Zeitschrift: Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique
Herausgeber: Fondation Hardt pour l'étude de l'Antiquité classique
Band: 35 (1990)

Artikel: Herodotus, historian of the Cimmerians and the Scythians
Autor: Harmatta, J.
DOI: https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-660891

Nutzungsbedingungen
Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. Mehr erfahren

Conditions d'utilisation
L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. En savoir plus

Terms of use
The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. Find out more

Download PDF: 07.01.2026

ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, https://www.e-periodica.ch

IV

J. HARMATTA

HERODOTUS, HISTORIAN OF THE CIMMERIANS AND THE SCYTHIANS

I

The theme of the present colloquium, viz. 'Herodotus, Historian of the non-Greek Peoples',[1] already involves a definite idea concerning the object and scope of the work written by the 'Father of History'. There exist a number of interpretations which consider Herodotus' work a gigantic Περσικὸς λόγος, a Persian History,[2] or regard the description of the great struggle between Greeks and Barbarians and the dissemination of the glory of their heroic deeds, i.e. the Persian War, as its proper object,[3] or look in it for evidence of Herodotus' evolution from geographer and ethnographer to

[1] It is worth while to refer to its forerunner: *Histoire et historiens dans l'Antiquité,* Entretiens Hardt, 4 (1958). On Herodotus: pp. 21-37.

[2] O. REGENBOGEN, "Herodot und sein Werk", in *Kleine Schriften* (München 1961), 72: "Schon [Friedrich] Creuzer sah, dass ... das Werk Herodots eigentlich ein gigantischer Περσικὸς λόγος, eine persische Geschichte, ist."

[3] E.g. M. POHLENZ, *Herodot. Der erste Geschichtschreiber des Abendlandes* (Leipzig/Berlin 1937), 9: "Herodots Ziel ist, die grosse Auseinandersetzung zwischen Griechen und Barbaren darzustellen und den Ruhm ihrer Grosstaten zu künden. Er deutet auf den Perserkrieg als sein eigentliches Thema hin." — Cf. also W. SCHADEWALDT, "Die Anfänge der Geschichtsschreibung bei den Griechen", in *Die Antike* 10 (1934), 159: "Ursache und Verschulden des Kampfes der Griechen und Asiaten will das Werk zur Darstellung bringen."

historian.[4] However, in elaborating these ideas scholars only took into consideration one part of Herodotus' programme indicated in the proem of his work and overemphasized it. Then, being impressed by the contradiction between this interpretation and the work itself, they tried to eliminate it by the theory according to which at first Herodotus wanted to write an ethnographical or geographical work but later changed his plan and incorporated his λόγοι written on several barbarian peoples, Persians, Egyptians, Scythians, Thracians etc., into the history of the Persian War.

On the contrary, the theme 'Herodotus, Historian of the non-Greek Peoples' arises from that conception which presumed long ago[5] that Herodotus integrated all that he made inquiries about into a unified work and comprehended the whole of mankind of his age in a unified view.[6] It was underlined that the *Histories* were not only a history of Graeco-Persian relations but they also represented a great research work of cultural anthropology.[7] Correspondingly, one could draw attention to the fact that the object of Herodotus' research was twofold: the Barbarians and the Greeks.[8]

[4] Cf. F. JACOBY, "Herodotos", in *RE* Suppl.-Bd. II (Stuttgart 1913), 327-74; K. von FRITZ, *Die Griechische Geschichtsschreibung* I (Berlin 1967), 442 ff.

[5] Ed. MEYER, *Geschichte des Altertums* IV 1 (Stuttgart [4]1944), 226: "... alles, was er erkundet hatte ... zu einem einheitlichen Werk zu verarbeiten...".

[6] M. GIGANTE, "Herodot, der erste Historiker des Abendlandes", in *Herodot. Eine Auswahl aus der neueren Forschung,* hrsg. von W. MARG (Darmstadt 1962), 259: "Herodot erfasst die gesamte Menschheit seiner Zeit in einer einheitlichen Schau."

[7] G. NENCI, "Economie et société chez Hérodote", in *Actes du IXe Congrès International de l'Association Guillaume Budé,* Rome, 13-18 avril 1973 (Paris 1975), 133: "Les *Histoires* ... ne sont pas seulement une histoire des relations gréco-perses, mais une grande recherche d'anthropologie culturelle...".

[8] G. NENCI, *Introduzione alle guerre persiane e altri saggi di storia antica* (Pisa 1958), 58-59: "La 'vulgata' non aveva avuto occhi che per la parte greca e non riconosceva gloria se non ai vincitori: Erodoto osa premettere che le azioni gloriose di cui egli intende sia serbato il ricordo furono τὰ μὲν Ἕλλησι, τὰ δὲ βαρβάροισι ἀποδεχθέντα (I *praef.*)". S. MAZZARINO, *Il pensiero storico classico* I (Bari 1966), 128: "...appunto l'obiettivo della sua ricerca [sc. di Erodoto] doveva essere duplice: i barbari, ma altresì i Greci".

II

If we examine the *Histories* from the view-point of the programme formulated in the proem, we can state indeed that Herodotus wanted to describe the comprehensive picture of the οἰκουμένη and the general historical development of it on the basis of some preferences and limited by some selections. Preference was given to the great achievements and deeds of both Greeks and Barbarians by striving for a balanced treatment of both (it is not by chance that he was denoted βαρβαρόφιλος by Plutarch) and to the causal nexus of the historical process. Selection was determined by his judgement of the importance of historical events on the one hand and by his opportunities to receive information about them on the other hand.

As was noticed long ago, Herodotus elaborated a general world-concept of the οἰκουμένη which makes him a forerunner of cultural anthropology. He clearly recognized the importance of centre and periphery in the evolution of human culture. According to his conception of cultural history the most developed high cultures occupy the central territories of the οἰκουμένη, the sedentary cultures of tillers take the zone around them while the next zone outwards is inhabited by populations of stock-breeders: in the northern hemisphere we find the equestrian nomads, and in the outermost zone, the periphery of the οἰκουμένη, occur the food-gathering tribes.[9] In this world-concept also the historical role played by the Cimmerians and the Scythians in Herodotus' *Histories* becomes intelligible.

[9] Kl. E. Müller, *Geschichte der antiken Ethnographie und ethnologischen Theoriebildung* I (Wiesbaden 1972), 121.

III

The Cimmerians do not receive any coherent treatment in the *Histories*. They are mentioned in five historical contexts:

1) At first, Herodotus asserts (I 6,3) that the campaign of the Cimmerian army coming to Ionia prior to the reign of Croesus did not destroy the Ionian cities, but it was only a predatory expedition.

2) The second context is the history of Sinope (IV 12,2): escaping the Scythians and invading Asia, the Cimmerians apparently also settled the peninsula where the Greek city stood in Herodotus' days.

3) The third historical context is represented by Lydian history: the Cimmerians, driven away by the Scythians from their land, get to Asia (Minor) during the reign of the Lydian king Ardys and take Sardis, his capital, except the citadel (I 15). To the same historical context belongs the narrative of Herodotus (I 16,2) according to which it was the Lydian king Alyattes who expelled the Cimmerians from Asia (Minor).

4) The fourth historical context is the history of the Scythians in 'Upper Asia' (I 103-106).

5) Lastly, we have the account of the Scythian conquest in Eastern Europe (IV 1 and 11-13).

It becomes clear from this survey that Herodotus probably received his information about the Cimmerians from different sources, but he did not make any attempt to compile a unified history of the Cimmerians.[10] He inserted the evidence for them into his description of the general historical

[10] For the history and archaeological finds of the Cimmerians cf. C. F. LEHMANN-HAUPT, "Kimmerier", in *RE* XI 1 (1921), 397 ff.; J. HARMATTA, "Le problème cimmérien", in *AErt* S. III 7-9 (1946-1948), 79-132; U. COZZOLI, *I Cimmeri* (Roma 1968); А.И. Тереножкин, Киммерийцы (Киев 1976); R. N. FRYE, *The History of Ancient Iran* (München 1983), 70 ff.; *Le manuscrit de Roman Ghirshman: Les Cimmériens et leurs Amazones* (Paris 1983); I. M. DIAKONOFF, in *The Cambridge History of Iran* II, 89 ff. with further literature.

process taking place in the οἰκουμένη and seemingly did not want to harmonize or to connect them with one another except in some cases.

Thus, in I 6,3 he only says that the raid of the Cimmerians in Ionia took place prior to the reign of Croesus although in the same relation of Lydian history he mentions the taking by the Cimmerians of Sardis during the reign of Ardys — an event which historical research connects with the Cimmerian raid in Ionia.[11] Similarly, when in the framework of Lydian history Herodotus speaks of the Cimmerian campaign against Lydia (I 15), he only says that the Cimmerians were driven away by the Scythians from their land, but he did not specialize in this passage where the land of the Cimmerians lay even though in six other passages (I 103,3; IV 1,2; 11; 12,2; 13,2; VII 20,2), when speaking of the Scythians, he clearly says that the original home of the Cimmerians was the North Pontic area. It might be that the information on the Cimmerian invasion of Lydia really related to the land of the Cimmerians in the neighbourhood of Urarṭu[12] from which they were driven westwards by the Scythians presumably after the defeat of their king Tug-dam-me-i.[13] Herodotus left the geographical location of the land inhabited by the Cimmerians before their expedition against Lydia undetermined. Perhaps, however, we can ascribe to Herodotus himself the remark that the Cimmerians, fleeing from Europe to Asia before the Scythians, settled the peninsula of Sinope.[14]

The expedition of the Cimmerians to Lydia and Ionia, their settlement on the peninsula of Sinope and their clash with the Scythians in Asia are well-known historical facts,

[11] Cf. e.g. K. von Fritz, *Die Griechische Geschichtsschreibung* I (Berlin 1967), 377 ff.

[12] According to the report of an Assyrian spy, the land Gamirra was only separated from Urarṭu by a district Guriana, located on the north-western limits of Urarṭian influence cf. I. M. Diakonoff, in *op. cit.*, 95.

[13] M. Streck, *Assurbanipal* I (Leipzig 1916), p. cccliv.

[14] For the Cimmerians at Sinope cf. R. Ghirshman, *op. cit.*, 38 ff.

also attested by other sources; even Herodotus' chronology and synchronisms fit rather well. But historical research considers his theory of the direct causal relation of the Cimmerian invasion into Asia with that of the Scythians unacceptable.[15] Herodotus obviously preferred this theory because he mentioned it six times even in contexts where it was not necessary to refer to it (e.g. VII 20,2). Thus, it was probably Herodotus himself who elaborated this idea which excellently fitted his endeavour to reveal the causes of historical processes and events.

Presumably, he had a twofold basis for this theory. In the context of Lydian history he was informed, on the one hand, that the Cimmerians taking Sardis were driven away by the Scythians from their land without the exact localization of the latter, and, when visiting Olbia, he learnt on the other hand, that Pontic Scythia was earlier inhabited by the Cimmerians. Without the knowledge of the exact chronology and of the events which took place on the vast territory between Pontic Scythia and Lydia, it was almost impossible not to draw the conclusion that the Cimmerians were expelled from their European home and pursued up to Asia Minor by the Scythians who missed the way and finally invaded Media—an event which was known to Herodotus again from other information. Thus, after all, he correctly recognized the historical connection between the movements of the Cimmerians and the Scythians both in Europe and in Asia Minor. For lack of exact chronological data and detailed historical evidence, however, he could not form any precise idea either about the real chronology or the actual process of the events taking place before the middle of the VIIth century B.C. in the life of these two peoples.[16] Besides, the Cimmerians were

[15] Cf. recently I. M. Diakonoff, in *op. cit.*, 96.

[16] Cf. for the whole problem J. Harmatta, "Kimmerek és szkiták" ("Cimmerians and Scythians"), in *Ant. Tan.* 13 (1966), 107 ff.

a people who no longer existed in his time; therefore he could not describe even the broad outlines of their culture.

IV

In contrast to the Cimmerians, the Scythians received an abundant treatment from both historical and anthropological view-points in Herodotus' *Histories*. "Die Nachrichten über die skythischen Völker, die uns Herodot im vierten Buch aufbewahrt hat, zählen mit zu den kostbarsten Schätzen seines Werkes"—wrote a scholar who, more than half a century ago, gave the best analysis of Scythian shamanism so far.[17] Nevertheless, although the greater part of Book IV of the *Histories* deals with the origin of the Scythians, their land, religion and burial customs, neighbours and neighbouring cultures, and with their struggle against the Persians as well as with their relations to the neighbouring peoples and the Ionians, one cannot speak of an independent and coherent treatment of the Scythians either. However rich and valuable the information and evidence collected by Herodotus by his researches concerning Scythian culture and history may be, they are subordinated to his comprehensive world-concept and the general history of the οἰκουμένη.

Thus, the Scythians appear not only in Book IV but in one historical context or another also in Books I, II, III, V, VI, VII i.e. altogether in seven from among the nine Books of the *Histories*. In Herodotus' narration, the Scythians play the most important role in two historical contexts: as masters of 'Upper Asia' for 28 years (I 130,1; IV 1, 2-3) and as adversaries

[17] K. Meuli, "Scythica", in *Hermes* 70 (1935), 121. A detailed review of the scholarly literature on Herodotus' reports concerning the Scythians was given by А.И. Доватур, Д.П. Каллистов, И.А. Шишова, Народы нашей страны в «Истории» Геродота (*The Peoples of our Country in the "Histories" of Herodotus*) (Москва 1982), 14-79.

of the Persians and victors over Darius (IV 1-142). The references to both contexts are numerous and comprehend almost the whole of the *Histories* and emphasize the unity of the work.

The first historical context, viz. the Scythian rule over 'Upper Asia', also includes the relations of the latter with the Cimmerians, the Medes, the Lydians, the Assyrians, and the Egyptians. Thus, Herodotus created a whole network of historical connections between the peoples of a definite geographical area by which the impression of a unified historical process came into being. Besides, the Scythians appear in the Egyptian story of the alleged expedition of Sesostris into Pontic Scythia (II 110). They are brought into connections with the Massagetae (IV 11) on the one hand, and they are differentiated from them (I 216,1) on the other hand. The social views of the Scythians are compared with those of the Persians, Thracians, Lydians (II 167,1) and, in the last passage (VII 64,2), where the Scythians still appear in the *Histories,* they are distinguished from the Amyrgian Scythians, the Sakā Haumavargā of the OP inscriptions[18] and the relationship between the Greek term 'Scythian' and Old Persian 'Sakā' acquires greater precision.

The antecedents and aftermath of Darius' expedition against the Scythians also extend far beyond the framework of the so-called Σκυθικοὶ λόγοι. The dramaturgical preparation of the Scythian expedition is inserted into the story of Demokedes, Darius, and Atossa in Book III (III 134), and Herodotus comes back to this event in Books V, VI, and VII eight times (V 24,3; V 27; VI 40; VI 84; VII 10 α 2; 10 γ 1; 52; 59) while at the same time the contacts of the Scythians with Sparta (VI 84) and their relation to Miltiades (VI 40) and to the Ionians are also related. Surely, it is not by chance that the

[18] R. G. KENT, *Old Persian. Grammar. Texts. Lexicon* (New Haven ²1953), 137 (*DNa* 25).

history of both the Cimmerians and the Scythians begins in Book I, and the last references to both peoples are to be found in Book VII.

V

Historical research recognized long ago that Herodotus' comments on the Scythian rule over 'Upper Asia' and the operations of the Scythians in Transcaucasia and Northern Mesopotamia as well as on their raid into Palestine and Egypt are based on reliable sources and can be confirmed by other evidences. As an illustrative case we may use Herodotus' report on Madyes, the Scythian king, son of Protothyes who liberated Ninua from the siege of the Medes. The form Προτοθύης represents the Scythian compound name **Pṛta-tavah-* 'who has force for fighting' which has been hellenized in its both parts and occurs in Assyrian texts several times in the form Partatua. During the IInd World War, in Iranian Kurdistan, south of Lake Urmiya at Sakkez, a rich burial was discovered which contained beside many objects of Assyrian origin also some pieces decorated in Scythian animal style.[19] Perhaps, the most interesting find among the grave goods was the fragment of a silver dish with a scratched hieroglyphic inscription consisting of 3 lines. The inscription contains 48 characters and 33 of them, i.e. almost 70 per cent, can be identified with Hieroglyphic Hittite (Hieroglyphic Luwian) signs, but the other 15 hieroglyphs, too, may derive from Hieroglyphic Hittite characters. On the basis of this comparison one may assume that the script of Sakkez

[19] A. GODARD, *Le trésor de Ziwiyé* (Haarlem 1950); R. GHIRSHMAN, "Notes iraniennes IV. Le trésor de Saqqez", in *Artibus Asiae* 13 (1950), 181-206; R. GHIRSHMAN, *Tombe princière de Ziwiyé et le début de l'art animalier scythe* (Leiden 1979); T. SULIMIRSKI, "The Scyths", in *The Cambridge History of Iran* II, 171 ff. (on the grave from Ziwiye). The hieroglyphic inscription on the silver dish was discovered and published by R. GHIRSHMAN, in *Artibus Asiae* 13 (1950), 186 ff. and fig. 11.

(Ziwiye) represents an adoption and adaptation of the Hieroglyphic Hittite alphabet to another language which was used at that time on the territory lying south of Lake Urmiya. Accordingly, we can presume the identity or similarity of the sound values in both scripts. Now, if one reads the sound values of the Hieroglyphic Hittite script into the text of the inscription from Sakkez, then the following text presents itself:[20]

1 pa-tì-na-sa-nà tà-pá wá-s_6-na-m_5 XL was-was-ki XXX
ár-s-tí-m_5 $ś_3$-kar-kar (HA) har-s_6-ta_5 LUGAL
2 par-tì-ta_5-wa_5 ki-$ś_3$-a_4-á KUR-u-pa-ti QU-wa-a_5
3 i_5-pa-$ś_2$-a-m_2

Even though the hieroglyphic orthography is not fully transparent, nevertheless the Iranian character of the language used in the inscription cannot be mistaken: it is Old Iranian. On the basis of this view the transliteration may be interpreted in the following way:

1 patinasana tapa. vasnam: 40 vasaka 30
arzatam šikar. UTA harsta XŠAYAI.
2 Partitava xšaya DAHYUupati xva-
3 ipašyam

Translation:

1 "Delivered dish. Value: 40 calves 30
silver šiqlu. And it was presented to the king.
2 King Partitavas, the masters of the land pro-
3 perty."

Obviously, this inscription represents an administrative record prepared in the court or in the chancellery of the Scythian king Partatua of the Assyrian texts, the Protothyes of the Greek sources, the master of the land Mannai in the VIIth century B.C. If we take into consideration the character of the script and the chronological and territorial spread of the

[20] Cf. J. HARMATTA, "Die Schrift bei den antiken Steppenvölkern", in *Akten des XVII. Eirene-Kongresses für klassische Philologie,* Berlin 1986, in the press.

epigraphic monuments written in Hieroglyphic Hittite script,[21] we would think of the possibility that this text was written by a Hittite scribe of king Partitava. There exist, however, some powerful arguments which definitely speak against such an assumption. First, it should be noted that the script of Sakkez only coincides with Hieroglyphic Hittite script partially, i.e. the two alphabets are not fully identical. Secondly, the text of Sakkez was not written in the Hieroglyphic Hittite (Hieroglyphic Luwian) language but in some Old Iranian dialect, apparently in the language of the Transcaucasian Scythians. These decisive facts are best explained by the assumption that the Scythians or their ancestors had already adopted the Hieroglyphic Hittite script at an earlier date and adapted it to write their own Old Iranian language. Indeed, such a theory can be verified by the Hieroglyphic inscription which were discovered on the pots of the timber grave culture of South Russia. Two of them, that of Pereyezdnaya and the one of Serko at Nikopol, can be deciphered and interpreted: they consist of 8 and 10 signs respectively. They are still written in Proto-Iranian.[22]

In all probability, the Proto-Iranian tribes of the Eastern European steppes adopted the Hieroglyphic Hittite script and adapted it to their language in the second half of the 2nd millennium B.C. Thus, they were able to bring with them this writing system to Transcaucasia in a further developed form

[21] Cf. P. MERIGGI, *Hieroglyphisch-hethitisches Glossar* (Wiesbaden ²1962); A. KAMMENHUBER, in *Altkleinasiatische Sprachen,* Handbuch der Orientalistik, I. Abt, II. Bd., 1-2. Abschn., Lfg. 2 (Leiden-Köln 1969), 148 ff. The sites of the Hieroglyphic Hittite epigraphic monuments are listed in E. LAROCHE, *Les hiéroglyphes hittites,* I: *L'écriture* (Paris 1960), p. XXI-XXV.

[22] A collection of the inscriptions on the pots of the timber grave culture was published by А.А. Формозов, Сосуды срубной культуры с загадочными знаками ("Pots with Enigmatic Signs of the Timber Grave Culture"), in *ВДИ* 1953/1, 193 ff. For their interpretation cf. for the time being my paper read before the Wiener Sprachgesellschaft on the 19th April 1972: "Protoiranische, skythische und sarmatische Inschriften in Ost- und Mitteleuropa."

which appears in Sakkez later. This hieroglyphic script was possibly used by the Scythians even later if the short hieroglyphic inscriptions of Scythian arrow-heads can really be regarded as its monuments.[23]

Thus, the inscription of Sakkez fully verifies the narrative of Herodotus on the Scythian king Partatua-Protothyes and reveals many new aspects of the earlier relations of the Scythians with Transcaucasia. It seems, however, that at the same time and in parallel with the Hieroglyphic Hittite script, the Scythians also became acquainted with the Old Aramaic alphabet. In a barrow at Krivoy Rog in South Russia a golden diadem has been found. [24] On its outer surface, three inscriptions were scratched. One of the records was written in Aramaic, and its text runs as follows:

zkn dr zwzn I C lṣbwt mlk'

This inscription represents a pure Aramaic text which can be interpreted in the following way:

"This diadem (weighs) one hundred *zūz*. At the order of the king."

The present weight of the diadem is 577 g, but a considerable part of it is missing. Thus, the original weight might have been significantly more than 600 g.

Beside the Aramaic record we can observe a hieroglyphic inscription consisting of two signs which are probably of Urarṭian origin and can be compared with the Hieroglyphic

[23] Cf. А.А. Формозов, Сосуды срубной культуры с загадочными знаками, in *op. cit.*, 199 and note 3.

[24] The diadem from Krivoy Rog was published by А.П. Манцевич, Золотой венец из кургана на Р. Калитве ("The Golden Diadem from the Barrow on the River Kalitva"), in Известия на Археологическия Институт 22 (1959), 57 ff., figs. 1,4a-b, 5. For the interpretation of its inscriptions cf. my paper read before the XXVIth International Congress of Orientalists at New Delhi on the 6th January 1964: "Eine neue aramäische Inschrift aus dem Fund von Krivoy Rog" and J. HARMATTA, "Die Schrift bei den antiken Steppenvölkern", in *Akten des XVII. Eirene-Kongresses für klassische Philologie*, Berlin 1986, in the press. For the Urarṭian Hieroglyphic script cf. R. D. BARNETT, "The Hieroglyphic Writing of Urartu", in *Anatolian Studies to Hans Gustav Güterbock on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday* (Istanbul 1974), 43 ff.

devices of the Urarṭian kings Rusa II and Sarduri III. The third inscription represents a Greek record which can be read and interpreted as follows:

Δ H ⊓ III X I i.e. "153 drachmas 1 chalkus"

If we reckon with Attic drachmas then 664 g present themselves as the original weight of the diadem. It follows that the Aramaic inscription indicated the weight of the golden diadem in another unit of weight, perhaps in Aeginetan drachmas.

Consequently, three different traditions of cultures and scripts meet each other in the scratched records of Krivoy Rog. Originally, the diadem possibly belonged to the treasure of Sarduri III, one of the last Urarṭian kings, the son of Rusa II.[25] The royal devices (= Sarduri III<son of>Rusa II) were engraved in his court. It is hardly probable that the Aramaic inscription, superficially scratched in, would belong to the same period in the history of the diadem. The writing technique and the care of the execution are so different that the two inscriptions must have been prepared obviously in two different historical contexts. In any case, however, the execution of the Aramaic inscription is similar to that of the Greek record. Thus, we can surely presume that the diadem came as booty in the possession of the Scythian kings who carried it to the Pontus region where the two records were prepared by the Aramaean and Greek scribes or managers of the Scythian royal household. Thus, this find and the records on it well illustrate the narration of Herodotus about the retreat of the Scythians from Transcaucasia to the Pontus region.

[25] For the last Urarṭian kings cf. N. V. Aroutiounian, "Problèmes concernant la dernière période de l'histoire d'Urarṭu", in *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft im Alten Vorderasien*, hrsg. v. J. Harmatta und G. Komoróczy (Budapest 1976), 415-28.

VI

Whilst Herodotus' account of the historical role played by the Scythians in the Near East proves to be a reliable source in general, historical research, on the other hand, almost unanimously asserts that his reports on Darius' expedition against the Scythians do not reflect the historical reality.[26] A great part of the historical interpretations attempting to save the historicity of Herodotus' description went even far beyond the limits of probability.[27] Professor G. Nenci, on the other hand, underlined thirty years ago[28] that Herodotus' narrative makes it impossible to accept that Darius wanted to control the whole coastal region of the Black Sea and to create a continental connection with the Caucasus. He was also right in stressing that Darius only wanted to have the acknowledgement of Persian supremacy from the Scythians. Thus, the object of the Persian expedition against the Scythians was only to strengthen the security of the territories already possessed by them.

New evidence and researches fully support this interpretation. On the basis of the Old Persian inscriptions it can be proved that after the expedition against the Scythians Darius organized two new satrapies, viz. 1) the *Sakā: tayaiy: paradraya* "the Sakas who (are living) beyond the sea" and 2) *Skudra* which included Macedonia and Thrace. The Scythian satrapy existed from 514/513 B.C. until 496 B.C. when the Scythians revolted.[29]

[26] Cf. e.g. Ph.-E. LEGRAND (éd.), *Hérodote. Histoires. Livre IV* (Paris 1945), 26 ff.; 132 note 1.

[27] J. L. MYRES, *Herodotus. Father of History* (Oxford 1953), 171 ff.

[28] G. NENCI, *Introduzione alle guerre persiane e altri saggi di storia antica* (Pisa 1958), 147 ff. Cf. also В.Д. Блаватский, О стратегии и тактике скифов ("On the Strategy and Tactics of the Scythians"), in *КСИИМК* 34 (1950), 21.

[29] J. HARMATTA, "Rapporti tra Grecia e Bacino Carpatico tra VI e V secolo a.C.", in *Il crinale d'Europa* (Roma 1984), 11 ff.

In addition, there exists a series of new finds of Old Persian objects in Bulgaria and Rumania[30] which speaks of the presence of the Persian army and administration on these territories. As striking cases, the fragment of an OP inscription found at Marosvásárhely (Gherla) in Transylvania[31] and the inscription discovered at Kölmen in Bulgaria[32] should be mentioned. The latter is written in a language of Asia Minor unknown so far and was probably the epitaph of a warrior from Darius' army.

The mistake of Herodotus or of his Greek informant in assuming a route of the Persian army up to the *Oaros* < **Varu* = Volga river can be explained by the fact that not only the Volga but also the Dniepr bore the name **Varu* "Broad" (*Borysthenes* < **Varu-stāna-* "having broad space", *Var* "Broad" in Jordanes, *Baruch* < **Varuχ* "Broad" in Constantine Porphyrogennitus, широкий Днепр "Broad Dniepr" in Russian).[33] Herodotus' primary Scythian source only attested the advance of the Persian army up to the Dniepr river, but the name **Varu* of the latter was identified by his Greek interpreter or informer with the **Varu* > *Oaros* = Volga (cf. Волга, Волга матушка, широкая глубокая "Volga, Volga mammy, broad < and > deep" in Russian folksong).

[30] For earlier finds of Old Persian objects in Bulgaria cf. М. Ростовцев, Сарматские и индоскифские древности ("Sarmatian and Indo-Scythian Antiquities"), in *Recueil d'études dédiées à la mémoire de N. P. Kondakov* (Prague 1926), 244. Recently, in both Bulgaria and Rumania further objects of Old Persian origin came to light (according to the kind informations of Professor V. Velkov and Professor P. Alexandrescu).

[31] J. Harmatta, "A Recently Discovered Old Persian Inscription", in *AAntHung* 2 (1953/54), 1 ff.; M. Mayrhofer, *Supplement zur Sammlung der altpersischen Inschriften* (Wien 1978), 16.

[32] V. Beševliev, "Inschrift in unbekannter Sprache aus Nordbulgarien", in *Glotta* 43 (1965), 317 ff.; V. Georgiev, "Die Deutung der altertümlichen thrakischen Inschrift aus Kjolmen", in *Linguistique Balkanique* 9, 1 (1966), 7 ff.; K. Olzscha, in *IF* 72 (1967), 152-6.

[33] M. Vasmer, *Untersuchungen über die ältesten Wohnsitze der Slaven*, I: *Die Iranier in Südrussland* (Leipzig 1923), 65 ff.

Thus, Darius' expedition against the Scythians becomes an intelligible part of the history of the οἰκουμένη. Surely, this result can again corroborate the statement that Herodotus was historian of the Cimmerians and Scythians in such a manner that at the same time he also was the historian of the whole οἰκουμένη.

Le professeur Harmatta n'ayant pas rédigé les réponses aux questions, fort importantes et intéressantes, qui lui ont été posées, les éditeurs se sont vus, à leur vif regret, dans l'obligation de renoncer à imprimer la discussion qui a suivi son exposé. Ils s'en excusent auprès des autres participants aux Entretiens et des lecteurs de ce volume.