13–17 Kent). These outbreaks among the Medes help explain the new tone and emphasis in Darius' inscriptions.

⁶³ The development of the OP script is now generally assigned to the reign of Darius: see Schmitt (n. 1) 17–20 for a summary of recent discussion. In addition, Darius seems to have established the custom of adopting a throne name, perhaps to gloss over the illegitimate nature of his rule: 'there is an apparent break in the tradition of naming between the older line of the Achaemenids on the one hand and Darius I and his successors on the other' (R. Schmitt, *AION* xlii [1982] 93). For a more general treatment of the period see W. Hinz, *Darius und die Perser: Eine Kulturgeschichte der Achämeniden* (Baden-Baden 1976) and n. 52 above.

inability to stay abreast of developments on the remote Iranian scene. In the war against Lydia, Cyrus may be understood as simply attempting to preserve the borders and commitments of the Median state which had previously existed under Astyages. During this campaign, the Greeks who surrendered unconditionally or cooperated freely with the Iranian forces could appropriately and legitimately be called 'Medizers'. The later shift in terminology from *Μῆδος* to *Πέρσης* is not an indication of any initial misunderstanding about the identity of the eastern invaders, but better understood as the product of latent forces which had existed within the Achaemenid dynasty from the beginning. It is not until the reign of Darius that the first real departures from the Median state are given explicit expression. The influences emanating from this collateral line of the royal house eventually overshadowed the earlier prominence of the Medes and established the privileged position and dominance of the Persians within the Achaemenid state. The Greek change in terminology is a reflection of their cognizance of these developments within the imperial power centered in Iran.

DAVID F. GRAF

Montana State University