

ATEAS AND THEOPOMPUS

THE fourth century BC Scythian King Ateas is mentioned in no contemporary, or near contemporary extant classical work, yet he is the subject of numerous stories in the works of such later writers as Trogus Pompeius (as epitomised by Justin), Satyrus (as quoted by Athenaeus), Polyaeus, Plutarch, Strabo, Frontinus, Lucian, Clement of Alexandria and Jordanes (in the sixth century AD). These stories all refer to events which might be dated to a period beginning a year or two before Philip's siege of Perinthus and ending the year after the siege. They would have fallen outside the scope of Ephorus' ἱστορίαι which seem to have come to a sudden end with Philip's siege of Perinthus in 341/40,¹ but would not have fallen outside the scope of Theopompus' work, Books xlvi–l of which contain many references to Thrace in this period (F217–26). The present paper is an investigation of the historical and historiographical significance of these stories. It will be argued that the various stories dealing with Ateas are historically reconcilable with each other, offer insights into the progress of a Scythian migration into the region south of the lower Danube and are compatible with, perhaps derived from, Theopompus' account of events in that period.

I. ATEAS AND THE TRIBALLI

There are two extant accounts of the conflict between Ateas' Scythians and the Triballi. In ii 4.20 of his *Strategemata* Frontinus wrote:

Atheas rex Scytharum, cum adversus ampliozem Triballorum exercitum confliget, iussit a feminis puerisque et omni imbelli turba greges asinorum ac boum ad postremam hostium aciem admoveri et erectas hastas praeferrere; famam deinde diffudit, tamquam auxilia sibi ab ulterioribus Scythis adventarent. Qua adseveratione avertit hostem.

When Atheas, King of the Scythians, was contending against the more numerous tribe of the Triballi, he commanded that herds of asses and cattle be brought up in the rear of the enemy's forces by women, children, and all the non-combatant population, and that spears, held aloft, should be carried in front of these. Then he spread abroad the rumour that reinforcements were coming to him from the more distant Scythian tribes. By this declaration he forced the enemy to withdraw.

Polyaeus wrote in vii 44 of his *Strategemata*:

Σκύθαι Τριβαλλοῖς παρατάσσεσθαι μέλλοντες παρήγγειλαν τοῖς γεωργοῖς καὶ τοῖς ἵπποφορβοῖς, ἐπειδὴν αἰσθῶνται συμβαλόντας αὐτοὺς τοῖς πολεμίοις, ἐπιφανῆσαι πόρρωθεν τὰς ἀγέλας τῶν ἵππων ἐπελαύνοντας. οἱ μὲν ἐπεφάνησαν, οἱ δὲ Τριβαλλοὶ πολὺ πλῆθος ἀνθρώπων καὶ ἵππων πόρρωθεν ἰδόντες κονιορτὸν ἐγειρόμενον, βοῆν αἰρομένην, νομίσαντες τοὺς ἀνω Σκύθας ἦκειν αὐτοῖς συμμάχους ἔφυγον φοβηθέντες.

The Scythians, being on the point of meeting the Triballi in battle, ordered the peasants and horse-keepers, as soon as they noticed they were engaging the enemy, to appear in the distance driving the herd of horses. They appeared, and the Triballi, seeing in the distance the great throng of men and horses raising a cloud of dust, and the war-cry being raised, fled in fright, thinking that the northern Scythians had come to their (the enemy's) aid.

The similarities between these passages, and also between Polyaeus' story in vii 42 (the ruse used by the Celts against the Ardians) and the story in Athenaeus x 60 p. 443 b/c where the cited source is Theopompus, led Rostovtzeff to suggest that the above Frontinus and Polyaeus stories

¹ B. Niese, *Hermes* xlv (1909) 170–8; G. L. Barber, 24–5; N. G. L. Hammond, *CQ* xxxi (1937) 86–7. *The history of Ephorus* (Cambridge, 1935) 11; *FGH* II c

go back to Theopompus.² This might not be the only case of Theopompean material surviving in Polyaeus. In iv 2.20 Polyaeus mentions a fort Karai which Philip was unable to take after a long siege.³ This was probably the Καρὸς λιμένος located by Arrian, *Pontic Periplus* 35, between Kallatis and Tetrissias;⁴ and Stephanus of Byzantium refers to Καρὸς κῆποι. χωρίον Θράκης, Θεόπομπος v. τὸ ἔθνικὸν Καροκηπίτης ὡς αὐτός. Polyaeus' account of the siege, therefore, might well go back to Theopompus' account of Philip's Thracian campaign.

The historical significance of the above passages on the Ateas-Triballi conflict may now be explored. Trogus (Justin ix 9.1) has Philip encounter the Triballi upon his return from his encounter with Ateas, and Arrian (i 2.1) makes it clear that at the time of Alexander's Danubian campaign the Triballi were settled some distance south of the Danube.⁵ The conflict between Ateas and the Triballi therefore probably took place south of the Danube. Frontinus' *feminis puerisque et omni imbelli turba greges asinorum ac boum ad postremam hostium aciem admoveri et erectas hastas praeferi* and Polyaeus' reference to γεωργοί and ἵπποφορβοί would, however, suggest that the tribe was not simply on a raid south,⁶ and had not just recently crossed the river. Moreover, Polyaeus' τοὺς ἄνω Σκύθας could, in the context, only refer to Scythians to the north, and this might confirm the suspicions raised by Frontinus' account, that the Triballi were led to believe that Scythians were coming to Ateas' aid from north of the Danube. Frontinus' and Polyaeus' accounts of Ateas' conflict with the Triballi may, therefore, testify to a growing Scythian presence south of the Danube in the mid-fourth century BC, and this testimony may originate with Theopompus.

II. ATEAS AND THE GETAE

Justin opens his account of Philip's Scythian campaign, ix 2, with a reference to *rex Scytharum Ateas, qui cum bello Histrianorum premeretur . . .*⁷ These hostilities are often described by modern scholars in terms of the Histrians attempting to defend themselves against a Scythian invasion from north of the Danube.⁸ However, as Schelov and Griffith point out, this is surely a misinterpretation of Justin's account, where it is Ateas who is being 'hard pressed' by the Histriani.⁹ Nicorescu has suggested that either Pompeius Trogus, Justin or a copyist has admitted an error into the account,¹⁰ but the only reason for suggesting this is the original assumption that it was Ateas who was on the offensive. This may not have been the case. Who in fact were the Histriani? Are they the people of the Istros or of Histria? If the former they are more likely to be identified with the Getae who appear to have lived on both sides of the Danube and to have used the river for their livelihood¹¹ than with the Triballi. If the latter the reference

² The Polyaeus story perhaps going back to Theopompus through the mediation of Duris: cf. M. Rostowzew, *Skythien und der Bosporus* i (Berlin 1931) 110, G. Schubert, *Die Quellen zur Geschichte der Diadochenzeit* (Leipzig 1914) 79-89 and Duris F 75.

³ Even though A. Schaefer, *Demosthenes und seine Zeit* ii (Leipzig 1886) 519 believes Philip conducted no sieges on the east Thracian coast and that an account of such a siege could not have been found in the 50th book of Theopompus' history.

⁴ For the text and a French translation see A. Baschmakoff, *La synthèse des périples pontiques* (Paris 1948) 104-5.

⁵ See *RE* xii (1937) s.v. 'Triballi' 2392-401 for a review of the tribe's history. Herodotus does not mention their presence in the region, and in later times Thucydides (ii 96) placed them beyond the river Oscius (Isker) and north of Mt. Scombrus. On the great extent of the tribe (up to the Danube) in later times see Strabo vii 5.11.

⁶ As suggested by N. G. L. Hammond, *A history of Greece to 322 BC* (London 1967) 564.

⁷ M. Iuniani Iustini, *Epitoma historiarum Philippicarum Pompei Trogi*, ed. O. Seel (Stuttgart 1972). English translations of Justin used in this paper will be taken from Justin, *Cornelius Nepos and Eutropius*, tr. Rev. J. S. Watson (London 1853).

⁸ e.g. Parvan, *Getica*, p. 51; Hammond (n. 6) 564; Joseph Wiesner, *Die Thraker, Studien zu einem versunkenen Volk des Balkanraumes* (Stuttgart 1963) 137.

⁹ Schelov (n. 12) 40 and N. G. L. Hammond and G. T. Griffith, *A history of Macedonia* ii (Oxford 1979) 560-1 (henceforth cited as Hammond and Griffith).

¹⁰ P. Nicorescu, *Dacia* ii (1925) 22-3.

¹¹ According to Arrian the Getae had wheat fields extending down to the river (i 2.5) and one of their towns was but four miles from the river (i 4.1-5). They were also probably the people who used dugouts 'for fishing, for up-river expeditions among themselves, and even more for thieving' (i 3.6).

to a *Histranorum rex* might indicate that the city of Histria had a form of government similar to that of the Bosporean kingdom and Heraclea Pontica.¹² A third possibility is, however, that the Histriani who opposed Ateas were a coalition of the mixed Hellenic/Getic/Thracian population of Histria and of several neighbouring Getic tribes. It is even possible that the Histrian and Getic king were one and the same. It is significant that at this time a Getic King appears to have sought an alliance with Philip II. According to Athenaeus (xiii 557 d), quoting Satyrus, τὴν Θράκην δὲ ὅτε [Philip] εἶλεν, ἦκε πρὸς αὐτὸν Κοθήλας ὁ τῶν Θρακῶν βασιλεύς, ἄγων Μήδαν τὴν θυγατέρα καὶ δῶρα πολλά. That this 'Thracian' king was in fact a Getic king is clear from Stephanus' entry on Γετία, where Philip II's wife is said to be Getic, and from the ample testimony that the names of the main Thracian kings in 342 were Cersobleptes and Teres.¹³ That the Getae appear to have had a king unifying them in 342 would encourage still further the identification proposed above of the *Histriani* with the Getae. Justin says that the death of the *Histranorum rex* brought about a change in Ateas' relationship with Philip, and this suggests that the marriage alliance between Philip and Kothelas was of great significance. Jordanes, in his seventh century AD Gothic History, preserves a record of this same marriage: *Philippus quoque, pater Alexandri Magni, cum Gothis amicitias copulans Medopam Gudilae regis filiam accepit uxorem ut tali affinitate roboratus Macedonum regna firmaret*, the Goths being the Getae and Medopa being Satyrus' Meda.¹⁴ The note that the alliance 'rendered the kingdom of Macedon more secure' is not supplied in the Athenaeus passage. Iliescu finds this motive incredible, suggesting that Philip took Meda more as a form of war booty than as part of a diplomatic contract and that the elevated interpretation of the marriage is the result of Cassiodorus' and Jordanes' 'gotenfreundlichen Propaganda'.¹⁵ Iliescu's interpretation would, however, seem to underestimate the importance of the Getae and of political marriages. Meda was the daughter of a king who was sufficiently significant to be confused by Satyrus/Athenaeus with the King of Thrace, and was only Philip's second wife after Olympias.¹⁶ The alliance with Kothelas may have made Philip not only the Getic King's son-in-law but also his adopted heir, and thus have extended Macedonian influence to the lower Danube.

An extra dimension to the problem of Scythian-Getic-Macedonian relations in the mid-fourth century is added by Jordanes' account (x 65) of the confrontation between Philip and the Goths outside the city of Odessus. Philip approached Odessus and:

... sacerdotes Gothorum illi qui pii vocabantur subito patefactis portis cum citharis et vestibus candidis obviam egressi patriis diis, ut sibi propitii Macedonas repellerent, voce supplicis modulantes. quos Macedones sic fiducialiter sibi occurrere contuentes stupiscent et, si dici fas est, ab inermibus terrentur armati.

Those priests of the Goths that are called Holy Men suddenly opened the gates of Odessus and came forth to meet them. They bore harps and were clad in snowy robes, and chanted in suppliant strains to the gods of their fathers that they might be propitious and repel the Macedonians. When the Macedonians saw them coming with such confidence to meet them, they were astonished and, it could be said, the armed were terrified by the unarmed.

¹² A. Gutschmid, *Kleine Schriften* iii (Leipzig 1892) 441 saw the reference to a Histrian King as precluding the possibility that the reference was to the inhabitants of the Greek city, but D. B. Schelov, *Eirene* ix (1971) 41 n. 22 (henceforth cited as Schelov) does not see this as a problem. The identification of the *Histriani* as the inhabitants of Histria has been made by P. Alexandrescu, *Studii Clasice* ix (1967) 88 (henceforth cited as Alexandrescu); Nicorescu (n. 10) 24; A. Momigliano, *Athenaeum* xi (1933) 343 (henceforth cited as Momigliano) and Hammond and Griffith 561.

¹³ See J. R. Ellis, *Philip II and Macedonian imperialism* (London 1976) 167 and ch. VI. n. 37.

¹⁴ Jordanes, 'Romana et Getica' in *Monumenta Germaniae historica inde ab anno Christi quingentesimo usque ad annum millesimum, Auctores antiquissimi*, Vol. 5.1, 1882 (rep. 1961) ed. Theodor Mommsen (Berlin 1961) x 65. English translations of Jordanes used in this paper will be from *The Gothic history of Jordanes*, tr., intro., and comm. by C. C. Mierow (New York 1966, rep. of 1915 ed.).

¹⁵ V. Iliescu, *Actes de la XII^e Conférence Internationale d'études classiques, Eirene, 1972, Bucharest* (Amsterdam 1975) 421, n. 81.

¹⁶ Athenaeus xiii 557 d.

Jordanes' declared source at this point is 'Dio',¹⁷ but his immediate source was probably Cassiodorus.¹⁸ Though Justin's epitome of Trogus offers no reference to Getic or Gothic priests facing Philip, Athenaeus (xiv 24 p. 627 de, Theopompus F 216) records that:

Θεόπομπος δ' ἐν τεσσαρακοστῇ ἕκτῃ τῶν ἱστοριῶν 'Γέται' φησί 'κιθάρας ἔχοντες καὶ κιθαρίζοντες τὰς ἐπικηρυκείας ποιοῦνται'.

Theopompus, in the forty-sixth book of his *History*, says 'The Getae conduct negotiations holding citharas in their hands and playing them'.

It is possible that Theopompus' reference to the Getic ambassadors was the original source for Jordanes' account of the Gothic priests' action against Philip. Harp-bearing ambassadors were hardly likely to rout a Macedonian army, but they might have secured an alliance which turned the army away. Satyrus (Athenaeus xiii 557 d) may have been reporting this same alliance when describing how Kothelas went over to Philip, 'bringing with him his daughter Meda and a large dowry'. Moreover, as Jordanes gave an account of the mission which led to the marriage alliance and would presumably have seen his error in ascribing two different treaties to Philip and the Getae ('Goths'), it may be concluded that it was Jordanes' understanding that the treaty Philip arranged with the harp-bearing priests was the same as the marriage alliance with the Getic princes.

Jordanes thus seems to connect the confrontation at Odessus with the marriage alliance originally recorded by Theopompus: but could a conflict between Philip's army and the Getae near Odessus have been the antecedent to the alliance?¹⁹ The alliance may have been concluded in 340 when a Macedonian force entered the Dobrudja to assist Ateas in his war with the Getic *Histriani*; but this reconstruction fails to explain Justin's reference to the death of the *Histriatorum rex*, or Jordanes' reference to Philip's presence with the Macedonians. Iliescu suggests that the marriage between Philip and Meda in fact predated the confrontation outside Odessus; he dates the former to shortly after the subjugation of Thrace in 342 and the latter to Philip's campaign north of the Haemus mountain range in 339.²⁰ It is possible that immediately following the defeat of Cersobleptes in 342 a Getic embassy and bride crossed the Haemus to secure an alliance with Philip. Jordanes may have joined together the Getic diplomatic approach to Philip in Thrace in 342 and an actual attack by Philip upon the Getic-held Odessus in 339 in order to have Alexander's father defeated by unnamed men.²¹ It is therefore possible to reconcile the various extant accounts of Skythian-Getic relations in the mid to late fourth century. It is likely that Theopompus described one important element in this piece of history, the forming of the alliance, and nothing precludes the possibility that he is behind all of the accounts of this history.

III. ATEAS AND PHILIP

Justin (ix 11) gives an account of messengers being dispatched between Ateas and Philip on at least six separate occasions. Ateas requested, through the Apollonians, Philip's aid against the *Histriani*, saying he would adopt him and bequeath him Scythia, and Philip appears to have sent a Macedonian force in reply. Subsequently Philip demanded that Ateas pay part of the cost of the siege and Ateas refused, claiming the Scythians were poor. Later Philip claimed to be marching to the Danube only to erect a statue of Heracles and fulfill a vow, and Ateas suggested that he

¹⁷ Dio is cited as an authority and/or praised a total of five times in the *Getica* (ii 14; v 40; ix 58; x 65; xxix 151). Jordanes probably believed, as Cassiodorus and Suidas had before him, that the Dio who wrote the *Getica* was Dio Cassius, when it was probably Dio Chrysostom. See Mierow (n. 14) 29 n. 98.

¹⁸ For a full discussion of Cassiodorus as a source see Mierow (n. 14) 23-9.

¹⁹ Suggested by Alexandrescu 91 and Hammond and Griffith 560.

²⁰ Iliescu (n. 15) 421 n. 88.

²¹ *Ibid.* n. 86. The anti-Macedonian and pro-Gothic sentiment in Jordanes' work would seem strong enough to argue that he was here consciously manipulating history.

himself should erect the statue for Philip and forbade Philip to enter his territory. The author of *Moralia* 174 F also makes several allusions to correspondence and diplomatic contact between Ateas and Philip, writing that:

Ἀτέας ἔγραφε πρὸς τὸν Φίλιππον, ἄνδρες ἄρχεις Μακεδόνων ἀνθρώποις μεμαθηκότων πολεμῆν· ἐγὼ δὲ Σκυθῶν, οἳ καὶ λιμῶ καὶ δίψει μάχεσθαι δύνανται’.

Ateas wrote to Philip: ‘You are the ruler of the Macedonians who have learned to fight against men; but I am ruler of the Scythians who have learned to fight both hunger and thirst.

and that:

Τοὺς δὲ πρέσβεις τοῦ Φιλίππου ψήγων τὸν ἵππον ἠρώτησεν, εἰ τοῦτο ποιεῖ Φίλιππος.

While he (Ateas) was engaged in currying his horse he asked the ambassadors who had come from Philip whether Philip did this.

Though it is not clear whether Ateas’ ‘bons mots’ were related by returning Macedonian ambassadors or fabricated by later humorists and philosophers, the anecdote would seem to indicate some degree of diplomatic contact. The same might be said of the three anecdotes in *Moralia* 174 F, 334 B, 1095 F on the relationship between Ateas and the Theban flute player Ismenias. Though Ismenias’ skill, wit and life-style were the subject of many anecdotes,²² though a meeting between Ismenias and the barbarian King Ateas may have been fabricated for its comic value, and though Ismenias is unlikely to have been captured by Ateas when it was Ateas who was defeated by Philip, it is possible that Ismenias made an appearance at Ateas’ court as a member of one of Philip’s ambassadorial parties. Philip attracted musicians to his court²³ and musicians were often used in diplomacy.²⁴ Should Theopompus have been Trogus’ source here (Trogus follows Theopompus not least in the naming of his work) then it would seem that Theopompus incorporated into his work a series of letters and witticisms composed, either by himself or a contemporary, around the historical kernels of several diplomatic exchanges between Ateas and Philip. The historical significance of the above stories might be considered.

The first piece of correspondence mentioned (Justin ix 2.1–2) is that from Ateas,

... qui cum bello Histrianorum premeretur, auxilium a Philippo per Apollonienses petit, in successionem eum regni Scythiae adoptaturus; cum interim Histrianorum rex decedens et metu belli et auxiliorum necessitate Scythas solvit.

... who being distressed by war with the Istrians, sought aid from Philip through the people of Apollonia, on the understanding that he would adopt him for his successor on the throne of Scythia. With the death of the Histrian King the Scythians were relieved from both the fear of war and want of assistance.

Griffith has taken this passage at face value and suggested that Ateas, who according to Lucian, *Macrobii*, lxii 10, was very old at the time, made an alliance with Philip which included some provision for Philip to be Ateas’ adopted heir and which was only broken when, with the death of the Histrian King and Philip’s failures against Perinthus and Byzantium, Ateas felt he no longer needed Philip.²⁵ The next sentence of Justin’s account (ix 2.3–4) suggests, however, that Ateas may never have recognised an alliance with Philip. Not only did Ateas send away the Macedonians, whose identity will be discussed later, but he ordered them to tell Philip that,

neque auxilium eius se petisse neque adoptionem mandasse; nam neque vindicta Macedonum egere Scythas, quibus meliores forent, neque heredem sibi incolumi filio deesse.

he had neither sought his aid, nor proposed his adoption, for the Scythians needed no protection

²² Plutarch, *Demetrius* i 6; *Pericles* i 5; *Moralia* ‘Table talk’ ii 632 C; Pliny, *Natural history* xxxvii 6, xxxvii 7.

²³ *Moralia* 67 F; 179 B, 334 B and 634 C–D;

Athenaeus x 46, quoting Theopompus’ 53rd book.

²⁴ Athenaeus xiv 627.

²⁵ Hammond and Griffith 562 and 582.

from the Macedonians to whom they were superior in the field, nor did he himself want an heir, as he had a son living.

The use of the perfect infinitives *petisse* and *mandasse* suggests that Ateas is claiming to have had no knowledge of the arrangements which he is earlier said to have proposed through the Apollonians. It is possible, as Griffith has suggested,²⁶ that Ateas had found new confidence and was lying to the Macedonian envoys but it is also possible, as Selby Watson suggests,²⁷ that the Apollonians had taken it upon themselves to make this request for help and promise of adoption. Their reasons may have been a misunderstanding of the Scythians' intentions, a desire to win the Scythians' favour, an interest in ensuring a Scythian victory over the Getae, or even a plan to embroil Philip in a war with Ateas and to have the west Euxine cities freed of their obligations to Scythians.²⁸ Whatever the reason for the contact, the messengers who came to Philip with the proposals seem to have been identified at the time as Apollonians, and some relationship between them and Ateas seems to have been recognised. Philip's response was to send Macedonians, who appear not only to have delivered a message and have returned with Ateas' reply (Justin ix 2), but to have been ready to fight for Ateas. Thus, when Philip learnt of their dismissal, he despatched ambassadors demanding from Ateas money towards the cost of the siege of Byzantium (Justin ix 2.6):

quod eo promptius eum facere debere, quod missis a se in auxilium eius militibus ne sumptum quidem viae, non modo officii pretia dederit.

a request, he said, with which he ought the more readily to comply as when he [Philip] sent soldiers to his assistance, he [Ateas] had not even paid their expenses on the march, to say nothing of remuneration for their service.

In his third reported message to Philip (Justin ix 2.10) Ateas refused the Macedonian demand for payment,

. . . inclementiam caeli et terrae sterilitatem causatus, quae non patrimoniis ditet Scythas, sed vix alimentis exhibeat, respondit nullas sibi opes esse, quibus tantum regem expleat; et turpius putare parvo defungi quam totum abnuere; Scythas autem virtute animi et duritia corporis, non opibus censerit.

alluding to the rigour of their climate and the barrenness of their soil, which, far from enriching the Scythians with wealth, scarcely afforded them sustenance, [he] replied, that he had no treasury to satisfy so great a king, and that he thought it less honourable to do little than to refuse altogether; but that the Scythians were to be estimated by their valour and hardiness of body, not by their possessions.

Here the *topoi* of Scythian poverty and Philip's greed have intruded upon the record of the diplomatic contact. It is evident that Trogus considered Philip's desire to recover the losses he had sustained in the siege of Byzantium as sufficient reason for the outbreak of hostilities. Thus the account of the conflict ends with an account of the plunder taken and the Macedonians' discovery that the Scythians were indeed poor (Justin ix 2.15 f.).

The literary nature of this section of Justin's work encourages once again speculation upon Theopompus' role in the development of the tradition. Schelov explained Justin's account in terms of Trogus moralising upon the base and greedy nature of Macedonian power,²⁹ but it is possible that both Trogus' moralism on this score and his account of the relations between Philip and Ateas go back to Theopompus' *Philippica*. The final purported diplomatic exchange (Justin ix 2.10) might similarly be put in a literary perspective:

Quibus inrhis Philippus soluta obsidione Byzantii Scythica bella adgreditur, praemissis legatis, quo securiores faceret, qui nuntient Atheae: dum Byzantia obsidet, vovisse se statuum Herculi, ad

²⁶ *Ibid.*

²⁷ Watson, *Justin, Cornelius Nepos and Eutropius*, 82 note.

²⁸ Such a plan as this was suggested by Momigliano

342 f.

²⁹ Schelov 44, with reference to two articles on the historical concepts of Pompeius Trogus by K. K. Zel'in.

quam in ostio Histri ponendam se venire, pacatum accessum ad religionem dei petens, amicus ipse Scythis venturus. Ille, si voto fungi vellet, statuam sibi mitti iubet; non modo ut ponatur, verum etiam ut inviolata maneat pollicetur; exercitum autem fines ingredi negat se passurum. Ac si invitis Scythis statuam ponat, eo digresso sublaturum versurumque aes statuæ in aculeos sagittarum.

Philip, mocked by this message, broke up the siege of Byzantium, and entered upon a war with the Scythians, first sending ambassadors to lull them into security, by telling Ateas that while he was besieging Byzantium, he had vowed a statue to Hercules, which he was going to erect at the mouth of the Ister, requesting an unobstructed passage to pay his vow to the god, since he was coming as a friend to the Scythians. Ateas desired him, if his object was merely to fulfil his vow, to let the statue be sent to him, promising that if he should set up the statue in spite of the Scythians, he would take it down when he was gone, and turn the brass of it into heads for arrows.

Here the process Herodotus referred to in iv 81 of Scythians turning arrow heads into a monument is reversed and Philip's deceitfulness is exemplified.³⁰ Of historical interest is Philip's clear intention to extend his power to the Danube (the erection of a statue of the mythical ancestor of the Macedonian royal house representing an extension of Macedonian rule),³¹ and Ateas' evident control of the lands immediately to the south of the Danube's mouth.

Several observations might be made upon the nature and significance of the military conflict between Ateas and Philip which followed the diplomatic exchanges. Justin's comment (ix 2.14) that *astu Philippi vincuntur* may be found in Frontinus' account (*Strategemata* ii 8.14) of how Philip,

. . . ne impetum Scytharum sui non sustinerent, fidelissimos equitum a tergo posuit praecepitque, ne quem commilitonum ex acie fugere paterentur, perseverantius abeuntes trucidarent. Qua denuntiatione cum effecisset, ut etiam timidissimi mallent ab hostibus quam ab suis interfici, victoriam acquisivit.

. . . fearing that his troops would not withstand the onset of the Scythians, stationed the trustiest of his cavalry in the rear and commanded them to permit no one of their comrades to quit the battle, but to kill them if they persisted in retreating. This proclamation induced even the most timid to prefer to be killed by the enemy rather than by their own comrades, and enabled Philip to win the day.

If a common source for Justin's (Troglus') and Frontinus' stories is to be sought, Theopompus, used directly or through Duris, would be a possibility. Lucian's statement (*Macrobii* lxii 10) that 'Ατέας δὲ Σκυθῶν βασιλεὺς μαχόμενος πρὸς Φίλιππον περὶ τὸν Ἰστρον ποταμὸν ἔπεσεν ὑπὲρ τὰ ἐνεήκοντα ἔτη γεγωνῶς suggests, given the circumstances, that the engagement took place just south of the Danube and it might be significant that both Justin/Trogus (probably following Theopompus) and Aeschines refer to the site of Philip's campaign as 'Scythia'.³² Frontinus and Justin do indeed suggest that in Ateas' day the Scythian numbers in the Dobrudja, later called 'Scythia Minor', were large. Justin (ix 2.14) says that the Scythians were more numerous than the Macedonians, and Frontinus (ii 8.14) that Philip's soldiers had been unnerved by the Scythian forces. Justin adds (ix 2.15–16) that after his victory Philip captured 20,000 youths and women and 20,000 fine mares. The large scale migration of Scythians into the Dobrudja, to which Strabo refers on two occasions, had probably begun in Ateas' day.³³

³⁰ As G. Shrimpton, *Phoenix* xxxi (1977) 137 observes, implicit in Theopompus' work is the presupposition 'that the absence of moral and political self-control leads to the loss of all hope of controlling one's destiny'.

³¹ Alexandrescu 87 and Momigliano 348. Cf. Arrian i 4.5.

³² Justin ix 3.1 'But as Philip was returning from Scythia, the Triballi met him' (*Sed revertenti ab Scythia Triballi Philippo occurrunt*) and Aesch., *Against Ctesiphon* 128 'Philip was not in Macedonia at that time, nor in Hellas, but in Scythia—so far away as that!' (οὐκ

ἐπιδημοῦντος ἐν Μακεδονίᾳ Φιλίππου, οὐδ' ἐν τῇ Ἑλλάδι παρόντος, ἀλλ' ἐν Σκύθαις οὕτω μακρὰν ἀπόντος).

³³ In vii 3.13 Strabo writes 'the Scythians and Bastarnians and Sauromatians on the far side of the river (the Ister) often prevail to the extent that they actually cross over to attack those whom they have already driven out, and some of them remain there, either in the islands or in Thrace . . .' and in vii 4.5 he writes that although 'Little Scythia' (μικρὰ Σκυθία) was initially a region between the Borysthenes and the Maeotis, 'on account of the large number of people who left Little

The reasons for the conflict between Ateas and Philip might now be explored. Justin (ix 2.5) not only records Philip's request that Ateas pay for part of the expenses of his siege of Byzantium, but seems to believe that the recovery of these expenses was Philip's reason for marching against the Scythians: hence the reference to the lack of gold and silver amongst the victory spoils (ix 2.15). This explanation may, however, only reflect Theopompus' conception of the Macedonian state as unprincipled and greedy.³⁴ The explanation advanced by most modern scholars, that Philip wanted to punish Ateas for his infidelity and the rejection of Macedonian aid (*cf.* Justin ix 2.5–6), might also be inadequate.³⁵ Punishing Ateas was probably only a pretext. Ellis' and Griffith's suggestion that Philip simply wanted to rebuild his army's morale after the failures at Perinthus and Byzantium in preparation for the campaign in Greece might underestimate the strength of Ateas' position and deny the Dobrudja any strategic value of its own.³⁶ Schaefer suggested that Philip may have had his eyes on the flourishing Athenian trading partners of the north Pontic coast: that may be setting Philip's sights on too distant a target, but the suggestion of Momigliano and Schelov that Philip wanted to win a certain degree of control over Euxine trade by gaining control over the cities of the south-west Euxine littoral has much to recommend it.³⁷ To achieve this control, Philip had to confront Ateas' Scythians, whose increasing presence south of the Danube had been felt not only by the Triballi and Getae, but, as will be discussed in the following section, also by those south-west Euxine cities.

IV. ATEAS AND THE GREEK CITIES OF THE WEST PONTIC COAST

The possibility that Ateas had dealings with the city of Callatis is opened up by the finding of five coins, all of which are datable by weight and style to some time between 353 and 347, all of which feature the name ΑΤΑΙΑ and the figure of a Scythian horseman, and some of which bear the letters ΚΑΛ, a possible abbreviation of ΚΑΛ[ΛΑΤΙΑΝΩΝ].³⁸ The existence of this coin series would suggest, first, some stability in Ateas' power on the west coast of the Euxine, and secondly that Scythian relations with Dobrudja cities existed a decade before the earliest extant literary testimony.³⁹

Clement of Alexandria's mention (*Stromata* v 5) of a letter from Ateas to the people of Byzantium presents an opportunity to examine Scythian relations with one other west Euxine city and for further exploration of the literary sources. Clement wrote:

Ἄριστόκριτος δ' ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ τῶν πρὸς Ἡρακλεόδωρον ἀντιδοξουμένων μὲνηται τινος ἐπιστολῆς οὕτως ἐχούσης. Βασιλεὺς Σκυθῶν Ἀτοίας Βυζαντίων δήμῳ. μὴ βλαπτέτε προσόδους ἑμᾶς, ἵνα μὴ ἔμοι ἵπποι ὑμέτερον ὕδωρ πῖωσι.

And Aristocritus, in the first book of his *Positions against Heracleodorus*, mentions a letter to this

Scythia and crossed both the Tyras and the Ister and took up their abode in the land beyond, no small portion of Thrace as well came to be called Little Scythia.'

³⁴ See Schelov 44.

³⁵ A. W. Pickard-Cambridge, 'Macedonian supremacy in Greece' in *CAH* vi (1927) 256 f.; V. Chapot, *Philippe II de Macedoine, homme d'état* (Paris 1936) 80; P. Cloché, *Un fondateur d'empire Philippe II, roi de Macedoine* (S.-Etienne 1955) 252–3; Cloché, *Histoire de la Macedoine jusqu'à l'avènement d'Alexandre le Grand* (Paris 1960) 233; D. G. Hogarth, *Philip and Alexander of Macedon, two essays in biography* (New York 1897) 115–16; A. Heuss, 'Hellas' in *Propyläen Weltgeschichte* iii *Griechenland; die hellenistische Welt* (Frankfurt, Berlin 1962) 396.

³⁶ J. R. Ellis (n. 13) 185 and Hammond and Griffith

581.

³⁷ Schaefer 517, Momigliano 345 and Schelov 46. This intention is very briefly alluded to by Chr. M. Danov, *Alithrakien* (Berlin 1969) 365. Iliescu (n. 15) 422 suggests Philip's aim was the extension of his realm as far as the Danube, but omits consideration of the significance of the Greek cities of the east Thracian coast in Philip's deliberations.

³⁸ Two coins were published by F. Imhoof-Blumer in *Revue Suisse de Numismatique* and G. F. Hill in *Numismatic Chronicle* in 1908 and 1912 respectively, and three were published by A. Rogalski in Varna and V. A. Anoliin in Kiev in 1955 and 1965 respectively. The numismatic evidence is overviewed by Alexandrescu 88.

³⁹ *Cf.* Schelov 38.

effect. 'Atoias, the King of the Scythians, to the people of Byzantium. Do not diminish my revenues, lest my horses drink at your water.'

Thus, according to Aristocritus,

συμβολικῶς γὰρ ὁ βάρβαρος τὸν μέλλοντα πόλεμον αὐτοῖς ἐπάγεσθαι παρεδήλωσεν.

the barbarian had disclosed with the help of a figurative expression that he was about to make war on them.

Between the death of Kotys in 360 and Philip's siege of Byzantium in 341/0 there may have been Scythian incursions as far as the Thracian Bosphorus.⁴⁰ Some scholars have even suggested that Ateas and Philip may have formed an anti-Byzantium alliance.⁴¹ These scholars, however, overlook the implication in Ateas' purported injunction μὴ βλάπτετε προσόδους ἐμὰς that a tribute (προσόδοι being a euphemism for φόρος or δῶρα) had already been imposed upon the city and had till now been collected without difficulty.⁴² As Scythians could not have reached Byzantium, Griffith has argued that Ateas was demanding that Byzantium desist from supporting the city of Histria which was refusing to pay the neighbouring Scythians tribute: he has thus read the above letter as meaning 'Do not harm my revenues by supporting Istria which is refusing to pay its tribute.'⁴³ However if, as Griffith himself argued, it was Histria which was pressing the Scythians, then they were hardly in need of Byzantine support. Even if they were, Ateas could hardly have hoped to dissuade the Byzantians from sending it with a threat they knew he could not carry out. To multiply the difficulties associated with the Byzantium letter, Clement is the only ancient source to mention it. It is mentioned neither in Justin's epitome of Trogus nor in the speeches of the Athenian orators, though it would have been newsworthy in Athens. The explanation for this may be that the letter was originally recorded as having been sent to a city much less important than Byzantium. Iliescu has suggested it was actually sent to a town between Apollonia and Callatis which Stephanus spelt variously as Βιζώνιος, Βιζωναῖος or Βιζωνίτης.⁴⁴ As Bizone was not a very important commercial centre and was destroyed by an earthquake in the middle of the first century BC, a copyist some time between Aristocritus⁴⁵ and Clement might have 'corrected' the name to Byzantium. Griffith has called Iliescu's thesis 'ingenious' but considered Bizone so unimportant that it was improbable that a letter from Ateas to the people of Bizone would have survived in any form.⁴⁶ Iliescu's thesis is not, however, so easily dismissed. The letter, like those dealing with Philip's relationship with Ateas, might have been fabricated around historical kernels either by Theopompus, who wanted to contrast the characters of the Macedonian and Scythian kings and better illustrate the moral of his history, or by Theopompus' source who may have treated them as a rhetorical exercise. Ateas was probably accustomed to tribute from the town Bizone and was as much in a position to lead his Scythians to the outskirts of Bizone as Scyles was in the mid fifth century to lead his Scythians to the outskirts of Olbia (Hdt. iv 78–80).

Insights into Scythian relations with two other west Euxine Greek cities, Odessus and Tomi, may be gained by considering Jordanes' account (x 65) of how, according to Dio, Philip,

inopia pecuniae passus, Odysitanam Moesiae civitatem instructis copiis vastare deliberat, quae tunc propter vicinam Thomae Gothis erat subiecta.

⁴⁰ As Schelov 37 suggests.

⁴¹ Schaefer 520; Cloché, *Histoire de la Macedoine* (n. 35) 234; F. R. Wüst, *Philipp II von Makedonien und Griechenland in den Jahren von 346 bis 338* (New York 1973) 234; G. Glotz, *Histoire grecque III. La Grèce au IV^e siècle: la lutte pour l'hégémonie, 404–336* (Paris 1931) 345; Nicorescu (n. 12) 24–5.

⁴² V. Iliescu, *Historia* xx (1971) 175; D. M. Pippidi, *Epigraphische Beiträge zur Geschichte Histrias in hellen-*

tischer und römischer Zeit (Berlin 1962).

⁴³ Hammond and Griffith 561.

⁴⁴ Iliescu (n. 42) 172 and 182.

⁴⁵ As Heraclodorus, for whom Aristocritus cites the letter, is probably the opponent of the Epicurean Philodemus, a contemporary of Cicero, Aristocritus may have lived in the first century BC.

⁴⁶ Hammond and Griffith 561 n. 5.

suffering from need of money, determined to lead out his forces and sack Odessus, a city of Moesia, which was then subject to the Goths by reason of the neighbouring city of Tomi.

This passage would suggest Odessus was subject to the 'Goths' and depending upon them for the city's defense. For two reasons it is possible here to see behind Jordanes' 'Goths', not Getae but Scythians. First, the reason for Philip's undertaking the campaign is said to have been that he was 'suffering from need of money' (x 65). This is the same issue over which Philip and Ateas are said to have argued in Justin's epitome of Trogus' work (ix 2). As Trogus' work is cited by Jordanes on several occasions (e.g. vi 48; x 61), it is possible that Jordanes' cited source for the account of Philip's Gothic campaign (x 65), Dio, had used (either directly or indirectly) Trogus. Philip's attack on Odessus may therefore have been recorded by Trogus, dropped from Justin's account with epitomisation, but have survived in Dio's work. If this were so, Philip's 'Gothic' expedition in Jordanes' work might be the same as Philip's Scythian expedition in Justin's work and the people to whom Odessus was subject may have been Scythians. Secondly, the reason Jordanes mentioned the city of Tomis in order to explain Gothic control of Odessus was probably, as Iliescu suggests,⁴⁷ that Odessus was close to Tomis and he believed Tomis was founded by Tomyris, a queen whom Herodotus (i 205–15) called 'Massagetic' (the 'Getae' portion of the name also being known as an ethnonym and sounding a little like 'Gothic') and whom others called Scythian. Though his belief that Tomis was founded by the queen Tomyris probably arose from the similarity of names,⁴⁸ it is possible that his account does preserve a record both of well established Scythian influence in the towns of Odessus and Tomis at the time of Philip's Scythian campaign, and of an alliance between these towns and the Scythians during the conflict with the Macedonians.⁴⁹ Jordanes, having lived in Moesia, may have personally collected the 'foundation story' from the citizens of Tomis.⁵⁰ One of Jordanes' frequent sources, Dio Chrysostom from Borysthenes, would also, however, have been in a position to collect the story.

It is possible to postulate Scythian dealings with three other west Euxine Greek cities. As has been noted earlier, Apollonians are said by Justin (ix 2.1 f.) to have been intermediaries in Ateas' initial diplomatic approach to Philip. Whether Ateas did in fact send these Apollonian messengers, whether the messengers invented their commission, whether Philip fabricated the whole story as a pretext for a northern campaign, or whether a later historian fabricated the whole episode, some relationship between Ateas and the Apollonians would seem to have existed.⁵¹ Again, as has been noted earlier, it is possible that the west Pontic town of Karos Kepoi figured in Theopompus' account of Philip's northern expedition. Given, moreover, the suggestion earlier in this paper that the *Histriani* with whom Ateas was at war might have included the citizens of Histria, it is significant that one of the several possible dates given by archaeologists for the destruction of the city's walls has been the mid fourth century BC.⁵² If this

⁴⁷ Iliescu, *Eos* lvi (1966) 318–19. Jordanes x 62: *tunc Thomyris regina aucta victoria tantaque praeda de inimicis potita, in partem Moesiae, quae nunc a magna Scythia nomen mutuatum minor Scythia appellatur, transiens, ibi in Ponti Moesiaco litore Thomes civitatem suo de nomine aedificavit.*

⁴⁸ Jordanes was keen to give such etymological explanations. For example, *Getica* 48: 'Hence even today in the Scythian tongue they (the Parthians) are called Parthi, that is, Deserters (*parentes*)' and *Getica* 156: 'the land of the Bruttii . . . chanced to receive its name in ancient times from a Queen Bruttia'.

⁴⁹ The omission from Jordanes' account of the Scythians' eventual defeat at the hands of Philip, the event which to Trogus was of the utmost significance (Justin i 2), is hardly surprising. Jordanes on his own admission, wrote his history *ad maiorem gloriam Gothorum* (Jordanes, *Concl.* 315–16), and while, for example, he will relate Decabalus' success against Domitian, he fails to mention Trajan's subsequent victory (76–8). See

also the account of Darius' disastrous 'Gothic' expedition (63); Xerxes' return to Asia after fearing to face Goths in battle (64), and of Sitalces' victory over the wrong Perdiccas (66). On this issue see Iliescu (n. 47) 319 and (n. 15) 411–28.

⁵⁰ Jordanes was clearly interested in foundation stories. See the ones on Marcianopolis (101) and Anchialus (108).

⁵¹ On the existence of such a relationship see Iliescu, *Actes du premier Congrès international d'études balkaniques et sud-est européennes, 26 août–1 sept. 1966, II* (Sofia 1970) 172.

⁵² This date has been proposed by M. Coja, *Studii si cercetari de istorie veche* xv (1964) 384–400. The earlier date of the end of the 6th century BC is favoured by S. Dimitriu, *Dacia* viii (1964) 132–44. For a discussion of a possible late 6th century BC context for the destruction see the present author's article 'Dareios' Scythian Expedition and its aftermath' *Klio* xlix (1987) 326–350.

dating is correct then the defences may have been destroyed either by the Scythians in the course of this war or by Philip when he campaigned in the region in 339.

V. ATEAS, THEOPOMPUS AND CONCLUSIONS

Two very different views of Ateas' power have been offered by modern scholars. Some have seen Ateas as the leader of a single or small group of tribes which had broken into the Dobrudja and which, until confronted by Philip, troubled the local tribes and coastal cities.⁵³ This conception of Ateas' power finds support in the accounts of Ateas' difficulty with the *Histriani*, his request for Macedonian aid, and his quick defeat by Philip. Other scholars have seen Ateas as the King of all the Scythians from the Dobrudja to the Sea of Azov and the founder of the first Scythian 'state'.⁵⁴ Thus, not only do Plutarch,⁵⁵ Justin, Frontinus, Polyaeus, Lucian and Clement of Alexandria all refer to Ateas as King of the Scythians, but Strabo concludes a lengthy account of the climate and geography of the region between the Borysthenes and the Maeotis with the statement: 'Ατέας δὲ δοκεῖ τῶν πλείστων ἄρξαι ταύτη βαρβάρων ὁ πρὸς Φίλιππον πολεμήσας τὸν Ἀμύντου (vii 3.18). The most useful conception of Ateas' power might lie somewhere between the two. It is possible that by Ateas' day the Scythian Empire which Herodotus had described had been broken up by invading Sarmatian peoples. Ateas' Scythians were not simply raiding south across the Danube, but migrating south—thus, the composition of the Scythian force which confronted the Triballi, the concern of Philip and the Getae and the long history of Scythian dealings with the Greek cities of the Dobrudja. Kallistov has indeed suggested that Strabo indicated by his use of *δοκεῖ* that he was not confident in the historical accuracy of his description of Ateas' realm.⁵⁶ Who then was Strabo's source? His main source on Scythian lands was Ephorus, but if Ateas' military conflict with Philip is to be dated to 339 then it would probably have fallen outside the scope of Ephorus' work. The most probable source for Strabo's comment upon Ateas was Theopompus. Theopompus probably included passages on Ateas in Books 46–50 of his history, is the most likely source of Strabo's interpretation of Homer on the Cimmerians⁵⁷ and was capable not only of condemning Macedonians, but also of imagining ideal states.⁵⁸ To Theopompus, the Scythians may have been the antithesis of the Macedonians, just as Hartog has recently argued that to Herodotus and others they were the antithesis of the Greeks.⁵⁹ If Philip's Macedonians were greedy and morally degenerate, Ateas' Scythians were simple in their possessions, and rewarded for their virtue by possessing a large unified empire. Thus, though Theopompus offered a very detailed account of the contact and conflict between Ateas and Philip, he may have worked with an unrealistic conception of Ateas' power and realm. Strabo's belief in the relationship between mode of life and national power may have made him receptive to the Theopompean conception.⁶⁰

⁵³ Nicorescu (n. 10) 23; Pickard-Cambridge (n. 35) 256; Momigliano 346; A. Aymard, *Le monde grec au temps de Philippe II de Macedoine et Alexandre le Grand* (Paris 1952) 170; Alexandrescu 90; G. Glotz (n. 41) 344–5.

⁵⁴ See discussion in Schelov 34.

⁵⁵ Ateas' sayings are included between those of Idanthyrus and Scilurus (*Moralia* 174 E–F), both of whom are associated with Scythian activity on the north Pontic coast. On Idanthyrus see Hdt. iv 76, 120 and 127. On Scilurus see *RE* iii A. 1526–7 (1927) s.v. 'Skiluros'. None of the sayings in the *Apophthegmata* are attributed to subordinate or provincial rulers.

⁵⁶ D. P. Kallistov, *Philologus* cxvi (1972) 285–92. Of the 19 other occurrences of *δοκεῖ* or *δοκεῖ μοι* in Strabo's work, one is in a quotation from Ephorus (i 2.28), 12 are concerned with relating mythology or very early,

legendary, history (v 2.5; v 4.4; vi 1.1; vi 3.8; vii 3.2; vii 3.6; vii 7.2; viii 3.5; viii 3.20; viii 3.32; viii 4.9; viii 6.9) and 5 are concerned with 'geographical' subjects (vi 1.12; vii 5.9; viii 3.3; viii 4.8; viii 6.19). Only once does he use *δοκεῖ* with regard to an historical matter and that is in the Ateas passage.

⁵⁷ P. von der Mühl, *MH* xvi (1959) 145–51, observes that both Strabo and Theopompus date the Cimmerian invasion of Asia Minor before Homer, and not vice versa: Strabo i 2.9 and iii 2.12 and Theopompus *FGrH* F 205.

⁵⁸ *RE* v. A.2 (1934) 2213 s.v. 'Theopompos', W. R. Connor, *GRBS* viii (1967) 133–54 and G. J. D. Aalders, *Historia* xxvii (1978) 317–27.

⁵⁹ F. Hartog, *Le miroir d'Herodote: essai sur la representation de l'autre* (Paris 1980).

⁶⁰ In xi 9.2 Strabo made the following observation

Theopompus has rarely been seen as the source for the stories discussed in this paper. Schaefer suggested Theopompus might be the source of the later writings dealing with Philip's Scythian expedition, but was cautious as there is no cited Theopompus fragment dealing with the Scythian expedition.⁶¹ Trüdinger mentioned Theopompus' work on the Scythians, pointing to the fragment to be found in Hesychius' entry under ἱππᾶκη, but only refers to the passage as an example of ethnographical digressions in the *Philippica*.⁶² Similarly van Paassen and Müller have noted that Theopompus appears to have embodied in his *Philippica* numerous 'ethnographical' or 'geographical' digressions including one on Scythians, but pursued Theopompus' Scythians no further.⁶³ Rostovtzeff suggested that Polyaeus' account of Ateas' conflict with the Triballi was derived from Theopompus' work, but this was the only Ateas story he traced back to Theopompus.⁶⁴ Griffith has recently suggested that Justin's account of Philip's relations with Ateas 'derives ultimately' from Theopompus; but he did not offer arguments in support of the proposition and lapsed into seeing 'some Greek writer anxious to disparage the Macedonians' behind some sections of Justin's account.⁶⁵ The links explored in the preceding discussion between Theopompus and the stories of Ateas' dealings with the Triballi, the Getae, Philip and the Greek cities of the west Pontic coast might, however, justify tracing elements of all extant literary references to Ateas back to Theopompus' history.

JOHN GARDINER-GARDEN

98, Schlich St.,
Yavralumla A.C.T., 2600
Australia

upon the Parthians' success: 'The cause of this is their mode of life, and also their customs, which contain much that is barbarian and Scythian in character, though more that is conducive to hegemony and success in war.'

⁶¹ Schaefer (n. 3) 518.

⁶² K. Trüdinger, *Studien zur Geschichte der griechischen-römischen Ethnographie* (Basel 1918) 63. Theopompus F 45: 'Σκυθικὸν βρῶμα ἐξ ἱππ(εί)ου γάλακτος. οἱ δὲ ὀξύγαλα ἱππεῖον, ὡς χρῶνται Σκύθαι. πίνεται δὲ καὶ ἐσθιεται πηγνύμενον, ὡς Θεόπομπος ἐν γ αὐτοῦ

λόγου'. (Scythians drink from mare's milk. The sharp milk of horses, which the Scythians use. It is drunk, or being frozen is eaten, as Theopompus writes in the third book of his work.)

⁶³ C. van Paassen, *The classical tradition of geography* (Groningen 1957) 259 and K. E. Müller, *Geschichte der antiken Ethnographie und ethnologischen Theoriebildung von den Anfängen bis auf die byzantinischen Historiographen I* (Wiesbaden 1972) 223.

⁶⁴ Rostowzew (n. 2) ch. 2, 4 and 5.

⁶⁵ Hammond and Griffith 560 and 583 respectively.