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DE-6 (2/88)
When Alexander the Great marched over to India towards the end of the 4th century B.C. and incorporated a section of this country in his Empire, it was not the first time that the ancient Greeks were learning about this part of the world, for they had known quite a lot about it already from centuries before. Indian words for various products from that country are to be found in Greek literature prior to the 4th century B.C., and even Homer shows awareness of a certain people living in the Far East whom he vaguely calls "Ethiopians". Knowledge of this region increased at the end of the 6th century B.C. when a Greek from Ionia, by the name of Scylax, was sent by the Persian king to explore the Indus valley. He completed this voyage and wrote a book about what he saw. His work was used by Hecataeus, a fellow Greek from Ionia, around the beginning of the 5th century B.C., when he decided to include a section about India in a geographical book which he was writing. Hecataeus' work was, in turn, used by Herodotus, who also wrote a few chapters on India in his Histories, towards the end of the 5th century B.C. An examination of these three authors will show that the ancient Greeks, prior to Alexander's expedition, knew
not only about the topography, climate, and creatures of this country, but also about the inhabitants, their customs, and, in some cases, their names. Their knowledge, in fact, extended so far as to even include the names of some of India's cities and regions. Alexander the Great, in other words, when he reached India, was not revealing to the Greeks of his time a country about which they knew nothing, but was rather expanding the knowledge which they already had.

This thesis undertakes to examine the extent of Greek knowledge of India down to the beginning of the fourth century B.C. and to test its accuracy.
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INTRODUCTION

The ancient Greeks before the 4th century B.C. knew much about the far reaches of the world around them. They were aware of the Black Sea to the north, of Ethiopia to the south, and of Spain to the west. It was not, therefore, remarkable that they had at least some knowledge of India. ¹ It is true that the Greeks themselves had sent no explorer to India to gather information on

¹A general explanation for the origins of the word "India" should be inserted here. The word can be ultimately traced back to the Sanskrit word for "river", "sindhu", which was used, no doubt, by the Indians as a generic appellation for the Indus river. When the word was adopted by the Persians as a name for the Indus, they dropped the initial Sanskrit "s" and put in its place the initial Old Persian "h", thus rendering the word, "hindus". The word would have remained in this form when it was borrowed by the ancient Greeks, since they also had an initial "h" in their language, had it not passed first through the hands of the Ionian Greeks who lived on the coast of Asia Minor and who acted as intermediaries between the Persians in the east and the rest of the Greeks in the west. Among all the Greeks, they were the only ones who had dropped the initial "h" in their dialect. Thus, when the word finally reached the rest of the Greek world, it had already changed to the more familiar "Indos" (Ἰνδός), or rather, as it appears in its Latinized form, "Indus". It is from this word that all ancient and modern derivatives to designate the country of India, its people, etc..., have come.
that country prior to Alexander the Great's campaign but that should not cause one to believe that the ancient Greeks knew nothing about that area. Inasmuch as Greece traded with Syria even during Mycenaean times, Syria had dealings with Mesopotamia, and Mesopotamia traded with the Indus valley, it is not inconceivable that Indian merchandise reached Greece, regardless of whether the place of its origin was known or unknown to the Greeks. The existence of pure Indian words in the Greek vocabulary for spices and other strange objects not native to Greece bears testimony to such a possibility. Although many of these words might have reached Greece through other vocabularies, such as Arabic for example, it would still at least prove that contact between the eastern Mediterranean in general and India existed. To give a few examples, the Greek word for tin, "kassiteros" (κασσίτερος) is

---

2This should not be looked upon as anything strange. The ancient Greeks, although explorers by nature, were not in the custom of sending out expeditions to faraway places if there was no commercial benefit to be gained. In order for such a large voyage to have been economically sound, Indian products, such as spices for example, would have had to have been sold at prices too extravagant for the average buyer at that time. In fact, it was not until the time of the Roman Empire that such merchandise was sought for that eagerly in the Mediterranean.

3According to the Greek etymological dictionary by Pierre Chantraine, Dictionnaire Etymologique de la Langue Grecque (Paris: Editions Klincksieck, 1968), the Greek words which will be shown in the examples below are, in fact, borrowed from another language. Although Chantraine disagrees with the connection of some of these words with Indian counterparts, the important thing to remember is that they were taken from an eastern language and hence cannot be traced back to a common Indo-European root.
closely related to the Sanskrit "kastīra", as in the Greek "elephas" (ἐλέφας) for ivory to the Sanskrit "ibha". Other examples are the Greek "oruza" (ορύζα) for rice and the Tamil "arisi", the Greek "karpion" (κάρπιον) for cinammon and the Tamil "karppu", the Greek "zingiberis" (ζιγγίβερις) for ginger and the Pali "singivera", the Greek "peperi" (πέπερι) for pepper and the Indian

4J. W. McCrindle, Ancient India as Described by Megasthenes and Arrian (Calcutta: Chuckervertty, Chatterjee, and Co., Ltd., 1877; 2nd edition, 1960), p. 1. Chantraine believes that it might be from Elamite. The similarity, however, with the Sanskrit form makes the connection of "kassiteros" with Sanskrit "kastīra" much more convincing.

5McCrindle, p. 1. This latter word may have reached Greek via the Egyptian "ebu" and the Hebrew "eleph", as pointed out by Hugh George Rawlinson, Intercourse between India and the Western World (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1916), p. 13. According to Chantraine, "elephas" may be from the Hittite "lahpās". He does not support the connection with the Sanskrit "ibha". Since, however, the last two syllables of the Greek word "elephas", "ephas", are remarkably similar to the Sanskrit "ibha", it would seem that once again Chantraine's theory should be abandoned.

6H. G. Rawlinson, p. 14. This also may have reached Greek via the Arabic "aruz". Chantraine proposes a derivation from the Afghan "vrizē" and also possibly from the Sanskrit "vrīhi". The Tamil "arisi" however, due to the initial vowel, seems closer to its Greek counterpart.

7H. G. Rawlinson, p. 14. This word, in fact, appears only once in Greek literature, in the Indica (49a.28.33) of Ctesias, where it is stated by him as being the Indian equivalent of the Greek "myrorodon" (μυρόροδον). The meaning, however, of this word is obscure. It literally means "sweet-smelling rose" and could refer to basically any type of plant with a strong smell. Since, moreover, the Greek word "kinnamomon" (κιννάμομον), derived from the Hebrew "qinnāmōn", is known to have been used for "cinammon", it would seem that Rawlinson's belief about the meaning of "karpion" is questionable.

8Chantraine. The Sanskrit equivalent, as pointed out by Chantraine, is "srngaver-a-". H. G. Rawlinson, p. 14, suggests a derivation from the Tamil "inchiver", but since the Pali form is
"pippari",⁹ and the Greek "berullos" (βηρυλλος) for the beryl-stone and the Prakrit "veruliya".¹⁰ The likelihood, therefore, that some knowledge of this faraway land may have seeped its way through, from trading post to trading post, merchant to merchant, to the ears of the Greeks is quite great. This information, albeit much distorted as it must have been by the many hands that it must have passed through, would have given the ancient Greeks a faint whisper of a land lying far to the east. It would not have told the Greeks much, if anything, about the religion, social structure, etc., of the Indians, but it would have given them rather the notion that somewhere to the east of the peoples living in Asia Minor and Persia lived yet another race, mysterious and unknown.

It is not, therefore, surprising that a vague reference to people living at the world's eastern edge is found in Homer. In his first book of the Odyssey (lines 23-24)¹¹ Homer speaks of two

closer to the Greek one than the Tamil, Chantraine's theory is more persuasive.

⁹Chantraine. As Chantraine makes note of, "pippari" originally came from the Sanskrit "pippali".

¹⁰Chantraine. The Sanskrit form, as noted by Chantraine, is "vaidūrya-". Chantraine believes that the word was introduced along with the stone during the Hellenistic Period. Since the word appears only in literature which dates to after Alexander the Great's conquests, Chantraine's theory is very convincing. It is not, however, indisputable for it is quite possible for this word to have existed in Greece before the Hellenistic Period but to either have never been recorded or to have been written down in literature or documents which have not survived.

¹¹For the original title of this and all other primary sources used in this thesis as well as the date of their authors and their full names where applicable, see the Bibliography at the end of this work.
races of Ethiopians: those living at the western edge of the world and those living at its eastern edge. The passage runs as follows: ".../the Ethiopians, the most distant of people, who are divided in two:/ those who live where the sun sets and those where it rises,/..." That Homer had clear knowledge of India and was thus making a direct reference to its inhabitants is doubtful. It is more likely that there was just a vague knowledge of a region which lay at the easternmost reaches of the known world and which was inhabited by a darker-skinned people. In fact, it was not until Herodotus' time that any distinction was made between the "Ethiopians of Asia" and the "Indians", where the former seemed to have been an unidentified race which formed part of the 17th satrapy of the Persian Empire (Herodotus, *Histories* 3.94) as opposed to the latter, which is known to have been a genuine race, ancestors of the modern Indians, and which made up the 20th satrapy (Herodotus 3.94).

Indeed, as can be seen from this comparison of Homer's and

12. Αἰθίοποι, τοι διεκδικείται, δικασταὶ ἄνδρῶν, οἱ μὲν δυσομένου Τηρίνος, οἱ δ᾽ ἄνισῶν.

13. It should be noted here that the Greek word for "Ethiopian", "Aithiops" (Αἴθιοψ), which simply means "burnt face", was used in Homer's time to designate any people with dark skin. The geographical limitations which this word today entails did not start appearing until much later, during the time of Herodotus.

14. Herodotus does not stop here. He continues later on in his work (7.70) to distinguish between the "Ethiopian of Libya" and the "Ethiopian from the region of the sun". The two are described as differing only in their speech and in their hair, the former having "the woolliest hair of all men" (οὐλότατον τρίχωμα...πάντων ἄνθρωπων) while the latter having straight hair.
Herodotus' information on this part of the world, there was a marked increase in knowledge concerning this region. Although, as has been mentioned already, trade between the eastern Mediterranean and the Indian world, via Mesopotamia, would have given the Greeks a vague idea of India, it would not have supplied them with enough information for Herodotus to have known about the Indians as much as he did. Obviously there was another factor involved, and this factor was the Persian Empire which, under the reigns of Cyrus the Great (559 B.C.-529 B.C.) and Darius I (521 B.C.-486 B.C.), stretched from Ionia on the coast of Asia Minor in the west all the way to India in the east. It was this empire which caused the great increase of information on India to reach Greece, for the position which it occupied between these two countries enabled it to act as an intermediary and to thus add to the ancient Greeks' knowledge about India.\footnote{The accuracy, however, of this knowledge was limited, for, as will be seen further on in this Introduction, it was often filled with so many mythical stories that it made India seem more like a 'magical kingdom' than a real country.} This however, was not its greatest contribution, for at the end of the 6th century B.C., Darius I sent out an Ionian Greek, by the name of Scylax of Caryanda, to explore the Indus valley and to report back to the Persian king what he saw, a feat which he did, in fact, accomplish. It was from this point onwards that the Greeks started to acquire knowledge on India, for this Scylax, as will be shown in the first chapter, wrote the first Greek work on India, now all but completely lost except for a few fragments. Soon after him came the first
historian, Hecataeus of Miletus, who wrote a geographical book on
the then known world, which included India. Hecataeus had Scylax
as one of his sources on India, if not his only one, and he in turn
was used by the Father of History himself, Herodotus of
Halicarnassus, when he included a description of India in his
Histories. In fact, it is only the works of these three authors
which depict what the ancient Greeks knew about India before
Alexander the Great.

Ctesias of Cnidus (4th century B.C.), although he wrote a
Greek treatise on India before Alexander the Great's expedition,
cannot be included in this group for the following reasons. First
of all, he did not use Herodotus as a main source but seems to have
relied rather on Persian sources, even though he does not mention
them. In other words, his work, unlike that of Hecataeus or
Herodotus, is not ultimately based on the voyage and testimonial of
Scylax but rather on the opinions and beliefs which the Persians
happened to hold about India at that time. Thus, his treatise,
albeit written in Greek and read by Greeks, does not depict so much
what the ancient Greeks knew about India before Alexander the Great
as much as what the Persians knew. Second, his Indica contains too
much of the fabulous and the mythical to be classified as
history. Yet, because of his claim of veracity (49b.31.39 ff.), we

\[16\] In fact, it is this very characteristic which strengthens the
argument that Ctesias had Persian sources, for the only truly far-
fetched piece of information which Herodotus gives about India, the
story of the gold-digging ants, is also the only description of
this country which is specifically reported by him (3.105) to have
been taken from the Persians. For these gold-digging ants, see
below, Chapter 3, pp. 90 ff.
cannot categorize his work as true fiction. It belongs rather to the new type of "historical" writing that started emerging after Ctesias, and which was to be satirized by Lucian centuries later, in his A True Story (1.3, 2.31): dealing with the marvellous while at the same time alleging everything to be true. Ctesias, therefore, as far as his approach to the whole subject matter of India is concerned, belongs to a different school from Scylax, Hecataeus, or Herodotus. It is for these reasons that he will not be included in this paper on Greek knowledge of India.

Scylax, Hecataeus, and Herodotus, on the other hand, will be dealt with because they represent a line of writers who passed down, from author to author, information on India which had originally been obtained by a Greek explorer and which remained, therefore, the one account of this country which was based on the testimonial of an eyewitness before Alexander the Great went there himself and brought the two worlds into contact with each other.
I. SCYLAX OF CARYANDA

1. His Journey

In chapter 44 of the fourth book of Herodotus' Histories there is an account of an expedition which was made into the land east of the Hindu Kush mountains. It was organized by Darius I (the Great), the king of Persia (521-486 B.C.), in order to find out where the Indus flowed into the sea and to see if the southern half of the Indus valley region was worth conquering—an intention made obvious by his decision later to annex it to his Empire. The passage runs as follows:

"But as for Asia most of it was explored by Darius who, in his wish to find out where the Indus River, which is the second of

---

1It should be noted here that it could only have been this part of the valley which was known as "India" (or rather, "Hindus") by the Persians, for the northern half of the Indus valley, as will be shown in Chapter 2 below (pp. 46 ff.) was known as "Gandhara".

2The later annexation of "India"/"Hindus" can be seen from the Persian inscription of Behistun which precedes this voyage and which mentions "Gandara" (the Persian version of the Indian "Gandhara") as being part of Darius' Empire but which fails to mention India, and by the sudden appearance of this latter name in the later inscriptions of Naksh-i-Rustam and Persepolis. For these inscriptions see n. 13 below. For more information on Gandhara see Chapter 2 below, pp. 46 ff, as well as W. S. W. Vaux, "Gandarae," Dictionary of Greek and Roman Geography, ed. by William Smith (London: Walton and Maberly, 1854), vol. 1.
all the other rivers to produce crocodiles, flows into the sea, sent a few trustworthy men with ships. And even Scylax of Caryanda went with them. Having set out from the city of Caspatyros and the land of Pactyice they sailed along the river towards the east, that is, towards the rising sun into the sea. Sailing from there in a westerly direction over the sea they arrived in the thirtieth month of their voyage to the same place from where the king of the Egyptians had sent the Phoenicians, whom I mentioned earlier, to circumnavigate Libya. After they had circumnavigated [Asia] Darius subdued the Indians and made use of this sea. Thus did he realize that in respect to the other regions of Asia, except the ones which lie towards the rising sun, she (Asia) possessed the same characteristics as Libya."

As can be seen, the mission of this journey was to explore this area by sailing down the Indus to the Arabian Sea and then

---

3 The other river was the Nile.

4 An island just off the coast of Asia Minor, perhaps the very one which is situated in the Gulf of Iasicus.

5 The words "and even" are a translation of the typically Herodotean expression "kai de kai" (καὶ δὲ καὶ) which in reality has greater emphasis in Greek than this English version shows. They have even been taken to imply that Scylax was captain of the expedition. This opinion though need not be dwelled upon as national pride over a man who came from the same region, Caria, as himself offers a totally acceptable explanation for Herodotus' use of such an expression.

6 See Bk. 4.42.

7 It should be pointed out here that the word "Libya" was used as a general term for the whole African continent regardless of what its size was believed to be at the time.
from there to travel in a westerly direction along its coast to the mouth of the Red Sea. At this point it was to turn northwards and keep sailing until it should reach the Gulf of Suez in Egypt.\textsuperscript{8} From there it is to be assumed that the voyage continued all the way to the Mediterranean Sea by passing through the canal which connected the Red Sea with the Nile Delta and which had been constructed by Darius himself.\textsuperscript{9}

2. Information on Scylax

The journey, Herodotus says, took a total of 30 months and had as one of its crew a man by the name of Scylax. Inasmuch as this Scylax came from the Carian city of Caryanda on the coast of Asia Minor, and must have, therefore, been acquainted with seafaring owing to the environment in which he grew up, it is to be

\textsuperscript{8}That the voyage reached this point can be seen from Herodotus' words "they arrived in the thirtieth month of their voyage to the same place from where the king of the Egyptians had sent the Phoenicians" which, as can be seen from Bk. 4.42, must have logically been the northernmost part of the Red Sea.

\textsuperscript{9}This canal had been started by the Pharaoh Sesostris at the end of the 3rd millennium B.C. and was worked on by the Pharaoh Necos around the turn of the 7th century B.C. but was not completed until the reign of Darius a century later (cf. Herodotus 2.158, Diodorus, The Library of History 1.33.9, and Strabo, Geography 17.1.25). An inscription found beside the canal identifying Darius as the builder describes how the canal was constructed for the sole purpose of enabling ships to sail directly from Egypt to Persia. For a translation of this inscription as well as information on the canal see A. T. Olmstead, History of the Persian Empire (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1948), p. 146 or Björn Landström, The Quest for India (Stockholm: Bokförlaget Forum AB, 1964), p. 29.
assumed that it was precisely for this reason that he was chosen. 
He is also attributed other skills such as those of mathematician and scholar (μαθηματικός και μουσικός) by the Suda\textsuperscript{10} and those of a map editor for the Persians by Myres.\textsuperscript{11}

His nationality need not be disputed for one look at his name shows that he was Greek - his name means "little dog". It was not an unusual name, for both Herodotus mentions a second Scylax who came from the Carian city of Myndos and who was a contemporary of Scylax of Caryanda (5.33) and Cicero writes about a third Scylax who also came from Caria, from the city of Halicarnassus, and who lived in the second century B.C. (On Divination 2.42).\textsuperscript{12}

3. Dating of Journey

As for the actual date of the expedition, it is not necessary to simply restrict the event to the years of Darius'

\textsuperscript{10}Under heading "Scylax" (Σκύλαξ). This reference to Scylax (fr. 1) as well as all others from the Classical Period down to the Byzantine can be found in Felix Jacoby, Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1958), vol. 3:C:2, pp. 587 ff.


\textsuperscript{12}The writer of a later 4th century B.C. work which is a coastal description of the Mediterranean and the upper Western African sea coasts is also called Scylax of Caryanda but it has been generally accepted that this was not the true name of the author but simply a false attribution of the work to the Scylax of Herodotus 4.44. See below, pp. 33 ff.
reign (521-486 B.C.), for a more precise answer can be obtained from the inscriptions which the Persians themselves left at this time.\textsuperscript{13} The first inscription to be examined is from Behistun and it dates to c. 516 B.C. In this inscription, which gives a list of all the countries belonging to the Persian Empire, no mention is made of India, thus suggesting that this region had not yet been annexed. Suddenly however, in the Persepolis and Naksh-i-Rustam inscriptions, which date to 510 B.C., India, called "Hindus", is included in the list of conquered lands.\textsuperscript{14} Since, as can be seen from Herodotus' passage, Darius conquered India only after Scylax' expedition, and this journey took 30 months to complete, it can be safely concluded that the expedition must have taken place sometime between 516 and 511 B.C.

4. Caspatyros

Herodotus says that Scylax set out for his journey from a city called Caspatyros (\textit{Κασπάτυρος}) and a land called Pactyice


\textsuperscript{14}\textsuperscript{}As was pointed out in n. 1, it was only the southern part of the Indus valley which was known as "India"/"Hindus". The northern half was known as "Gandhara".
Of the various places which have been proposed as possible locations for Caspatyros three stand out: Multan, Peshawar, and Kashmir.

The preference for Multan is based on a passage by the mediaeval historian Alberuni which states that the original name of this city was Kasyapapura. Since, then, Kasyapapura resembles Hecataeus' word "Caspapyros" (Κασπάπυρος), and "Caspapyros" should be equated with Herodotus' "Caspatyros", it was concluded by Cunningham that this was the city from which Scylax departed. Toynbee supports this conclusion and although he does not mention

---

15 For other references to Caspatyros see 3.102 and for Pactyice and the Pactyes 3.93, 3.102, 7.67-68, and 7.85.

16 The city of Kabul has also been proposed as the old site of Caspatyros by Heeren, reference for whom will be found in J. Talboys Wheeler, The Geography of Herodotus (London: Longman, Brown, Green, and Longmans, 1854), p. 199, n. 2.

17 Alberuni, India ch. 29, trans. by Edward C. Sachau (New Delhi: S. Chand and Co., 1964), p. 298. It should be pointed out, however, that the validity of Alberuni's statement, regardless of what he says immediately afterwards that cities often change their names due to invasions by various peoples, is highly questionable especially when the numerous other names which he says belonged to Multan after it was named Kasyapapura (Hamsapura, Bagapura, Sambhapura, and Mulasthana) and the lack of any continuity in their structure, save the suffix "-pura" which simply means "city" in Sanskrit, are considered.


Alberuni but simply says that Kasyapapura is a Sanskrit word which had been preserved through Indian tradition, he nonetheless goes on to suggest that Scylax reached ancient Multan by a road which led directly eastward from where modern Quetta is situated, and that from there he sailed down either the Chenab or the Ravi River.

Both Caroe and Woodcock disagree with Toynbee's views. Caroe argues\textsuperscript{21} that first of all, had Scylax started his journey from ancient Multan, he would have travelled in a south-westerly direction from there and not eastwards as Herodotus says.\textsuperscript{22} Secondly, Hecataeus' Caspapyros which, according to Caroe, should be identified with Herodotus' Caspatyros is located by Hecataeus in Gandhara\textsuperscript{23} which is too far north to have encompassed the ancient city of Multan. Thirdly, according to a passage in Athenaeus' Deipnosophists (2.70b-c), the Indus is described in a book attributed by Athenaeus to Scylax\textsuperscript{24} as having a mountain on either side of it covered with thick forest and artichokes which, Caroe argues, should be taken as a description of the gorges just south of Attock (where the Kabul River joins the Indus) and which, assuming that the book was truly written by Scylax, could never

193-194, 198, and 236 for further support of this viewpoint.

\begin{itemize}
  \item[22] This argument, in fact, is not a strong one as will be seen on pp. 25 ff. where Herodotus' description of Scylax sailing eastward is given a logical explanation.
  \item[23] See n. 1 above.
  \item[24] For Scylax' writings see below, pp. 28 ff.
\end{itemize}
have been seen by him had he started out from ancient Multan. Woodcock's argument\textsuperscript{25} is that if Caspatyros is equated with ancient Multan, and Scylax arrived there from the direction of modern Quetta, one would have to assume that he crossed the Indus itself in order to arrive at the river Chenab down which he would have had to have sailed only to reach the Indus again.

The argument for Peshawar has been brought forward in greatest detail by Caroe,\textsuperscript{26} who bases his view on the belief that the eastward-flowing direction of Scylax' expedition can only be explained if Scylax set out by sailing down the Kabul first before reaching the Indus.\textsuperscript{27} He observes first of all that the Kabul is navigable only after it reaches the Peshawar District.\textsuperscript{28} He also makes a connection between the name Caspatyros and that of Peshawar by asserting that Herodotus' Caspatyros is the same as Hecataeus' Caspapyros which is in turn very close to the name "Paskapuros" which, according to Henning,\textsuperscript{29} is the ancient name for Peshawar.


\textsuperscript{26}Pp. 30-33. For further support of this view see Vincent A. Smith, The Early History of India from 600 B.C. to the Muhammadan Conquest (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1924) p. 40, n. 1, and Sir Marcus Aurel Stein's comment in his translation of Kalhana's Rajatarangini: A Chronicle of the Kings of Kasmir (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1961), vol. 2, p. 353, who simply say that Caspatyros was located somewhere in the Peshawar District.

\textsuperscript{27}See n. 22 above.

\textsuperscript{28}For a detailed map of the Kabul River and its surrounding territory see Caroe, p. 31.

He strengthens this argument by suggesting that Paskapuros changed to the Sanskrit "Purushapura" before becoming Peshawar.\(^{30}\)

Kashmir was first proposed as the region in which Caspatyros lay by Wilson\(^{31}\) who argues that "according to Sanskrit writers" "Kasyapa-pur"\(^ {32}\), which means literally in Sanskrit "city of Kasyapa" and which resembles both Herodotus' "Caspatyros" and Hecataeus' "Caspapyros", was the original name of the city Kashmir, which has not been found yet but which must have given its name to the district.\(^ {33}\) In other words, Herodotus' "Caspatyros" and

\(^{30}\) That Purushapura was the Sanskrit name for Peshawar can be seen by the word "Po-lu-sha-pu-lo" which was used by the mediaeval Chinese traveller Huien Tsang to identify the city of Peshawar. See Samuel Beal's translation of Tsang's work, Si-Yu-Ki: Buddhist Records of the Western World (London: Trübner and Co., 1884), Bk. 2, vol. 1, p. 97 as well as Beal's note 54 on pp. 97-98. It should be noted here though that the only true resemblance between "Purushapura" and "Caspapyros" is the suffix "-pura" which, as has been mentioned in n. 17, is the Sanskrit word for "city".


\(^{32}\) Or rather, "Kasyapa-pura", the more correct Sanskrit word for "city of Kasyapa".

\(^{33}\) Unfortunately, Wilson does not state who his Sanskrit sources are. The existence of such a city, however, does not seem too incredible in view of both the legend which says that a sage by the name of Kasyapa drained the valley of Kashmir, formerly a lake, and the subsequent founding of a city named "Kasyapapura" after him which might have occurred. For this legend as it appeared in the 12th century A.D. see Kalhana's Rajatarangini 1.26-27, trans. by Ranjit Sitaram Pandit [Allahabad (India): The Indian Press, Ltd., 1935; reprint, New Delhi: Sahitya Akademi, 1977], Pandit's note on the same page, as well as H. H. Wilson's translation of this same legend as recounted in the Wakiat-i-Kashmir in The Hindu History of Kashmir [First published in the Asiatic Researches, Serampore 15 (1928), pp. 1-119. Calcutta: Susil Gupta (India) Private Limited, 1960], p. 87. For the dating of this event see H. H. Wilson's
Hecataeus' "Caspapyros" are ultimately derived from "Kasyapapura", the original appellation of ancient Kashmir. He believes that since Alexander the Great never encountered a city of Caspatyros, it should not be looked for east of the Indus but rather is to be located somewhere near its source. Philip Smith agrees with him and even takes Wilson's argument a step further by suggesting a connection between Caspatyros and Ptolemy's region of Caspeiria [Κασπηρία (Geography 7.1.42, 7.1.47-50)] which, he argues, should be identified with the valley of Kashmir, with the only difference in his argument being his belief that Caspatyros actually lay on the banks of the River Jhelum. This connection is indeed a table in the same book where both the 4th and the 3rd millenia B.C. (the latter more likely) are given as the periods during which the draining of the Kashmir valley must have occured.

"It should be pointed out that Wilson's placement of Caspatyros in Kashmir is not confined to the modern district of Kashmir only but includes the territory of modern Punjab as well, for in earlier times the district of Kashmir covered a larger area than it does today. See Tsang's description of Kashmir, Bk. 3, vol. 1, p. 148 as well as Beal's note on the same page."


"Wheeler completely disagrees with placing Caspatyros in Kashmir because Scylax would have sailed in a south-westerly direction from there rather than eastward as Herodotus says—an argument whose weakness will be revealed on pp. 25 ff."
strong one seeing the resemblance between "Caspatyros" and "Caspeiria", Ptolemy's placement of the Caspeiraei (Kασπειραίοι) on the western side of the "Uindius" (Οὐινδιός) mountain (7.1.47), his mention of a city called "Caspeira" (Κάσπειρα) in this region (7.1.49), as well as his placement of this city to the east of the city of Alexandria (8.26.7) which is believed to have been located in the vicinity of the city of Kabul.

The argument for Kashmir is by far the strongest for the location of the ancient Caspatyros especially in view of two more things. First, according to Hecataeus, Caspapyros (which has already been pointed as being the same as Caspatyros) was a city of Gandhara and it is known from the Gandhara-Jataka that Kashmir was part of the kingdom of Gandhara during the middle of the 6th century B.C. Second, according to the Peutinger Table which, although not accurate in its placement of land masses in relation

---

37 The Vindhya mountain range, no doubt, which was located in the middle of the Indian subcontinent. This connection seems to have been first made by Heinrich Kiepert, A Manual of Ancient Geography (London: MacMillan and Co., 1881), p. 23.

38 For the placement of Alexandria in this region, see ch. 2 below, pp. 62 ff.


to one another, is highly detailed in its listing of cities, there was a city by the name of "Spatura" which was located between the cities of "Alexandria Bucephalos" and "Palibotra", and which resembles very closely Herodotus' "Caspatyros" and the Indians' "Kasyapapura". Since Alexandria Bucephalos was located just east of the Indus, and Palibotra, known better by its equivalent of "Pataliputra", was located somewhere along the Ganges, it would be safe to say that Spatura was not only east of Alexandria Bucephalos but most likely located somewhere in Kashmir as can be seen by the fact that it is placed, on the Peutinger Table, much closer to Alexandria Bucephalos than to Palibotra.

---

41The Peutinger Table is a copy made in the 13th century A.D. of a map from the 4th century A.D. which depicted the whole world as it was known at that time, ranging from Britain in the west to the Ganges in the east. For this Table, see Konrad Miller, Die Peutinger'sche Tafel (Stuttgart: F. A. Brockhaus Komm.-Gesch., GmbH., Abt. Antiquarium, 1887; later edition, 1962).

42For Kasyapapura, see pp. 17 ff below.

43For other references to the city of Palibotra on the Ganges, see Diodorus 2.39.3, 60.2-3, Strabo 15.1.11, 15.1.36, 15.1.72, Arrian, Indica 10, Ptolemy 7.1.73, and Stephanus of Byzantium, under the heading "Palimbothra" (Παλιμβόθρα), all of which are, no doubt, obtaining their information from the 4th century B.C. writer Megasthenes, fragments of whose work can be found in Jacoby, vol. 3:C:2, pp. 603 ff. For a translation of these fragments, see J. W. McCrindle's Ancient India as Described by Megasthenes and Arrian. For more information on Megasthenes, see Chapter 2 below, p. 50.

44This placement of Caspatyros east of the Indus should normally seem awkward for the same reason that Woodcock rejects Cunningham's and Toynbee's placement of Caspatyros in Multan (p. 16 above): Scylax would have had to have crossed the Indus to reach Caspatyros only to retrace his steps in order to reach the Indus again. This should not cause any problems, however, since a perfectly good explanation for how this placement can be logical is given below, pp. 27 ff.
5. Pactyice

As for the land of Pactyice, Wilson, who places Caspatyros in Kashmir, identifies Pactyice with a region which encompassed the modern district of Kashmir as well as the land just to the south and west of it and including possibly even the region beyond the Indus.\textsuperscript{45} Vaux agrees with him\textsuperscript{46} and is even inclined to place it in Gandhara in accordance with Hecataeus' statement.\textsuperscript{47} He does not, however, believe that it extended as far west as Armenia as we are told by Herodotus (3.93).\textsuperscript{48}

The most popular location for Pactyice is in north-eastern Afghanistan\textsuperscript{49} for the main reason that this area is inhabited today by a people called the Pathans who are believed by some to be direct descendants of the ancient Pactyes.\textsuperscript{50} The name "Pathan",

\textsuperscript{45}Ariana Antiqua, p. 136.

\textsuperscript{46}"Pactyice", Dictionary of Greek and Roman Geography.

\textsuperscript{47}See n. 1 above.

\textsuperscript{48}For a solution to this problem see Caroe, p. 34, where a scribal error in the records Herodotus was using is blamed.

\textsuperscript{49}This placement of Pactyice in north-eastern Afghanistan would mean that the region of Pactyice was part of the Persian satrapy of either Bactria or Gandhara, the latter being more likely since Gandhara extended as far westwards as the area around Kabul, and perhaps even beyond that. For the size of Gandhara, see ch. 2, pp. 46 ff.

\textsuperscript{50}Supporters of this theory are Walter Woodburn Hyde, Ancient Greek Mariners (New York: Oxford University Press, 1947), p. 175, H. G. Rawlinson, p. 16, n. 2, Caroe, pp. 30 and 33-37, and Stein, p. 353.
in fact, is not what these people call themselves but is rather the Indian form of their true appellation which is "Pakhtun".\textsuperscript{51} The connection, then, between "Pakhtun" and "Pactyes" would be an easy one if it were not for one problem. The Pathans' language is actually divided into two dialects: the "-kh-" and the "-sh-" forms. In other words, in one part of Afghanistan they are known as the Pakhtuns while in another they are known as the Pashtuns.\textsuperscript{52} Therefore, before any conclusion can be drawn concerning their possible origin, the following question must be answered: "Which of the two dialects is the older?". Unfortunately, the more popular view is that it is the "-sh-" form which existed first and that the "-kh-" dialect developed from it at a much later stage.\textsuperscript{53} This view, then, led many to believe that any connection between the ancient Pactyes and the modern Pathans ought to be rejected.\textsuperscript{54} Caroe argues against this conclusion by drawing attention to the word "Choaspes/Khoaspes" (Χοασπης) which is given by Aristotle

\textsuperscript{51}Caroe, p. xv.

\textsuperscript{52}For a well-detailed report of their distribution as well as their differing characteristics, see Caroe, pp. xvi-xvii.


(Meteorology 1.13.350a), Strabo (15.1.26), and Curtius (History of Alexander the Great of Macedon 8.10.22) as the name of the river by which Alexander fought the Aspasii.\textsuperscript{55} His argument develops as follows: since Arrian calls this same river "Euaspla" (Anabasis of Alexander 4.24.1),\textsuperscript{56} it can be assumed that the syllable "kho" in Khoaspes has the same meaning as the syllable "eu" in Euaspla. In other words, "kho" means "good". The Pathan word for "good" is "sho/shuh" in Pashtu and "kho/khuh" in Pakhtu. Therefore, Caroe argues, it can be concluded that it is the Pakhtu dialect which has retained the older form of the language. It is with this in mind that Caroe makes the connection between the ancient Pactyes and the modern Pakhtun.\textsuperscript{57}

\textsuperscript{55}p. 37.

\textsuperscript{56}There is a problem, however, with this word in the manuscripts. It is only in the editions following the year 1576 that one finds the word "Euaspla" (Εὐάσπλα). All other manuscripts have "Euas..." (Εὐασ...) except manuscript A which has "euaspoleos" (εὐασπόλεος). Although, due to its positioning in the sentence, this word can refer to either a river or a city, a closer examination of the syntax makes the former more likely.

\textsuperscript{57}This placement of Pactyice in north-eastern Afghanistan with Caspatyros having already been located in Kashmir may cause problems due to the general belief that Caspatyros was located in Pactyice. It should be noted, however, that nowhere does Herodotus explicitly say that this is the case but simply states that the inhabitants of both places "lived north of the other Indians" [πρὸς ἄρκτον τε καὶ βορέω ἀνέμου κατοικτέαν τῶν ἄλλων ἰνδῶν (3.102)]. It should also be pointed out here that Herodotus' use of the Aorist tense with the participle for "setting out" (ὁμημένης) implies that the sailing part of the journey did not start until after Scylax left Pactyice. Therefore, it is very likely that Pactyice does equal north-eastern Afghanistan and that Scylax did, in fact, go through Pactyice before reaching the Indus.
6. Eastward Flow of the Indus

Another detail of Scylax' voyage which has caused some confusion is the eastward flowing direction of the Indus. Several suggestions have been proposed as possible solutions to this problem. The first is that it was a geographical error on the part of Herodotus.\textsuperscript{58} To accept this it would have to be assumed that when Herodotus learned about this voyage, whether it was from someone who was on it, from Scylax' account of it,\textsuperscript{59} or perhaps even from the Persian records, he was not informed about the direction in which the Indus was flowing and that he therefore had to make a guess. But the certainty he portrays in twice describing it as flowing eastward makes this highly unlikely.

Another explanation is that Scylax actually sailed eastward along the Kabul first before joining the Indus while believing all along that the former was just an extension of the latter.\textsuperscript{60} Since the Kabul is navigable for about 70 km before reaching the Indus,\textsuperscript{61} it would be possible for this theory to be valid if it were not for one problem: the Kabul as well as the northern section of the Indus


\textsuperscript{59} See below, pp. 28 ff.

\textsuperscript{60} See Wheeler, p. 199, Cary and Warmington, p. 61, Hyde, p. 175, and Caroe, p. 33.

\textsuperscript{61} Caroe, pp. 30-32.
were already part of the Persian Empire at this time and could not, therefore, have been confused with one another.\textsuperscript{62}

A more plausible explanation has been brought forward by Myres.\textsuperscript{63} He argues that there was not one but two expeditions which took place east of the Hindu Kush mountains at the end of the 6th century B.C. which were both probably accompanied by Scylax\textsuperscript{64} and which were confused by Herodotus. One of these sailed down the Indus while the other headed in an eastward direction, perhaps down the Ganges River.\textsuperscript{65} This, according to him, would explain three peculiarities surrounding Scylax' voyage: the eastward flow of the river, the thirty months' time it took him to reach the Nile

\textsuperscript{62}This can be seen from the Behistun inscription which mentions Gandhara, a region which, no doubt, included both of these areas. For the territories which Gandhara encompassed, see ch. 2 below, pp. 46 ff. For the Behistun inscription, see n. 13 above.

\textsuperscript{63}p. 623.

\textsuperscript{64}The evidence, however, seems to point only to the Indus voyage as being accompanied by Scylax. See below, n. 73.

\textsuperscript{65}An exploratory expedition down the Ganges basin is not, in fact, too inconceivable for this period. It is well known that during the 6th century B.C. this whole region was under the dominion of the kingdom of Magadha whose main interest seems to have been drawn at this time more towards expanding its frontiers than towards showing hostility to outsiders. It should also be noted that any empire which is strong and confident of its power would hardly feel threatened by, and is therefore much less likely to attack, an expedition whose mission is exploratory rather than militaristic (cf. the empires of Persia, Alexander, and Rome). The real danger for such a voyage would have been going through territory inhabited not by members of an empire but by individual tribes who, due to their weakness, could easily feel threatened by the intrusion of a stranger. For more information on the Magadhan kingdom see Vincent A. Smith, pp. 31-39 and Bimala Churn Law, \textit{The Magadhas in Ancient India} (Hertford: Stephen Austin and Sons, Ltd., 1946), pp. 7-12.
Delta,\textsuperscript{66} which would have been too long for a voyage starting from the mouth of the Indus but not for one starting from the mouth of the Ganges, and the description of Asia, as a result, no doubt, of the expedition, as "possessing the same characteristics as Libya" (δύοια παρεχομένη τῇ Λιβύῃ),\textsuperscript{67} which should be taken to mean that Scylax, in sailing as far south as Cape Comorin, discovered the same thing about India which Herodotus says Necos discovered about Africa after sailing around it (Histories 4.42)—namely that the Indian subcontinent extended to a great degree into the south.\textsuperscript{68}

7. Herodotus' Confusion of Two Expeditions

If, then, there were two expeditions, a question has to be answered: "How did Herodotus confuse the two?". The only explanation is that the sources which Herodotus must have been using, whether they were in the form of a testimonial of, or a second-hand report from, someone who was on the expedition, a published account of the voyage written by Scylax himself,\textsuperscript{69} or even perhaps Persian records, considering they existed and

\textsuperscript{66}For Scylax reaching the Nile Delta see p. 11 above.

\textsuperscript{67}That is, Africa. See below, n. 7.

\textsuperscript{68}The belief in the similarity between Africa and the Indian subcontinent can also be explained in that they both have a triangular shape which comes to a point at the southernmost tip.

\textsuperscript{69}See below, pp. 28 ff. That Herodotus had access, however, to such a work is unlikely, since he makes no mention of it.
Herodotus had someone to translate them for him, mentioned the Ganges expedition as flowing eastward while omitting to describe, or at least emphasize, the direction of flow of the Indus one, no doubt because this was already known from the course the Indus took in the Persian satrapy of Gandhara. Herodotus consequently, in his belief that only one river existed in this part of the world, concluded that the two accounts were relating to the same event. He thus must have attributed the eastward flow of the Ganges to the Indus,70 which in reality means nothing more than "the Indian river", the length of the journey from the mouth of the Ganges to the northernmost part of the Red Sea to that of the journey which started from the mouth of the Indus and probably went as far as the Persian Gulf only,71 and the starting point for the expedition down the Ganges which must have logically been Caspatyros in Kashmir to the one down the Indus.72

70 The abundance of crocodiles in the Ganges need not be taken as another characteristic of this river which was transferred to the Indus for it is a generally well known fact that this latter river also produces crocodiles. See Arrian, Anabasis 6.1.2.

71 This last hypothesis is based on the view that if the journey down the Indus, which must have logically preceded the one down the Ganges, continued all the way to the Gulf of Suez, with the purpose, no doubt, to see if such a task was possible and if so how long it would take, then the expedition to the Ganges which, as can be seen by its length, did reach Egypt would have carried out the latter half of its journey in vain.

72 It is possible that Pactyice was also mentioned in the account concerning the expedition down the Ganges for it would have been the region through which one would have passed before reaching Kashmir. That Caspatyros was the starting point for only the voyage down the Ganges, however, is a logical conclusion based on the observation that since Caspatyros is located east of the Indus, it would have been absurd for Scylax to have crossed the Indus to get to it, only to retrace his steps to get back to the Indus.
Herodotus' confusion can further be understood if the two expeditions happened so close to each other in time that he concluded that they were in reality one and the same. The first one had as its goal the task of exploring the lower section of the Indus only, and of sailing from there most likely to Mesopotamia in order to report on its findings, while the second had a mission which was twofold: to explore the Ganges River and then to see if it was possible to navigate the southern coastline of Asia starting from its mouth and proceeding all the way to Egypt.

8. Scylax' Writings

Since these two voyages were known to Herodotus, it is not unlikely that a separate account of them was written, perhaps in the form of a diary, and published by someone who had taken part. No traces have been found of such a work concerning the Ganges\textsuperscript{73} but evidence for one on that of the Indus does exist. It is found in the works of various later authors, ranging from the Classical period all the way to the Byzantine, who not only refer to such a book but even quote from it. The first to do so is Aristotle, who again. PACTYICE on the other hand seems to have been the logical starting point for any voyage down the Indus. Herodotus then, believing that only one expedition took place, concluded that Caspatyros and PACTYICE were located right next to each other.

\textsuperscript{73}It is precisely this lack of any Greek treatise on the Ganges which implies that Scylax did not accompany this voyage.
in his *Politics* (7.13/1332 b24-25) mentions Scylax as the authority on the ruling system of India and on the social distance which separated the Indian king from his people. Athenaeus (2.70b-c) goes even further than Aristotle in not only stating Scylax as the one responsible for topographical information on India and the Indus valley but even in going so far as to quote him, as can be seen by the sudden change in his writing from the Koine dialect to the Ionic - the very dialect which Scylax, being from the coast of Asia Minor, would have used. He says, for example, that India is a land watered by springs and waterways, or canals, that artichokes and other types of vegetation grow on the mountains there, and that the Indus is flanked on either side by high mountains which are covered with wild forest and prickly artichokes. Philostratus

---

74See Jacoby, vol. 3:C:2, pp. 587 ff., or Karl Müller, *Geographi Graeci Minores* (Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1855; later edition, 1965), vol. 1, pp. xxxiii-xxxiv for this as well as all subsequent references concerning Scylax' work. It should be noted here that Herodotus mentions no such book and that Alexander the Great seems not to have known about Scylax' voyage, as can be seen by his initial belief that the Indus was connected to the Nile (Arrian, *Anabasis* 6.1.2-5). However, in view of the references made to such a work by ancient authors, Herodotus' and Alexander's ignorance can only be explained if few copies of the work were made resulting in poor distribution and hence a limited number of people who knew about this voyage.

75It should be noted here that Athenaeus shows doubt as to the authorship of this information. He says that it might even have been a certain "Polemon" (Πολέμων) who wrote this. This Polemon must have, no doubt, been Polemon of Ilium (c. 190 B.C.), a Stoic geographer who did indeed collect geographical information in a work entitled *Concerning the Inscriptions Which Are to be Found in Various Cities*. Since, however, this was a work which dealt primarily, as can be seen from its title, with inscriptions rather than geography, it is far more likely that the source used by Athenaeus was Scylax rather than Polemon.
(c. A.D. 200) in his *Life of Apollonius of Tyana* (3.47), while discussing various strange-looking humans which lived in faraway lands, states Scylax as an authority on such matters and even says that Scylax had more than one book written.

The Suda, which was written sometime in the 10th century A.D., gives a list of several books it ascribes to Scylax. Unfortunately, these books are not all, if any, authentic. The work entitled *A Reply to Polybius' History* (*Ἀντιγραφὴ πρὸς τὴν Πολυβίου Ἱστορίαν*) cannot have been written before the 2nd century B.C. since it is known that this is the time when Polybius flourished, and the one which was known as *A Periplus* of the Lands outside the Pillars of Hercules (*Περὶπλους τῶν ἐκτος τῶν Ἡρακλέους Στηλῶν*) sounds as if it might have been the work of the author who wrote the much later and more famous *Periplus* falsely ascribed to Scylax. In fact, it might even have been the latter section itself of this treatise which does indeed describe the western coast of Africa. The two works from the Suda list which can perhaps be ascribed to Scylax are *A Map of the World* (*Γῆς Περιοδος*), which seems to have been

---

76 Under heading "Skylax" (Σκύλαξ).

77 Or, *A Coastal Description*.

78 For more information on this *Periplus* and its authenticity see below, pp. 33 ff.

79 Jacoby has suggested that it might be identical to the work on India but this would be stretching the words "outside the Pillars of Hercules" too far. See vol. 3:C:2, p. 589.
a popular subject for the Ionians,\textsuperscript{80} and Concerning Heracleides, the King of the Mylasians (Ţα κατά Ἡρακλείδην τῶν Μυλασσῶν βασιλέα). This last work which, no doubt, referred to the Carian leader responsible for ambushing the Persians during the Ionian revolt\textsuperscript{81} could conceivably have been written by Scylax for two reasons: the date of its subject matter was contemporaneous with Scylax, and it dealt with a fellow Carian, thus giving Scylax an opportunity to exalt his own people.\textsuperscript{82}

Tzetzes (12th century A.D.) in his Chiliades (7.621) also mentions a certain book written by Scylax on India and on the peoples living there. In it, he tells us, are descriptions of the strange inhabitants of this land such as the "Monophthalmoi" (one-eyed),\textsuperscript{83} the "Sciapodes" (shadow-footed) whose feet were so big that they would lift them up and use them as umbrellas against the sun's rays when lying down, the "Otoliknoi", men whose ears were so

\textsuperscript{80}Anaximander of Miletus (610-540 B.C.) is said to have been the first to draw a map of the earth. Hecataeus is also credited with making a map, perhaps the very one which Aristagoras of Miletus (c. 500 B.C.) showed to the Lacedaemonians. For further information on as well as ancient references to the first two see G. S. Kirk, J. E. Raven, and M. Schofield, The Presocratic Philosophers, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1957; 2nd edition, 1983), pp. 104-105. For Aristagoras see Herodotus 5.49.

\textsuperscript{81}See Herodotus 5.121.

\textsuperscript{82}For a different opinion on the authenticity and date of this work see Niebuhr, "On the Age of the Coast-Describer, Scylax of Caryanda," trans. into English from the German in Philological Museum 1 (1832), pp. 263-264.

\textsuperscript{83}Megasthenes also speaks of them. See Strabo 2.1.9.
large that they resembled winnowing fans, and the "Henotiktontes". This treatise on India actually sounds very similar to the book described by Philostratus and it is not unlikely that the two authors were referring to the same work. The problem with this book, however, is that it dealt with fabulous creatures living in India while at the same time was ascribed to a man who actually went there and explored the region personally. It seems, therefore, that the work referred to by Philostratus and Tzetzes does not in reality belong to Scylax but rather to Ctesias, whom we know to have dwelled extravagantly on such fables.

The two references made to Scylax by Strabo (14.2.20) and Stephanus (Ethnica "Caryanda"), which simply say that Scylax was an old writer/logographer, probably refer not to the actual Scylax of Caryanda but rather to the man who wrote the much later geographical treatise called the Periplus and who had been falsely named Scylax of Caryanda. For convenience' sake, however, this writer will be referred to as Pseudo-Scylax.

---

84 The word "Henotiktonton" (Ἠνοτικτόντων), here in the Genitive Plural Case as it appears in the text, does not seem to make any sense unless Kiessling's emendation to "Enotokoiton" (Ἑνοτοκοίτων) is accepted, in which case the word would literally mean "they who have a bed-chamber in their ears", referring in other words to men whose ears are so large that they can use them as blankets. For other references to the Enotokoitones see Megasthenes' reports in Strabo 2.1.9 and 15.1.57.

85 Further evidence for this is that Scylax is quoted by Tzetzes as professing everything he has said to be true-this is exactly what Ctesias says at the end of his book (49b.31.39 ff.).

86 Or, National Affairs.

87 For the full text of the Periplus in the original Greek along with both a Latin translation and a commentary in Latin see Müller, vol. 1, pp. 15 ff.
9. Periplus of Pseudo-Scylax

The Periplus of Pseudo-Scylax is a geographical treatise of the whole Mediterranean basin and a part of Africa's western sea coast. It was written as a guide to sailors and was helpful in describing where all the harbours were and how many days' sailing or stadia\(^88\) they were from one another. It seems to have been known as early as Strabo, who also mentions the author as being Scylax of Caryanda (12.4.8, 13.1.4).

The Attic dialect, however, in which it is written betrays almost immediately the falsity of the authorship. A closer examination of the cities it refers to shows that it was written much after Scylax' time. Firstly, the mention of the city of Thurii in Italy does not allow a dating for this work to precede 444 B.C. (the year of Thurii's founding) while the lack of any mention of Alexandria shows that it could not have been written after the conquests of Alexander. It was by looking at the cities in this work and relating their description to what is known about their history that Bunbury was able to fix a more accurate date.\(^89\)

Since the town of the Epicnemidian Locrians was described as

---

\(^{88}\)"Stadia", or rather, as it appears in the singular, "stadion" (στάδιον), was a unit of measure used by the ancient Greeks to determine distances. It was equivalent to 606.75 English feet.

belonging to the Phocians (ch. 61), who did not gain control of this city until 353 B.C.\textsuperscript{90}, and Olynthus, which we know to have been destroyed in 347 B.C., was mentioned as still existing (ch. 66), the \textit{Periplus} must have been written sometime during the six year span in between.\textsuperscript{91}

10. Conclusion

In the end this much can be said concerning the subject matter of Herodotus' passage: sometime between the years 516 and 511 B.C., Darius the Great must have sent out two expeditions. The first one had as its purpose the exploration of the southern section of the Indus valley region for the purpose of finding out both if this country was worth conquering, and at what point the Indus flowed into the sea. One of its crew members, if not the captain himself, was an Ionian Greek by the name of Scylax of Caryanda. With his crew he went first to the region of north-eastern Afghanistan, and then from there proceeded on to the Indus

\textsuperscript{90}Bunbury does not give the name of the town. It was, no doubt, Thronium (Θρόνιον), which was indeed captured by the Phocians in 353 B.C. under the leadership of Onomarchus.

presumably by either going through the Khyber Pass or sailing down the well-known tributary of the Indus, the Kabul River, the former being more likely when the verb tenses Herodotus uses in his description are closely examined. From there he sailed all the way to the mouth of the Indus while taking notes of what he saw along the way. Once at its mouth he turned right and sailed in a westerly direction along the coast until he reached, it seems, the Persian Gulf where he made his report to the Persian king resulting in the end with the annexation of this region to the Persian Empire.

The second expedition, which most likely happened just after Scylax finished his, was sent to explore the Ganges River and to find out how long it would take to sail from its mouth to Egypt. Setting out then, no doubt from the city of Caspatyros in Kashmir, it sailed down the Ganges and then travelled from its mouth in a westerly direction along the coast to the mouth of the Red Sea at which point it turned northwards and continued sailing until it reached the Gulf of Suez—a journey which took 30 months to complete. Scylax probably did not accompany this expedition as can be seen by the lack of any published Greek treatise on this part of the world. This is not the case, however, with the Indus expedition which did, in fact, produce a book describing the Indus valley. Although it itself as a whole does not survive, fragments of it in the form of quotations by ancient authors who bear

92 See n. 57 above.
93 See n. 71 above.
testimony to both its existence and its authorship do exist.

These two expeditions must have been made known to Herodotus either by someone who was on them, by second-hand reports, by a written account of them, or even perhaps by Persian records which no longer exist. Their details, however, must have differed. The source on the Indus expedition seems to have mentioned the Indus without making a note on, or at least emphasizing, the direction it was flowing for the main reason that this was already known from the northern section of this river which already formed part of the Persian Empire. Nor does it seem to have mentioned the time it took it to reach the Persian Gulf, no doubt because this was not part of its mission. It does seem, however, to have referred to the land of Pactyice as being the region through which Scylax passed in order to reach the Indus.

The report for the Ganges expedition mentioned the easterly flow of the river, since it was not already known (and would therefore have been a detail worth stressing), the 30 month period it took it to reach Egypt, and Caspatyros as being the city from which the expedition set out before sailing down the Ganges. It might even have mentioned Pactyice as the region through which it must have passed before reaching Kashmir. The two points at which the sources for both these expeditions might have been identical are where they may have mentioned the land of Pactyice as the region through which the expeditions must have passed to get to Gandhara, and the crocodiles which dwelled in both rivers.

---

94See n. 74 above.
Herodotus, then, learning both accounts, confused the two. He must have seen that they happened relatively close to one another in time, that they passed through Pactyice, and that they both dealt with an expedition down a river which was inhabited by crocodiles, which lay east of the Hindu Kush, and which then ran down towards the sea. Believing then, as he did, that only one river existed in India, he concluded that the two accounts referred to one and the same expedition. Even if the Ganges had been given a specific name, by the sources which Herodotus was using, to differentiate it from the Indus, Herodotus must have taken it as nothing more than a variant of the same name. He then attributed the eastward flowing direction of the Ganges to the Indus, and the 30 month long trip of the Ganges expedition to that of the Indus. The very belief which prevailed among the ancient Greeks after Herodotus that India had only one river, the Indus, and that this flowed towards the east ought to be attributed to Herodotus. This indeed was the one belief concerning India which remained steadfast and unchanged until Alexander the Great went over there himself and proved to the Greek world that the Indus flowed towards the west and that India, in fact, had not one river, but two.

95 It should not be forgotten here that "Indus" simply means "river" in Sanskrit, and that if this piece of information was known by Herodotus, the name of the Ganges could easily have been understood by him as being the true name of the Indus. For "Indus" meaning "river", see Introduction below, n. 1.
II. HECATAEUS OF MILETUS

1. His Life and Works

Hecataeus of Miletus was born, according to the Suda, during the 65th Olympiad. Since the Olympics began in, or at least started to be dated from, 776 B.C., this would mean sometime between 520 and 516 B.C. He was a student of Protagoras and seems to have used and adapted Acusilaos' writings. He is also credited with drawing a map of the known world (rivig), of writing a description of all the lands which lie in Europe, Asia, and Africa,

---

1"Hecataeus" (Ἐκαταῖος)/fragment 1 in Jacoby, Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker, vol. 1:A, p. 1. All references to Hecataeus dating from Antiquity and continuing down to the Byzantine era can be found in this volume of Jacoby.

2There seems to be a dispute as to the meaning of the word which the author of the Suda uses for "born". The word in Greek is "gegone" (γέγονε) which is the Perfect tense of the verb "gignomai" (γίγνομαι). This has been taken by Bunbury, A History of Ancient Geography, vol. 1, pp. 134-135, to mean "flourished" but an examination of the verb's meaning in other ancient Greek works clearly shows that it has the connotation of "to be born", "to start existing".


called *Periegesis* (Περιήγησις),\(^5\) no doubt to act as a guide to the map, and of putting together a mythological work known variously as *Genealogies*, *Histories*, and *Herology* (Γενεαλογία, Ιστορία, Ηρωολογία).\(^6\) In 499 B.C. he advised the Ionians not to revolt against the Persians, listing off all the lands under Persian rule as proof of their strength\(^7\) and perhaps even using the map he had already drawn to show them where all these lands were located. It must have been, no doubt, due to this position which he took as regards the revolt that he was chosen by the Ionians the following year, after the revolt had been put down by Darius, to act as ambassador to the Persians in order to negotiate peace talks.\(^8\)

### 2. His Map and *Periegesis*

He seems to have done a lot of travelling for he is called a "much-travelled man" (ἀνήρ πολυπλανής) by Agathemerus (*Geographical Information 1.1*).\(^9\) It is from these trips that it is to be assumed

---


\(^6\) The map and the *Periegesis* will be discussed below. For the *Genealogies/Histories/Herology*, see Jacoby, vol. 1:A, pp. 7-16.

\(^7\) Herodotus 5.36.

\(^8\) Diodorus 10.25.4.

\(^9\) Jacoby, vol. 1:A, p. 3, fr. 12a. It is known from Herodotus (2.143) that Hecataeus did visit Egypt but it is not sure whether he ventured into the interior of Europe, Asia, or Africa. Bunbury, vol. 1, p. 137, n. 7, believes that Hecataeus probably visited no place other than Egypt.
that he gained the experience needed to draw his map and write his Periegesis which, as Pearson properly points out, must have been written before 499 B.C., in other words, before the Ionian Revolt, for it would have been difficult for Hecataeus to list off all the countries under Persian rule (Herodotus 5.36) without such a map.

His map is attested by Agathemerus (1.1), and by the scholiast on Dionysius 'Periegetes' (p. 428) who, no doubt, acquired his information from Agathemerus, since he basically repeats what he says. Agathemerus says that Hecataeus was the second person after Anaximander of Miletus to draw a map of the world and that his map differed from Anaximander's only in that it was much more precise. As was mentioned above, it could also have very well been the map which Aristagoras of Miletus showed to the Lacedaemonians in 498 B.C. (Herodotus 5.49).

His Periegesis seems to have been written as a guide to his map. It was divided into two sections, the first being called Europe and dealing with this continent including Greece, and the second being known as Asia and dealing, it seems, with all the lands east of the Aegean, reaching all the way to India, as well as with Africa (Libya and Ethiopia). Both books seem to have

---


13See p. 31, n. 80.
described the peoples living in various regions and to have listed off the cities and towns in each area and their relative location to major landmarks. It is very probable that the Periegesis also described both the Ocean as encircling the whole world and the continent of Asia as being the same size as Europe, for Herodotus mentions in a rather derisory fashion certain such Periegeses (4.36) which were current in his time and which described just that. Dionysius of Halicarnassus, who wrote in the 1st century B.C., had access to it. He describes it as being divided according to nations and cities, and as giving an account of the history, traditions, and legends of these areas, but as being shorter than the work of Herodotus (On Thucydides 5).

The book on Europe seems to be the one which was used by Herodotus when he cites Hecataeus as the main source for the story on the expulsion of the Pelasgians from Attica (6.137) as well as by Pliny when he mentions Hecataeus as the authority on the Hyperboreans (Natural History 6.20.55). As for his book on Asia, it seems to have been very well detailed, for the Greek grammarian and philosopher Agatharchides described in his book entitled Concerning the Red Sea Hecataeus and another scholar named Basil as being the main authorities on the lands which lie towards the East.

Even though the Periegesis is known to have existed at least

\[14\] This book, in fact, does not survive today but extracts, however, were taken from it by the 9th century A.D. Byzantine Patriarch Photius. See Photius' Bibliotheca 250, p. 454 b 30, or Jacoby, vol. 1:A, p. 3, fr. 14.
during Herodotus' time due to his mention of such a written work (6.137) and to the fact that he always refers to Hecataeus as a historian (2.143, 5.36, 5.125), the copy of the book which existed during the Hellenistic Period and which continued to be regarded as Hecataeus' right down to the time of Stephanus is questioned as to its authenticity. The debate seems to have been started by Callimachus, who worked at the Library of Alexandria in the 3rd century B.C. According to Athenaeus (2.70a),\textsuperscript{15} Callimachus, presumably in his book entitled Pinakes\textsuperscript{16} stated that the section of the Periegesis which dealt with Asia and which was ascribed to Hecataeus of Miletus should actually be attributed to a man called Nesiotes.

Eratosthenes, however, who was Callimachus' pupil and who became later head of the Library of Alexandria believed, according to Strabo (1.1.11),\textsuperscript{17} that the book which was ascribed to Hecataeus of Miletus, presumably the same work which Callimachus referred to, did actually belong to Hecataeus due to its similarity, no doubt in style, to the other works which were written by Hecataeus and which were known to be his. Strabo seems to accept this viewpoint (1.1.11) due to the fact that, unlike Athenaeus (2.70a, 9.410e)\textsuperscript{18}

\begin{footnotes}
\item[16] Or, Catalogues.
\item[18] Jacoby, vol. 1:A, pp. 3-4, fragments 15a and 15b respectively.
\end{footnotes}
and Arrian (Anabasis 5.6.5), who appear uncertain about the problem, he does not refute or show the least doubt about its authorship. Nor should it be forgotten that Dionysius of Halicarnassus had read the book and also had no doubts about its authenticity (On Thucydides 5). The debate has continued amongst modern scholars, namely C. G. Cobet, and J. Wells, who believe that it is a forgery, and H. Diels, who argues for its authenticity. For the sake of argument, however, the authenticity of Hecataeus' Periegesis will be given the benefit of the doubt.

3. Fragments on India

The number of fragments which deal specifically with India are seven in total. They are:

Fr. 294a (Stephanus of Byzantium, "Gandarae"):

---

23 As can be seen below, six of the fragments are from Stephanus of Byzantium, the 6th century A.D. scholar from Constantinople to whom our indebtedness is immense, since, if it were not for him, nothing would have been known on Hecataeus' Indian section.
Gandarae: an Indian race. Hecataeus [says so] in [his book on] Asia. They are also called "Gandarii" by him and their land "Gandarian".\(^{24}\)

Fr. 294b (Stephanus of Byzantium, "Gandri"):  
Gandri: a Parthian race which was attacked by Dionysus, according to Dionysius in his 4th book of Bassarica.\(^{25}\) Hecataeus, however, calls them "Gandarae".\(^{26}\)

Fr. 295 (Stephanus of Byzantium, "Caspapyros"):  

Fr. 296 (Athenaeus 2.70b):  
And he (Hecataeus of Miletus) says that on the banks of the Indus River grows the artichoke.\(^{28}\)

Fr. 297 (Stephanus of Byzantium, "Argante"):  

\(^{24}\)Γανδάραι: Ἰνδῶν ἔθνος. Ἡκαταῖος Ἀσία. λέγονται καὶ Γανδάριοι παραστάτη καὶ Γανδαρική ἡ χώρα.

\(^{25}\)Or, Poems on the Legend of Bacchus.

\(^{26}\)Τάνδροι: ἔθνος Πάρθων ἀντιταξθέν Διονύσῳ, ὡς Διονύσιος Βασσαρικών δ'. Ἡκαταῖος δὲ Γανδάρας αὐτοῦς καλεῖ.

\(^{27}\)Κασπάπυρος: πόλις Γανδαρική. Σκυθῶν δὲ ἀκτῆ. Ἡκαταῖος Ἀσία.

\(^{28}\)καὶ περὶ τῶν Ἰνδῶν δὲ φησὶ ποταμὸν γίνεσθαι τὴν κυνάραν.
Argante: a city of India, according to Hecataeus.²⁹

Fr. 298  (Stephanus of Byzantium, "Calatiae"):

Fr. 299  (Stephanus of Byzantium, "Opiae"):
Opiae: an Indian race. Hecataeus [says so] in [his book on] Asia: "among these [people] live a [race] by the Indus River called the Opiae, and there is a royal fortress there. Up to this point are the Opiae. From this point onwards is desert, all the way to the Indian people".³¹

4. Gandarae/Gandarii

Fragment 294a deals with an Indian race variously known by Hecataeus as the "Gandarae" or the "Gandarii". The earliest mention of them in Greek literature, apart from Hecataeus himself, is by Herodotus who describes them as belonging, along with the

²⁹'Αργάντη πόλις Ίνδιας, ως Έκαταιος.

³⁰'Καλατίαι: γένος Ίνδικών. Έκαταιος Άσια.

³¹'Ωπαι: ἔθνος Ίνδικόν. Έκαταιος Άσια: "ἐν δ᾽ αὐτοῖς οἰκείωσιν ἀνθρώποι παρὰ τὸν Ἰνδὸν ποταμὸν Ωπαῖ, ἐν δὲ τείχος βασιλέων. μέχρι τούτου Ωπαί· ἀπὸ δὲ τούτου ἑρμήν μέχρις Ἰνδῶν."
Sattagydae, the Dadicae, and the Aparytae, to the seventh satrapy of Darius' empire (3.91), as paying, along with these people, a tribute of 170 talents (3.91), and as being assigned to the same contingent of Xerxes' army as the Dadicae (7.66). According to Ptolemy, the Gandarae are to be located in the land between the River "Suastus" (Σούστας) and the Indus (7.1.44). Since the Suastus is, no doubt, the same as the modern "Swat" river, the northern tributary of the Kabul River, this area should lie somewhere to the north of the point where the Kabul and the Indus meet.

Strabo, however, writes about a land called "Gandaris" (Γανδαρίς) which was governed by a man named Porus II, nephew of the Porus who fought Alexander the Great, and which was located east of the river Acesines (Ἄκεσινῆς (15.1.30)). Since the Acesines is most commonly identified with the Chenab River, one of the major tributaries of the Indus, the region known by Strabo as "Gandaris" should be located in the West Punjab.

There is even a second region mentioned by Strabo, which resembles "Gandaris", called "Gandaritis" (Γανδαρίτης) through which the River Choaspes flows before it joins up with the River Cophen (Κόφην (15.1.26)). Since it is now generally accepted that the Cophen was the modern Kabul River the Choaspes ought to be identified with one of its major tributaries. Since only two

---

32 See Vaux' article, "Suastene," *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Geography*. 
tributaries are large enough to be worth recording, namely the Chitral and the Swat, the region at Gandaritis mentioned by Strabo most likely lies just to the north of the Kabul, either in the Chitral or in the Swat valley, the former being more likely, inasmuch as the Chitral is by far the larger of the two rivers. Strabo is obviously making a distinction between Gandaritis and Gandaris, the latter being probably the region Ptolemy has in mind when he mentions the land of the Gandarai. The astounding similarity of the words "Gandaris" and "Gandaritis", however, cannot be passed over as just coincidence. They most likely refer to one and the same area. This region, as can be seen from the Persian inscription of Behistun which dates to c. 516 B.C.,\(^{33}\) was known as "Gandara"/"Gandhara". The difference, therefore, in the names "Gandaris" and "Gandaritis" could simply be due to the appellation of this area by peoples of different dialects.

This area of Gandhara, then, encompassed at least all of the West Punjab on the east and the eastern half of the Kabul valley and its adjoining northern regions on the west. Its people, as mentioned by Hecataeus, were of Indian stock, carried with them, according to Herodotus (7.66), the same equipment in Xerxes' army as the Bactrians, that is, a Median-like head-dress, bows made of reed and short spears, and, as Wilson points out,\(^{34}\) could very well have been the ancestors of the modern tribes living in the Hindu Kush mountains, known today as the "Hazaras".

\(^{33}\)For reference to this inscription see below, p. 13, n. 13.

\(^{34}\)Ariana Antiqua, p. 131.
5. Gandri

Fragment 294b deals with a people called the "Gandri". They were Parthians, according to Stephanus, and seemed to have been involved in a battle with the god Dionysus. Stephanus' main source for this legend was a Greek author whose name was, quite coincidentally, Dionysius. There are several authors by that name who could have written the work entitled Bassarica which was ascribed to this Dionysius but the one who is generally accepted as the author is the one known as "Periegetes" (Περιηγητής) which means "the Guide" in Greek.\(^{35}\) He is believed to have lived in the 2nd century A.D. and is known to have written a Periegesis, or "description", of the known world (Οἰκουμένης Περιήγησις).\(^{36}\) Bassarica is not the only work attributed to him for there are also the Lithica (Λιθικά) which dealt with various types of stone, the Ornithiaca (Ορνιθιακά), a book on birds, and the Gigantias (Γιγαντιας) which pertained to myths surrounding the Giants. None of these last works, including the Bassarica, exist in their full form anymore. Fragments, however, of the Bassarica as found in

\(^{35}\)The conclusion that Dionysius 'Periegetes' was the author of this work seems to be rather recent, for earlier scholarship attributed the work to the Hellenistic mythographer Dionysius of Samos. See Müller, Geographi Graeci Minores, vol. 2, p. xxvi.

\(^{36}\)For the full text in the original Greek with a Latin translation, see Müller, vol. 2, pp. 103-176.
Stephanus, have been collected by Müller\textsuperscript{37} and give a general idea of what the book was about. It seems to have dealt, at least in part, with the military exploits in India of the god Dionysus who is seen launching a military campaign against various peoples and cities there. The legend itself, or at least a form of it, seems to go as far back as the 5th century B.C. where the playwright Euripides, in his play \textit{Bacchanals} (line 15), portrayed the god Dionysus as having just arrived from the Far East, namely Bactria, the land just west of Gandhara.

The legend next appears in the work of the 4th century B.C. writer Megasthenes. Megasthenes had been sent several times to India by Alexander the Great's successor in the East, Seleucus I, to establish a treaty between Chandragupta, the ruler of the kingdom of Maurya, and the Hellenistic monarch, and to gather at the same time information on that part of the world. He collected everything he learned in a book entitled \textit{Indica}, of which only fragments exist today.\textsuperscript{38} Part of fragment 4 (Diodorus 2.38.3-7)\textsuperscript{39} describes the legend of Dionysus' arrival from the West as it was current among the Indians of Megasthenes' time. According to the legend, this god, arriving with a large army, overtook India and established his rule there until he died 52 years later, leaving

\textsuperscript{37}Vol. 2, pp. xxvii-xxviii.

\textsuperscript{38}All of these existing fragments can be found in Jacoby, vol. 3:C:2, pp. 604-639. For a translation, see J. W. McCrindle's \textit{Ancient India as Described by Megasthenes and Arrian}.

\textsuperscript{39}Pp. 608-609 in vol. 3:C:2 of Jacoby, and pp. 34-36 in McCrindle's translation.
the kingdom to his sons.

As for the date of Dionysus' campaign, Megasthenes, or at least what is left of Megasthenes' work, does not say anything more specific other than that it happened "in the most ancient times" (ἐν τοῖς ἀρχαίοις χρόνοις). Arrian however, who repeats the legend, gives the date of 153 kings, or 6042 years, before the time of Chandragupta (323 B.C.), known by the Greeks as "Sandracottus" [Σανδράκοτος (Indica 9.9-10)].

Diodorus (3.63-65) brings forward the idea that this Dionysus could have actually been a historical figure who had divine honours bestowed upon him as a result of his achievements. Arrian more or less adopts the same view with the pious precaution of not denying altogether the possibility that this Dionysus may have been the god himself (Anabasis 5.1.1-2 and 5.3.4), even though Eratosthenes in the 3rd century B.C. rejected the whole validity of the legend (Arrian, Anabasis 5.3.4). Whether this pre-Alexander campaign by a Westerner against India happened or not, the legend seems to have been current among the Greek world from at least the time of Euripides. A closer look at Hecataeus' fragment 294b, however, may change that viewpoint.

Stephanus makes a distinction between the "Gandarae" of fragment 294a and the "Gandri" of fragment 294b. As he sees it, the Gandarae are of Indian stock whereas the Gandri are of

---

40Anabasis 5.1, 5.2, 5.3.4, 6.3.4, 6.28.1-2, 7.20.1, and Indica 1.1.4-7, 1.5.8-10, 1.7.4-9, 1.9.9-10.

41See above, p. 50.
Parthian. According to him, however, Hecataeus called the "Gandri", "Gandarae". In order for Stephanus to make this statement there must have been a certain detail about the people which are named "Gandri" by Dionysius 'Periegetes' which was ascribed to the Gandarae by Hecataeus. It is very probable that this detail was the battle with Dionysus. Therefore, it would not be highly unlikely if this battle was first mentioned by Hecataeus, was described as taking place between Dionysus and the Gandarae who were Indians, and that Stephanus, seeing that this same battle was described in the Bassarica of Dionysius 'Periegetes' as occurring between Dionysus and the Gandri who were Parthians, concluded that Hecataeus called the "Gandri", "Gandarae". Whether these Gandri were of Indian or Parthian stock cannot be ascertained.\textsuperscript{42} The only thing that is certain is that Hecataeus believed that the people who were named centuries later "Gandri" by Dionysius 'Periegetes' were the same as the "Gandarae"; in other words, they were Indians. If, then, Hecataeus did describe this battle, he would have been both the first person, as far as one can know, in the Greek world to talk about it and therefore the most likely source for Euripides when he described Dionysus as having arrived from that part of the world.

6. Caspapyros

\textsuperscript{42}Due to the similarity, however, of the name "Gandri" to "Gandarae", the former is more likely.
Fragment 295 deals with the city of "Caspapyros" which is described as being in Gandhara and located "on the shore of the Scythians" (Σκυθῶν δὲ ἄκτη). As for the location of this city, enough has been said in the previous chapter. Only the much-disputed term "shore of the Scythians" will be looked at here. There seem to be four different translations of this term.

The first and most accepted is the one proposed by Markwart in 1905 which interprets the expression as "coast of the Scythians". According to Markwart, there were Scythians, namely the "Saka Haumavarga", living at that time in the area between Bactria and Gandhara. Caspapyros then, being located "on the coast" of these people must have been a port situated on the banks of a river. Supporters of this view are Junge, who differs from Markwart's belief only insofar as he believes that it was the Saka "Tigrakhauda" rather than the Saka "Haumavarga" who were living in this area, Litvinskij, and Tucci.

---

43See below, pp. 14 ff.

44Josef Markwart, Untersuchungen zur Geschichte von Erān (Leipzig: 1905), vol. 2, pp. 140 and 242. This as well as all other references to arguments over the meaning of "shore of the Scythians" have been taken from P. Daffinå's "On Kaspapyros and the So-Called 'Shore of the Scythians'," Acta Antiqua 28 (1980), pp. 1-8.


Herrmann,\textsuperscript{48} refusing to believe that there were Scythians living in this part of the world at that time, adopted Wilhelm Sieglin's emendation of the Greek word for "shore", "akte" (\(\acute{a}k\tau\eta\)), to "antie" (\(\acute{a}v\tau\i\eta\)) which literally means "across from", rendering the term "shore of the Scythians" to "across from the Scythians".\textsuperscript{49} He understood this to mean that Caspapyros was located on the same longitude as, literally "on the other side of", the Scythians of Southern Russia.

Herzfeld\textsuperscript{50} preferred to retain the original reading of "akte", translating it as "coast-line" and believing this word to mean "latitude" thereby interpreting the phrase as meaning that Caspapyros lay on the same latitude as the Scythians.

Markwart's viewpoint cannot be accepted for the following reason: there are no traces of any Scythians living in that part of the world, neither during the 5th century B.C. nor during Alexander the Great's time, whose chroniclers mention no such people in that area. Nor is Herrmann's argument a strong one, inasmuch as it is based on a totally hypothetical and, as will be seen soon, 

\textsuperscript{48}A. Herrmann, "Kaspapyros," \textit{Paulys Realencyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft}.

\textsuperscript{49}Jacoby also accepts this emendation and even proposes that the Greek verb "keitai" (\(\kappa\epsilon\tau\i\alpha\i\)) which literally means "lies" might have originally been written after "antie", rendering the phrase "lies across from the Scythians".

\textsuperscript{50}Ernst Emil Herzfeld, \textit{Archäologische Mitteilungen aus Iran}, vol. 4 (Sakastān) (1931-1932), p. 10 and \textit{The Persian Empire} (Edited from the posthumous papers by Gerold Walser. Wiesbaden: F. Steiner, 1968), p. 338, n. 5. This theory is also strongly supported by Daffinā as can be seen from his article, n. 44 above.
unnecessary emendation. Nowhere in Greek literature does the word "antie" mean "longitude", or even "latitude", a fact which nullifies Herzfeld's theory as well.

All of these theories are unacceptable for the following argument: their authors have attempted to give the word "akte" a specific meaning, such as "shore", "coast-line", etc., without realizing that the word actually has a general one. All it means is "edge". It can refer to a coast-line simply because it is the "edge" of a piece of land, just as it can refer to a boundary because it is the "edge" of a certain territory. Therefore, the phrase "Skython de akte" (Σκυθων δέ ἀκτη) should be translated as literally "edge of the Scythians", no doubt meaning, as can be seen from the context, "borderline of the Scythians". In other words, Caspapyros was located at the very boundary between the land of Scythia and that of Gandhara. This does not mean, however, that there were Scythians in that part of the world in the 5th century B.C. The phrase is unquestionably a gloss inserted there by some later author, perhaps Stephanus himself. It could be a geographical mistake made by someone whose notion of the Scythians may have been one of a people lying so far to the east that any country farther than them could only have been India itself, it could be a reference to the later presence of Scythians/Sakas in that area in the 1st century B.C., or, as is more likely, it could refer to the "Ephthalite" Huns\(^5\) who are known to have invaded

\(^5\)Also known as the "White" Huns.
Kashmir, Gandhara, and the Kabul valleys before the time that Stephanus was writing (6th century A.D.) and who were often called "Scythians" by Byzantine scholars ever since the 4th century A.D.

7. Artichoke Plant

Fragment 296 deals with a reference to the artichoke plant as growing by the Indus. Inasmuch as, according to Athenaeus (2.70b-c), Scylax is reported to have recorded the same information as to the location of this plant by this river, one may conclude that Hecataeus' source here was Scylax' own book. Hence a further argument for the existence of this book and an indication that one of Hecataeus' sources, if not the main one, was Scylax himself.

8. Argante

Fragment 297 makes reference to a certain city of India called "Argante" ('Αργάντη). There are two areas in modern Afghanistan which bear a name similar to this. The first is "Arghandab" which is located c. 25 km north of the city Kandahar. Although its name is very similar to Hecataeus' "Argante", it is too far west to have been seriously considered a city of India.
The second area is known today as "Arghandeh".\(^52\) It lies c. 35.4 km (22 mi) west of Kabul (68° 55' E, 34° 30' N) and is therefore located much closer to India than the area of Arghandab and could very well have been considered a part of it, since Gandhara came very close, if not actually encompassed, this region. Its name also resembles much more Hecataeus' "Argante" than the area of Arghandab. It was located on the main route leading to the major city of Kabul, and would therefore have been seen by anyone travelling to ancient Kabul from Persia. Its location amongst the Hindu Kush mountains also plays a strong role in favour of its connection with Argante, for, according to Ptolemy (6.18.5), there was a city by the name of "Arguda" (Ἀργοῦδα) situated among the "Paropanisadae" (Παροπανισάδαι) which was the term with which the ancient Greeks referred to the inhabitants of the Hindu Kush.\(^53\) Since "Arguda" resembles "Argante", it is not inconceivable, then, that "Arguda" is in reality a corruption of "Argante" and that Ptolemy was referring to the same city as Hecataeus.

\(^{52}\)This area is today so small that only a highly detailed map is likely to show it. The one used here is No. 38.B which was published in 1913 by the British Military Intelligence Section of the Department of National Defence under the direction of Colonel T. F. B. Renny-Tailyour, Officiating Surveyor General of India.

\(^{53}\)It was also spelled as "Paropamisadae" (Παροπαμισάδαι) and "Parapamisadae" (Παραπαμισάδαι). The mountains in which they lived, the Hindu Kush, were known to the Greeks variously as "Paropanisus" (Παροπάνισος), "Paropamisus" (Παροπάμισος), and "Parapamisus" (Παραπάμισος). The other name by which the ancient Greeks referred to these mountains was "Caucasus" (Καύκασος). The difference between the two terms, as pointed out by Wilson, *Ariana Antiqua*, pp. 180-181, seems to have been that whereas "Paropanisus" was used for the whole range, "Caucasus" referred to the highest peak.
9. Calatiae

Fragment 298 deals with an Indian people called the "Calatiae" (Καλατιαι). They are, no doubt, the same race as the "Callatiae" (Καλλατιαι) of Herodotus 3.38 and, with a slightly different spelling, the "Callantiae" (Καλλαντιαι) of Herodotus 3.97, both of whom are labelled as "Indians". The description by Herodotus in 3.97 of the Callantiae as having semen "black like that of the Ethiopians" could very well have been the result of a misunderstanding of the meaning of their name, for, as A. D. Godley properly points out, "Kala" is Sanskrit for "black".

Their anthropophagic customs as described by Herodotus in 3.38 have much in common with another Indian race called the "Padaei" (Παδαι), also spoken of by Herodotus (3.99). To both is attributed the practice of killing the old members of their tribe and eating them. The only differences between the two is that, according to Herodotus' descriptions, the Calatiae are only

---

54 Cf. 3.101.


56 In fact, these customs are attributed by Herodotus to various non-Indian tribes as well, such as the Massagetae and Issedones (1.216 and 4.26 respectively) who dwelled just east of the Caspian Sea, and by Strabo to the Irish (4.5.4). Kartunnen however, p. 199, says that this specific custom of eating old and sick relatives "seems to be unattested in Indian literature".
described as eating their parents when they have reached old age while the Padaei are described as killing and eating their closest friends not only when they are old but when they are sick as well.\textsuperscript{57}

The location of the Calatiae is difficult to determine. Herodotus relates how all the Indians who have black seed like the Ethiopians dwell "a far distance from the Persians, towards the direction of the south wind, and were never subjects of King Darius" (3.101). If this description includes the Calatiae, then their likely position would have been somewhere towards the interior of the Indian subcontinent. If they were neighbors of the Padaei, since they shared customs, then their likely location would very well have been the interior since the Padaei are described by Herodotus as dwelling east of the fish-eating Indian tribe which dwelled by the river marshes of the Indus, very likely the Indus Delta itself (3.98-99).\textsuperscript{58} Megasthenes, however, mentions a people, who eat the bodies of their dead relatives, as living in the Caucasus (Hindu Kush),\textsuperscript{59} and Ptolemy mentions a "land of the Pandoui" (ἡ Πανδοοὺων χώρα)\textsuperscript{60} as being situated around the river

\textsuperscript{57}It is, however, possible that this appearance of differences between the two could be due to the insufficient amount of information which Herodotus gives and that the two had in reality the same customs.

\textsuperscript{58}See Kartunnen, pp. 198-199, for a different interpretation of Herodotus' placement of the Padaei.

\textsuperscript{59}Jacoby, vol. 3:C:2, p. 631, fr. 27b/Strabo 15.1.56.

\textsuperscript{60}7.1.46.
"Bidaspes", which is, no doubt, the same as the Hydaspes, the ancient Greek name for the Jhelum, the famous Indus tributary.

As can be seen by these various arguments, the location of these Calatiae could have been as far south as the area east of the Indus, or as far north as the Hindu Kush or the Western Punjab. The only thing which can be said for certain, if Herodotus is to be trusted here, is that they were an Indian people who practised a form of cannibalism which seemed completely abhorrent to any Greek but perfectly acceptable and even pious to themselves.\(^{61}\)

10. Opiae

Fragment 299 deals with an Indian race called the "Opiae". A part of them\(^{62}\) are depicted as living by the Indus, as having a royal fortress, and as being located west of a desert. The royal fortress is, no doubt, a Persian one like the kind which were used at or near borders and very similar to the Persian one which is described by Herodotus (7.59) as being situated in Thrace and which is called by Herodotus a "teichos basileion" (τεῖχος βασιλίων), the very same name which Hecataeus gives to the one in the land of the Opiae.

The great desert which lay beyond this area, "all the way to

\(^{61}\)See Herodotus 3.38.

\(^{62}\)The reason why it is believed that only a section of them lived by the Indus will be described below, pp. 61 ff.
the Indians", could only have been the same desert which is reported by Herodotus as being located east of the Indians (3.98), with the only difference here being Hecataeus' belief that there were still other Indians living on the other side of it as opposed to Herodotus' which was that there was nothing beyond it. The only desert which is most likely to have been met by anyone travelling to India would have been the "Great Indian Desert" which is located just east of the Indus. This would greatly fit Hecataeus' report of Indian races living on either side of it. From Hecataeus' description it would seem that this particular group of Opiae were located somewhere in the area which encompassed the Indus, which lay west of the Great Indian Desert, and which was situated within the boundaries of the Persian Empire, in other words somewhere around the northern section of the Indus.63

One need not, however, be restricted to Hecataeus' passage for locating the Opian people for Stephanus makes reference to their territory when he describes a city of Alexandria as being situated "in the Opian land, towards India" (ἐν τῇ Ὀπιανῇ κατὰ τὴν Ἰνδικῆν).64 Since this Alexandria could only have been the same Alexandria which is mentioned by Pliny (6.21.62) and Arrian (Anabasis 3.28.4, and 4.22.3) as being located somewhere in the

63 This does, however, cause some confusion due to the fact that Gandhara was known to have existed in this area. It would seem, therefore, that if the Opiae lived in Gandhara, then they either made up part of the Gandharan race or simply lived in their territory.

64 See heading "Alexandria". This is, in fact, the only other reference to these people in ancient or Byzantine literature.
Caucasus/Paropanisus mountains (Hindu Kush), it would seem that the Opiae lived as far west as this area. To know, therefore, just how much they had penetrated into these mountains, one would have to find out just where this Alexandria was.

According to Arrian (Anabasis 3.28.4), Alexander, on his way to Bactria, founded a city of Alexandria at the Hindu Kush. The whereabouts of this city is difficult to determine from Arrian's information for in this passage he insinuates that it was founded just before Alexander crossed the Hindu Kush while in another passage (Anabasis 4.22.3-4) he says that Alexander, upon his return from Bactria, revisited this city which was located "amongst the Parapamisadae". If one takes into consideration the fact that Alexander, according to Diodorus (17.83.1-2), took sixteen days to travel from the south side of the Hindu Kush to the north side, but that, according to Arrian (Anabasis 4.22.3), it took him ten days to reach Alexandria from the northern side, it would be safe to conclude that the city of Alexandria was located somewhere in an area which was six days' march from the south side of the mountains and ten days' march from the northern one. In other words, Alexandria was situated somewhere just of bit south of the middle

This would be supported by Curtius' remark that Alexandria was founded "at the foot of the mountain" [in radicibus montis (7.3.21)]. Pliny's description of Alexandria as being located at the foot of the Caucasus (6.21.62) would also seem to support this unless one were to accept Wilson's view that "Caucasus" only referred to the highest peak of the Hindu Kush rather than the whole range itself (n. 53 above).
of the Hindu Kush range.\textsuperscript{66}

Pliny gives even more specific information on the location of Alexandria for he says (6.21.61) that this city of Alexandria was situated 50 Roman miles from the city of "Ortospana" (Ὅρτοσπανα). Since one Roman mile is equal to 5,000 Roman feet, which in turn is equal to 4,854 English feet, then 50 Roman miles would be equivalent to 242,700 English feet, or 70.77 kilometers. If, therefore, Ortospana can be located, then Alexandria ought to be about 70 km from it, thus giving an idea of the extent of the territory which the Opiae inhabited. According to Strabo (11.8.9 and 15.2.8), Ortospana\textsuperscript{67} is a city which lay in the Paropamisadae at a place where three roads from Bactria met.\textsuperscript{68} Ortospana is generally identified with the modern city of Kabul due to this last description. As Lassen points out\textsuperscript{69}, there are three roads which

\textsuperscript{66}The only thing which might pose a problem to this is Strabo's comment (15.1.26) that Alexander took a shorter route on his way back from Bactria. In reality however, no matter how short the route might have been, it could not have taken Alexander only ten days to cover a distance which otherwise would have taken sixteen.

\textsuperscript{67}It should be noted here that the name "Ortospana" is Casaubon's and later editors' emendation from "Orospana" (Ὅροσπανα), no doubt based on the form of this name as it appears in Strabo 11.8.9, Ptolemy 6.18.5, and Pliny, Natural History 6.21.61.

\textsuperscript{68}It should be pointed out here that Strabo's text actually says "Bactra" (Βάκτρα) referring to the city which was located in the region of "Bactria" (Βάκτρια). Strabo's report, then, of there being three separate roads starting from one city and ending in another would seem absurd unless one were to emend the genitive plural form of the word "Bactron" (Βάκτρων) here to "Bactrion" (Βάκτριων), thus taking Strabo's description as saying that the three roads came in reality from Bactria rather than from Bactra.

\textsuperscript{69}Indische Altertumskunde, vol. 1:1, p. 36, n. 1.
meet at Kabul and which indeed come from Bactria: the one going by the city of Bamian, the one which passes over the Hindu Kush, and the one which goes from Anderab to Khawar. Indeed, as Vaux shows, when Ptolemy says (6.18.5) that Ortospana is another name for "Kaboura" (Καβουρα), this city of Kaboura should be taken as nothing more than a corruption of "Kabul". That this city could have been known as "Kabul" by the ancient Greeks is not at all improbable especially since, as Lassen makes note of, there is a people mentioned by Ptolemy (6.18.3) who lived in the Paropanisadae and who were known as "Kabolitai" (Καβολίται). Since, then, Ortospana was most likely the city of Kabul, Alexandria would have been located within a 70 km radius from it, a placement which would correspond very well with its location already in an area just a bit south of the middle of the Hindu Kush. It is, as a result, very interesting to note that just 60 km north of Kabul and c. 3.2 km (2 mi) west of the city of Charikar

---

70 As can be seen from Lassen's viewpoint, Strabo's "Bactra" should be taken as "Bactria".

71 "Ortospana," Dictionary of Greek and Roman Geography.

72 As Vaux indicates, the word "Kaboura" appears only in some of the manuscripts. Others write "Karoura" but this should not cause any problems for the miscopying of a greek "b" (B) into a greek "r" (P) is not at all inconceivable.

73 Vol. 1:1, section 29.

74 As Vaux points out, "Kabolitai" is found only in the earlier edition of Ptolemy, for in the later one by C. F. A. Nobbe (1893) "Kabolitai" is changed to "Bolitai" (Βολίται).
(35° 2' N, 69° 8' E) there is an area today called "Opian". It would even be very possible that the ancient city of Alexandria was located just at this point for Masson describes seeing ruins of two capital cities in the area just surrounding Charikar. Whether it existed at that particular location or not, one thing is certain: the territory of the Opians extended at least this far west into the Hindu Kush mountains.

11. Conclusion

What has been found in the end about Hecataeus' knowledge of India from these seven fragments is that he was aware of the area of Gandhara which extended from the Kabul valley on the west all the way to modern Kashmir on the east, of the city of Caspapyros which was situated in Kashmir, of the city of Argante which was located just west of Kabul, on the road which one would normally have taken in ancient times to reach this city, of the Calatiaie who practised anthropophagic customs, and of the Opiae who lived by the Indus, either forming part of the Gandharan people or simply dwelling in their country and who, no doubt, lived as far west as

75 See map 38.E of the British Military Intelligence Section of the Department of National Defence which was published in 1915 under the direction of Colonel Sir S. G. Burrard, Surveyor General of India.

the area of Kabul. In other words, the Indian territory which was covered by Hecataeus started from at least an area just west of Kabul and continued all the way to modern Kashmir. He could have visited it himself, have gained all this knowledge from travelling merchants, or have used Scylax' writings for information on it, and even perhaps as a guide-book to help him around if indeed he did travel there. This last possibility would after all be the most logical thing to do if one wanted to visit this part of the world and there was at one's disposal a book written in one's own language and dialect on this area as it appeared to a fellow countryman who had already visited it not long before. It is difficult to say whether he used anyone else as a source for he mentions no one. Nonetheless, it should not be inconceivable that a man from Ionia, having heard of the exploits of a fellow Ionian in this area, felt the need to gain the fame which Scylax had gained, a reward which Hecataeus indeed received if not for his actual travels, at least for the information which he has left us on the ancient Greeks' knowledge of this remote land at that particular point in time.
III. HERODOTUS OF HALICARNASSUS

1. His Life

Herodotus, according to Dionysius of Halicarnassus (On Thucydidés 5), was born just before the commencement of the Persian Wars and lived right up to the time of the Peloponnesian War. Aulus Gellius (Attic Nights 15.23) is more specific and gives the date of 484 B.C. for Herodotus' birth, a date which would seem to contradict Dionysius' statement of Herodotus being born just before the Persian Wars (490 B.C.) unless, as Pritchett points out, one either emends Dionysius' phrase "a little before the Persian Wars" (δύτη πρότερον τά Περσικά) to "a little after the Persian Wars" (δύτη υπόπερον τά Περσικά) or takes the words "Persian War" to refer to Xerxes' expedition of 480 B.C. rather than Darius I's of 490 B.C. He is believed to have died in the Athenian colony of Thurii (Θωύριοι) sometime before 420 B.C. but is definitely known to have lived until 430 B.C. for he makes reference to certain events from

---


2According to the Suda, Herodotus might have died in Pella, Macedonia. See heading "Herodotus" (Ἡροδότος).
that period such as the execution of Aristeus of Corinth (7.137).  

2. His Travels

As for his travels outside of Halicarnassus, besides Samos (3.60) where he lived for a period of his life, he is known to have visited Egypt, Gaza (3.5), and Tyre (2.44) in the south, the Euphrates (1.185) and Babylon (1.178-183) in the east, Scythia (4.16, 4.81), the Bosporus (4.87), and Thasos (6.47) in the north, and Athens (5.77), Sicily, and southern Italy (4.15, 4.99) in the west. It must have been during his travels in the east that Herodotus obtained information on India. Although usage of Hecataeus' work on the same subject should not be excluded, it is known that Herodotus, during his travels in the Persian Empire, 

---

3This is, in fact, the only concrete piece of evidence for dating Herodotus' publication of the Histories as late as 430 B.C. It is generally believed, however, by scholars who compare other passages of Herodotus with contemporary events that Herodotus may have published as late as 425 B.C., and perhaps even later. The various arguments are given by David Sansone, "The Date of Herodotus' Publication," Illinois Classical Studies 10.1 (1985), pp. 1-9, who believes that the first four books and the beginning of the fifth were written and published before the mid-420s B.C. and that the rest of the Histories became published around the end of the Archidamian War (421 B.C.), J. A. S. Evans, "Herodotus' Publication Date," Athenaeum 57 (1979), pp. 145-149, who argues that Herodotus published at least as late as 424 B.C. but not much later, and Charles W. Fornara, "Evidence for the date of Herodotus' Publication," Journal of Hellenic Studies 91 (1971), pp. 25-34, as well as "Herodotus' Knowledge of the Archidamian War," Hermes 109 (1981), pp. 149-156, who argues for the even later date of 414 B.C.

acquired information either from merchants or Persian officials on this part of the world for his account is quite detailed and he does not hesitate to expressly state his Persian sources when they were being used.\(^5\) His description of India includes information on many aspects of this region, ranging from its topography and climate and extending to its wildlife and inhabitants,\(^6\) and is thus the most detailed Greek account of this part of the world which we have from the 5th century B.C.

3. Herodotus' Location of India and Indian Desert

Herodotus correctly describes India as lying farthest to the east of all the other nations known by either him or anyone else (3.98, 3.106, 4.40). His belief that there was a desert to the east of all the Indians (3.98, 4.40, and perhaps 3.102\(^7\)) is also partly correct, because, first of all, the only Indians about whom Herodotus could have had the most information would have been those

\(^5\)See 3.105 where the Persians are twice mentioned as a source.

\(^6\)All the references made by Herodotus to the country of India and all its aspects are: 1.192, 3.38, 3.94, 3.97-102, 3.104-106, 4.40, 4.44, 5.3, 7.65, 7.68, 7.85-86, 7.187, 8.113, and 9.31.

\(^7\)The desert mentioned by Herodotus in 3.102 may or may not have been the same desert which lies, according to Herodotus, to the east of India. If it is, then it would seem from this passage that it extended, in Herodotus' mind, to northern India. If on the other hand it is not the same desert, then it would seem odd that Herodotus does not expressly say that there was more than one desert in this country. Perhaps he was not sure himself.
living by the Indus, who were within the Persian Empire, and second, there is indeed a desert to the east of the Indus, the Great Indian Desert. Herodotus was wrong, however, in assuming that there was nothing beyond it.

4. India as a Persian Satrapy and its Tribute

According to Herodotus, India occupied the twentieth place in the list of satrapies (3.98). Its tribute, however, was enormous: 360 talents of gold dust (3.94), a sum which, as he points out, was greater than that paid by any other satrapy. Where the Indians obtained all this gold is, however, a problem. According to Herodotus, it was either mined (3.106), collected from

---

8It should be noted, however, that Herodotus was at least partly aware of the India which rested outside the Persian boundary for he mentions a certain Indian race which lived far to the south but which was never subject to King Darius (3.101) as well as another nation which dwelled east of the Indus (3.99).

9It should be pointed out here that Herodotus' satrapy list differs from the lists of people under Persian rule which are to be found on Persian monuments. This has been taken by O. Kimball Armayor, "Herodotus' Catalogues of the Persian Empire in the Light of the Monuments and the Greek Literary Tradition," Transactions of the American Philological Association 108 (1978), pp. 1-9, as an indication of inaccuracy on Herodotus' part over the satrapy list. He argues that the Persian list is the correct version and that Herodotus' is only the Greek idea of the number and types of Persian satrapies. The counter-argument has been brought forward by George G. Cameron, "The Persian Satrapies and Related Matters," Journal of Near Eastern Studies 32 (1973), pp. 47-56, who believes that the Persian list is only a depiction of various peoples under Persian rule who were worth mentioning, and that Herodotus' list is, in fact, an accurate account of the Persian satrapies which existed at that time.
the river (3.106),\textsuperscript{10} or taken from "gold-digging ants" (3.102, 3.104-105).\textsuperscript{11} As far as mining is concerned, it is not clear just how much the Indians knew about it. Tarn believes that the Indians knew practically nothing about this technique, and is of the opinion that the gold which the Indians paid to the Persians in the form of gold-dust actually came from the gold mines of Siberia.\textsuperscript{12} That the Indians obtained gold-dust from a river is not at all inconceivable, since, according to Cunningham,\textsuperscript{13} the sands of the upper Indus, even to this day, when washed, produce gold.\textsuperscript{14} Megasthenes' statement (Strabo 15.1.57) that rivers in India carry gold-dust should also not be overlooked.

As for the amount of gold paid by India, according to Lassen,\textsuperscript{15} How & Wells,\textsuperscript{16} and Tarn,\textsuperscript{17} it is highly exaggerated.

\textsuperscript{10}Herodotus is not specific as to which river is meant, whether it was the Indus itself or one of its tributaries. See below, however, for Cunningham's observation.

\textsuperscript{11}For these gold-digging ants, see below, pp. 90 ff.


\textsuperscript{14}Contrary to Tarn's belief, based on Pliny 33.21.66, (\textit{The Greeks in Bactria and India}, p. 108), that only the upper Ganges and its tributaries yielded gold.

\textsuperscript{15}Christian Lassen, \textit{Indische Alterskunde}, vol. 1:1, section 238.


\textsuperscript{17}\textit{The Greeks in Bactria and India}, p. 108.
How & Wells, who adopt Lassen's view, believe that Herodotus, upon learning about the abundance of minerals in north-western India and the manner in which Indians dressed, simply concluded that India was a country rich in gold. Tarn believes that India had no gold other than the washings of the Ganges. If India did pay gold to the Persian king, argues Tarn, it was in the form of gold-dust which had been imported first from Siberia. Herodotus' statement, however, of the amount of gold paid by the Indians should not be taken as incorrect. It seems that India had a good deal of gold, but then, due to the enormous tribute it paid, its supply quickly dwindled, thus leaving it a country with no gold as the Greeks of Alexander the Great's army realized upon arrival there (Arrian, Anabasis 5.4.4).

5. Indian Cotton

One thing which it did produce, however, as recorded by Herodotus, and for which it was famous was cotton (3.106, 7.65). The cotton itself was described by this author as "a fruit which

---

18 The Greeks in Bactria and India, p. 108.
19 The Greeks in Bactria and India, p. 108.
20 Pliny's statement, however, that the Indian Dardae were "most rich in gold" [fertilissimi...auri Dardae (6.22.67)] should not be taken seriously for it is, no doubt, based on Megasthenes' tale of the "Derdai" [Δέρδαις (Strabo 15.1.44)] and the gold-digging ants. Cf. also Pliny's account in 11.36.111. For the gold-digging ants, see below, pp. 90 ff.
bears wool" (καρπὸν εὐρια...προφέροντα) and as for the cotton clothes which were worn by the Indian soldiers in the Persian army, they were known by Herodotus as "garments made out of trees" (εἴματα...ἀπὸ ξύλων πεποιημένα). This cotton, in fact, was labelled by Herodotus as being "more beautiful and more excellent than the wool of sheep" (3.106). It could even have been Indian cotton shrubs which were mentioned by Theophrastus (Research on Plants 4.7.7) as growing on an island in the Persian Gulf. In fact, it is possible that the lined breastplate of the 6th century B.C. Pharaoh of Egypt, Amasis, which is mentioned by Herodotus (3.47) as being decorated with gold and "wool from trees" (εἰρίσσαι ἀπὸ ξύλου) used cotton which had either been grown on these shrubs from the Persian Gulf or had been imported directly from India.

6. Indian Climate

As for the climate of India, a typical day is described by Herodotus as being hottest in the morning rather than at midday as is the norm in other countries (3.104). The heat at that time was supposed to exceed by far that of Greece at noon. In fact, it was reported by Herodotus as getting so hot there that the people had to soak themselves with water just to endure it. This intense heat

---

21 As How & Wells point out, however, (vol. 1, p. 290), although this is the first time that cotton is mentioned by a Westerner, Herodotus' belief that it grows on trees is wrong for, in reality, it grows on a shrub.
was said by Herodotus to last "until the break-up time of the
market-place" \( (\text{μέχρι \ οὗ \ ἀγορῆς \ διαλύσως}) \)^{22} and then to continue dying
down as the day proceeded, making the temperature during afternoon
equal that of the morning sun elsewhere. By the time sunset would
come, it was supposed to be exceedingly cold.

According to How & Wells,^{23} Herodotus' report is based on
his belief that since India is located at the extreme east, it
would only be logical if the morning were unbearably hot due to the
sun's proximity and that the evening were exceedingly cold due to
its distance. Cary, however, who bases his view on the personal
observation of a modern traveller,^{24} argues that Herodotus'
description of the Indian day surprisingly fits the course that a
day takes in the Niti valley which is located in the central
Himalayas. There, morning is by far the hottest part of the day
due to the fact that a very hot wind blows through the valley,
which dies down only in the afternoon. Cary argues that such a
climatic condition is indeed possible, since Marco Polo himself
records in his Travels (ch. 19) seeing a similar situation at Ormuz
(Persian Gulf). There, during the summer, a wind would blow in the
morning from 9:00 to noon, which would be so hot that the people
would have to immerse themselves up to the chin in water just to

^{22}Around 10 A.M., according to How & Wells, vol. 1, p. 290.

^{23}Vol. 1, p. 290.

^{24}M. Cary, "Herodotus III.104," The Classical Review 33 (1919),
pp. 148-149. The modern travellers' report can be found in
That such a climatic condition as Herodotus describes is possible can be seen, therefore, from both the report of a modern traveller of the Niti valley and Marco Polo's account of Ormuz. It would, however, be difficult to say that Herodotus actually had the valley of Niti specifically in mind when he was describing the Indian day for it would have to be assumed that he had knowledge of the Himalayan Mountains. The chances also of Herodotus having simply heard of an account given by a merchant from this valley and of him then attributing it to all of India would seem rather slim for it would be by far more likely for him to have heard about the climatic conditions of Gandhara and the Indus valley than that of a remote valley in a mountain range which lay so far away from the Persian boundary. It would seem, therefore, that How & Wells' argument is by far more likely and that Herodotus simply viewed the earth as a flat disk with India lying very near its eastern edge and hence very close to the rising sun.

7. Indian Creatures

As for the creatures of India, both four-footed and flying, they are described as being much bigger than the animals of other countries (3.106). The only exception which is given by Herodotus is the horse which was described by him as being smaller than the
Median horse called "Nesaean". It would seem that Herodotus' statement might have been based simply on the view that any country as rich as India was likely to excel even in the size of its animals. In fact, as How & Wells point out, as far as the Indian elephant and lion are concerned, they are surpassed in size by their African counterparts. As for the horses, the only detail which is known about them is that they were ridden by the Indians in Xerxes' army and even used, along with wild asses, to draw their chariots (7.86). The wild asses themselves, according to How & Wells, are represented on bas-reliefs from Assyria and Persepolis, and are, in fact, to be found in north-western India. Indian dogs are also mentioned by Herodotus (1.192, 7.187) as forming part of the many possessions of the governor of Babylon (1.192) and being taken along by Xerxes on his march to Greece (7.187). The fierceness, however, for which they became very famous in later times, is not mentioned at all by Herodotus.

---

25 For these horses, see Herodotus 7.40.

26 Vol. 1, p. 290.


28 For a full account of these dogs, see Ctesias 45b.5.13-14, Aristotle, Generation of Animals 746 a 34, History of Animals 607 a 4ff, Parts of Animals 1.3.643 b, and Physical Problems 10.45/895 b, Megasthenes in Strabo 15.1.37, Diodorus 17.92.1-3, Grattius, Cynegetica 159, Strabo 15.1.32, Curtius 9.1.31-33, Pliny 8.61.148, and Claudius Aelian, On the Characteristics of Animals 4.19, 8.1. Cf. Alexander's encounter with the dogs of ancient Albania, just west of the Caspian Sea, in Pliny 8.61.149-150.
8. Indian People

As for the inhabitants of India, they are described with much detail by Herodotus. They are called first of all the most numerous of all nations known (3.94, 5.3), a statement which has been taken by C. F. Smith²⁹ and How & Wells³⁰ as contradicted by Thucydides' about the size of the Scythian nation (Histories 2.97.5). It should be noted, however, that whereas Herodotus says that the Indians are the most numerous of nations known, Thucydides says that the Scythians are the most numerous nation "in respect to their army". Herodotus was referring to the population as a whole while Thucydides was talking only about its military force. In other words, no contradiction need to be seen here. It may also be an indication that the Indians, though a large nation, contributed only a small part of their population for military purposes.

Herodotus' statement in 3.98 of the Indians being composed of many nations and possessing many languages is remarkably accurate. The Indians of Herodotus' time, as the Indians of today, were composed of two distinct races: the Indo-Aryans who entered this region around 1500 B.C. and the Asiatic Dravidians who already inhabited this area before their arrival. The Indo-Aryans took over northern India leaving the southern subcontinent to the much darker-skinned Dravidians. The two peoples have continued to live


³⁰Vol. 1, p. 287.
in these areas and to speak their own distinct languages right up to the present time.\textsuperscript{31}

9. River-Dwellers

In this same passage (3.98) Herodotus mentions a race of Indians who lived in the marshes of a certain river. They are described as eating raw fish which they catch from boats made of reed and as dressing themselves in clothes made from rushes which they cut from the river and entwine together so as to be able to wear them like a breastplate. The river mentioned is, no doubt, the Indus, and the marshes described would make the Indus Delta the most likely location of these people. The reed (κάλαμος) from which their boats were made was apparently so long that, according to Herodotus, the length of just a section of it between joints was long enough to span a boat. In other words, each boat must have been made of sections of this reed laid side by side with each other and then tied together. Ctesias (45b.6.24-26) speaks of this same reed (κάλαμος) as being so long that two men had to stretch their arms out to span it. In fact, it was, according to Ctesias, as tall as the mast of a ship. The reed spoken of here cannot, as

\textsuperscript{31}See below, pp. 85 ff. where an account is given by Herodotus of an Indian tribe (3.100-101) which is depicted as possessing both Indo-Aryan and Dravidian characteristics but whose description must have been the result of a confusion on Herodotus' part of an Indo-Aryan tribe with a Dravidian one.
Lassen rightly points out,\textsuperscript{32} have been the bamboo for it is not long enough. He believes that it was a similar reed called the "Kana" which grows as tall as 50 ft (c. 15 m).

The rush (\textit{Φλούς}) which they wear is believed by How & Wells\textsuperscript{33} to be of the species known as "Arundo Ampelodesmon". That they ate raw fish could either have been an interpolation made by Herodotus to indicate their primitiveness through lack of knowledge of the use of fire, or, as is more likely, it could be an accurate account of a primitive people who still lived by the Indus, unmolested by their neighbors. This is the belief held by Lassen\textsuperscript{34} and How & Wells\textsuperscript{35} who look upon Herodotus' account of these people as an indication that there were still "primitive Dravidian races"\textsuperscript{36} which lived by this river and which should be taken as proof that there were still non-Indo-Aryan Dravidians living in north-western India at this time. Postans\textsuperscript{37} describes a tribe called the "Mianis" who lived by the Indus in his day, who are very dark-skinned, and who use the reeds of the river to make mats and baskets. If they are direct descendants of this ancient tribe, their dark skin may be taken as an indication of their Dravidian

\textsuperscript{32}Vol. 2:1, section 633.
\textsuperscript{33}Vol. 1, p. 288.
\textsuperscript{34}Vol. 1:1, sections 388 ff.
\textsuperscript{35}Vol. 1, p. 286.
\textsuperscript{36}How & Wells, vol. 1, p. 286.
ancestry. Nothing, however, can be said for sure until an examination of their language has taken place first. As for the source of information on this tribe, Herodotus must have used either the Persians, since this Indian tribe obviously lived within the Persian boundary, or Hecataeus. The latter is more likely, however, inasmuch as Hecataeus is known to have used Scylax' book which described the Indus valley.\textsuperscript{38} That Herodotus used Scylax' book directly is, however, uncertain since in his account of this voyager (4.44) he mentions no such work.

10. Padaei and Land of Pandaea

Chapter 3.99 deals with a race called the "Padaei" who lived east of the Indians of the Indus Delta. Their name, according to How \& Wells,\textsuperscript{39} may have been derived from the Sanskrit "padja" which means "bad", perhaps a reference to their cannibalistic customs, or, in view of the similarity of their name to the Pandaeans who are mentioned by later authors,\textsuperscript{40} it may have been derived from the Sanskrit "pandu" which means "white",\textsuperscript{41} perhaps an indication that these people were Indo-Aryan in origin and

\textsuperscript{38}For Hecataeus using Scylax' book, see Chapter 2 below, p. 56. For Scylax' book, see Chapter 1 below, pp. 28 ff.

\textsuperscript{39}Vol. 1, p. 288.

\textsuperscript{40}For these authors, see below, pp. 81 ff.

\textsuperscript{41}As pointed out by Kartunnen, \textit{India in Early Greek Literature}, p. 203.
therefore labelled as "white" by their much darker Dravidian neighbors. Their similarity in anthropophagous customs to the Indian Callatiae of Herodotus 3.38 and 3.97 as well as a complete description of this latter race has already been covered in the previous chapter.\footnote{See above, pp. 58 ff.}

Their location is generally believed to have been east of the Indus Delta due to their placement by Herodotus east of the Indians of 3.98 who are believed to have inhabited the river marshes of the Indus Delta.\footnote{The exact wording of Herodotus' phrase is: "Other Indians who live to the east of these [Indus Delta-dwellers] are nomads and eaters of raw flesh and are called Padaei..." (\'\'Αλλοι δὲ τῶν Ἰνδῶν πρὸς ἥδον οἰκέοντες τούτων νομάδες εἰσὶ κρεών ἐδέσται ἄμων, κολάζοντα δὲ Παδαίοι,...\>). Kartonnen, p. 199, n. 33, proposes the following translation: "other of those Indians living in the east", thus suggesting that the Padaei might not have necessarily lived east of the Indus Delta. The wording of the original Greek, however, makes Kartonnen's suggestion very weak.}

In a section of Megasthenes' \textit{Indica} mention is made of a land called Pandaea (Πανδαία) which should be taken as the equivalent of the land of the Padaei, the latter being, no doubt, a Greek corruption of the former as will be seen later. This land of Pandaea was named after the daughter of Heracles, Pandaea (Πανδαία) who was given this land by her father to rule.\footnote{See Jacoby, vol. 3:C:2, pp. 617-618, fragment 13a, or Arrian's \textit{Indica} 8.} Megasthenes also went on to say that the women of this land bore children at the age of six.\footnote{See Jacoby, vol. 3:C:2, p. 618, fragment 13c, or Phlegon, \textit{Concerning Wondrous Things} 33.}
Tibullus (1st century B.C.) is the next author to make mention of the Padaei (4.1.144-145/Panegyric of Messala 144-145). All he says, however, is that the Padaean is "a neighbor of Phoebus" (vicinus Phoebo), meaning that he lives at the eastern edge of the world, for Phoebus Apollo was the god of the sun. The Padaean is also described by him as having "unholy banquets" (impia convivia) on "savage tables" (saevis mensis), a description which, no doubt, had Herodotus as its source.

Pliny also talks about the land of Pandaea. He probably used Megasthenes as his source, however, (6.23.76) since he says basically the same thing as Megasthenes: that Heracles gave this land to his daughter to rule. He goes on to say, moreover, that this land was ruled by women who traced their descent back to Heracles' daughter.

Ptolemy, as mentioned in the previous chapter, "6 talks about a "land of the Pandoui" [ἡ Πανδούων χώρα (7.1.46)]. It sounds very similar to Megasthenes' "Pandaea" but is unfortunately placed by him in north-western India, by the "Bidaspes" (Hydaspes) river. If this land is to be equated with Pandaea, then the only thing that can be concluded from Ptolemy's description is that there were Padaeans living at that time as far north as this area as well.

Polyaenus (2nd century A.D.) gives more detailed information, which he may or may not have borrowed from Megasthenes, on the location of Pandaea in his Stratagems (1.3.4).

46See p. 59.
Apart from the account which Megasthenes writes as to the giving of this land by Heracles to his daughter to rule, Polyaeus goes on to explain how this land "extended towards the south and continued all the way to the sea" (πρὸς μεσομβρίαν καθῆκουσαν εἰς θάλασσαν), a description which may be taken as coinciding very well with their placement by Herodotus east of the Indus Delta, taking into account of course Herodotus' ignorance as to the southward extension of the Indian subcontinent.

Solinus (c. 200 A.D.) also mentioned the land of Pandaea (A Collection of Memorable Things 52. 6-17). All he says, however, is that this land had as its first leader the daughter of Heracles and that it has been ruled by women ever since, a detail very similar to Pliny's description (6.23.76) and which, therefore, was very likely originally taken from Megasthenes.

As for modern theories, the Padaei have been identified with the Gonds who lived south-east of the Indus Delta by Lassen,\(^4^7\) with the Vrātyas and later the Bhils who lived south-east of the Indus Delta by Charpentier,\(^4^8\) with the Pāndavas of the Indian epic the Mahābhārata by Vaux,\(^4^9\) and with the Pāndyas of southernmost India.

\(^4^7\) *Indische Altertumskunde*, vol. 2, section 635.


by Puskás.⁵⁰ Although it is possible for the Gonds, the Vṛātyas, and the Bhils to be associated with the Padaei of Herodotus due to their location,⁵¹ the lack of any similarity between their name and that of the Padaei makes a connection highly questionable. The only tribes which can conceivably be identified with the Padaei of Herodotus are the Pāṇḍavas and the Pāṇḍyas. It has been shown, however, by Parpola,⁵² through literary and archaeological evidence, that the Pāṇḍavas inhabited northern India from the 8th to the 5th century B.C. first before proceeding to the south.

The location, however, of the Pāṇḍyas in southern India at this time would coincide with both Polyaenus’ description of Pandaea lying towards the south and continuing all the way to the sea (Stratagems 1.3.4) and Herodotus’ account of them living to the east of the Indus Delta (3.99), taking into consideration, as has already been stated, a lack of knowledge on his part of the extension of the Indian subcontinent into the south. The fact, however, that the Pāṇḍyas did not practise cannibalism makes the connection between them and the Padaei not as strong as one would want it to be. The only thing that can be said for certain is that


⁵¹ And anthropophagous customs as far as the Vṛātyas are concerned.

Herodotus was talking about the Pāṇḍyas when he was describing the Padaei and that he simply attached the cannibalistic custom of another tribe, such as the Vṛātyas for example, which lived in the same basic area, to this tribe, believing all along that the two tribes were one and the same.

11. Vegetarians

The next tribe which Herodotus describes is in chapters 3.100-101. They are described as being vegetarians, as never sowing seed, and as not building houses. The only thing they eat is grass and a certain grain which is described as growing as large as the millet-seed and which they are reported to gather, boil, and eat in its husk. The fate of those afflicted with a sickness among their tribe seems to have been quite harsh: they were to go into the desert and lie there, presumably until they either got well so that they could return or until they died. No one was to care for them. They had intercourse in the open and their semen was the same colour as their skin: black. Finally, they are located by Herodotus far to the south and are described by him as never having been subjects of King Darius.

According to Lassen, their vegetarian diet makes them identifiable with Brahman hermits. The problem, however, with this identification is that the Brahman caste did not accept

\[^{53}\text{Vol. 2:1, section 635.}\]
vegetarianism as a way of life until centuries later when they were influenced by Buddhism. In other words, Buddhist monks practised vegetarianism before the Brahman caste did. However, before any identification between Herodotus' tribe and Buddhists can be made, it would first have to be assumed that Buddhist monks were practising vegetarianism as early as the 5th century B.C., for this way of life did not exist with the Buddhists from the beginning of this religion's founding. If, then, the practice of vegetarianism by Buddhist monks in the 5th century B.C. can be proved, then Herodotus' passage could be the first western remark on Buddhists or even, perhaps, on the Brahman caste of India if Buddhist influence can also be traced to such an early date.

If, moreover, this last hypothesis can be proved and Lassen's theory is correct, then it would show that Herodotus' whole account of this tribe is actually referring, as How & Wells make notice of,54 to two different people, for the Brahmans are known to have been Indo-Aryans and therefore white, a fact which clashes with Herodotus' description of them having black skin.55 Their placement, also, in the south, descriptions which belong more to the Dravidians of the south than to the Indo-Aryans of the north, would strengthen the argument of their being two races which are referred to here.

---

54Vol. 1, p. 288.

55Although it is possible for this characteristic to have been applied loosely by ancient writers, the fact that Herodotus emphasizes it with these people while omitting it with others makes it very likely that they were indeed dark-skinned.
Their primitive stage of development is shown in various ways such as in their habit of boiling a grain and eating it in its husk, a practice which shows a lack of knowledge of the grinding wheel, in their custom of making the sick leave their settlement, which reveals either an ignorance of the art of medicine and hence a fear of contagious diseases or a belief that sickness is the result of ritual pollution, and their custom of having intercourse in the open, "like cattle" (κατὰ περὶ τῶν προβατῶν) as described by Herodotus. The description of their genital seed as being black "like that of the Ethiopians" reveals a rather strange belief held by Herodotus that anyone with black skin also had black semen.

That they dwelled in the deep south and were never subjects of King Darius would place them south-east of the Indus Delta, a likely location, since the southern section of the Indus, known as "Hindus" by the Persians, was known to have been included within Darius' Empire.\textsuperscript{56} No identification with any known Indian tribe is possible here. Inasmuch as they had the lifestyle of Indo-Aryan Brahmans but the colour of skin and place of habitation of Dravidians, it would seem that How & Wells' suggestion of this being an account of Indo-Aryan Brahmans and Dravidians blended into one is the most logical conclusion one can find.

12. Northern Indians

\textsuperscript{56}See Chapter 1 below, p. 9.
Chapter 3.102 deals with another Indian tribe which dwelled north of the other Indians. They are described as occupying the land next to both the city of Caspatyros and the region of Pactyice, and as having the same life-style as the Bactrians. They were the most warlike of all the Indians and were the ones responsible for retrieving the gold from the gold-digging ants.

Since Pactyice has already been identified with north-eastern Afghanistan\textsuperscript{57} and Caspatyros with a city in Kashmir\textsuperscript{58}, it would seem that the land which these Indians occupied must have been somewhere in between. In other words, it must have been located somewhere in the area of the Kabul valley and the northern section of the Indus. In fact, since the Dards, according to Strabo (15.1.44),\textsuperscript{59} were also responsible for retrieving gold from the gold-digging ants, it is very likely that the Indians of Herodotus 3.102 were one and the same as the ancient Dards who lived in north-western India and who still live in this area today which is known as Dardistan. This identification would coincide very well with the description given by Herodotus of them sharing the same lifestyles with the Bactrians, since anyone living in this part of India is very likely to have had contact with the Bactrians and hence to have been influenced by them.

That they were the most warlike of the Indians would make it

\textsuperscript{57}See below, pp. 21 ff.

\textsuperscript{58}See below, pp. 17 ff.

\textsuperscript{59}It should be pointed out here that Strabo calls them "Derdae". That this, however, was simply a Greek corruption of "Dards" is evident.
possible, as Wheeler points out, for them to have been a part of the warrior caste of Hindostan, some of whose descendants are today the Mahrattas and the Sikhs. How & Wells say that they were the only Indians of Aryan stock who are mentioned by Herodotus apart from the Brahmans of 3.100, who are unfortunately confused with the black Indians. This warlike quality may also make it possible that these were the very Indians who made up part of the Persian army, inasmuch as their location would have included them within the Persian Empire. If this is true, then they wore garments made of cotton and used bows made of reed as well as arrows with iron tips (7.65), a characteristic which is also applied to the Bactrians and which would therefore strengthen the identification of the Indians of 3.102 with those of the Persian army, for the former, as mentioned above, were much like the Bactrians. If they did form part of the Persian army, then they must have been involved in the breeding of swift horses and in the usage of war chariots, for these last two were used by the Indians in this army (7.86). One thing, however, is certain about them: they were charged with the task of obtaining the gold, which was to be used for paying their tribute to the Persian king, from the gold-digging ants.

13. Gold-Digging Ants

---

60 The Geography of Herodotus, p. 300.
61 Vol. 1, p. 289.
These ants were first mentioned in Western literature by Herodotus (3.102, 3.104-105). They are described as living in a desert and as inadvertently tossing up gold-dust along with the sand which they dig out while burrowing holes. They were bigger than foxes but smaller than dogs and reacted very viciously against anyone sneaking into their territory to take the gold away. The process of obtaining this gold from the ants involved harnessing three very swift camels, two males on the outside with a female which had just given birth on the inside, and proceeding towards the ants in the morning when the sun was hottest since the ants were usually to be found underground at this time of the day. Upon taking the gold, they had to ride away as fast as possible to avoid getting caught. The only means, however, of a sure escape was to let go of the male camels, which were slower, and to continue with the female which was much faster due to her desire to return safely to her newly-born young. Herodotus also says, to give credence to the story, that the Persian king had some of these ants which had been caught in this desert.

Nearchus is the next Westerner to describes these ants (Strabo 15.1.44). He mentions having actually seen the skins of these animals (τῶν δὲ μυρμήκων τῶν χρυσαφέων δέρματα) which he describes as being "leopard-like" (παρδαλέας ὀμοιά). The term "leopard-like" should be taken to mean "spotted" since the 2nd century A.D. writer Lucian in his work Twice Accused (8) uses this word (παρδαλωτός) to describe a man who was spotted. The place where Nearchus saw these, although not mentioned by Strabo, was the Greek Camp for
Arrian (Indica 15.4) says that although Nearchus saw no gold-digging ants, he saw only their skins which had been brought there. This would coincide also very well with Herodotus' report about the Persian king owning some of these ants.

Megasthenes repeats the legend (Strabo 15.1.44) as narrated by Herodotus. His account is almost identical to the latter's with the exception of a few details. He says that the ants dig in winter, in contrast to Herodotus' lack of mention of a specified time of the year during which they make their burrows, that the people who go after the gold set pieces of meat around so as to distract the ants, and that the area where all this activity takes place lay below a plateau which is 3000 stadia in circuit and which is inhabited by a people called the "Derdæ" (Δέρδαι), no doubt a Greek corruption of "Dardae", ancestors of the modern Dards who inhabit a region in north-eastern India and a section of the Hindu Kush mountains known today as "Dardistan". Megasthenes obviously used Herodotus as his main source for this story but did not hesitate to add to it information which he must have acquired while abroad, probably in India, or which he may even have invented himself. This would especially explain his description of the plateau of the Dards and the area below which makes it sound like he saw the region personally.

Strabo seems to be the first author to show doubt as to the validity of this story. He says first of all that Megasthenes is not to be trusted as an accurate source of information on India (2.1.9), and remarks later on that the story of the gold-digging
ants is an example of the type of stories which are "blown out of
proportion" (ἐπὶ τὸ μεῖζον) and "made marvellous" (περατωδέστερον) by
writers (15.1.37). He does not hesitate, however, to add another
detail to the story of the gold-digging ants, which had not been
mentioned previously by any known author: that some writers say
that the gold-digging ants have wings (15.1.69), a notion which
must have, no doubt, developed out of the belief that these ants
were so swift that they could outrun even camels.

Pliny adds to the story of the gold-digging ants. Apart
from simply a mention of them (33.21.66), he gives a full account
of the story (11.36.111). He, no doubt, used Megasthenes as a
source for he mentions in this account the land of the Dardae whom
he called earlier "the most rich of people when it comes to gold"
(6.22.67) and whom he places in northern India. He says that these
ants carried their gold out of caves (cavernis) from the earth but
that they were very quick to scent out any intruder and to attack
him. Inasmuch as he mentions winter as the time of year during
which they dug, but summer as the time during which they went
underground, thus making the retrieval of this gold by others much
easier, it would not be unlikely if Pliny used both Megasthenes and
Herodotus as his sources and tried furthermore to correlate the two
stories by making the ants dig at winter time and rest during the
summer. As for the ants themselves, Pliny describes them in great
detail. He says that they have the colour of cats (color felium),
in contrast to Nearchus' observation of their spotted skins,62 and that they are as big as Egyptian wolves (magnitudo Aegypti luporum). Unlike Strabo, Pliny tries to make the whole story credible by reporting that the horns of one of these Indian ants (Indicae formicae cornua) can be found at the temple of Heracles at Erythrae. Pliny's sources for this account must have been only Herodotus and Megasthenes, for he gives details which were obviously taken from both but seems not to have used Nearchus, for he describes the ants' skins as being the colour of cats and mentions the ants' horns at Erythrae while failing to say anything about the skins which Nearchus saw, a detail which, if he knew about, he would probably not have omitted since he believed the story of the gold-digging ants to be true.

Dio Chrysostom mentions this legend as well in his First Tarsic/Thirty-Third Discourse (23-24). He seems to have been familiar with Herodotus' story for he describes the ants as being larger in size than foxes but he adds details of his own. He says, for example, that the gold-dust which is thrown up by the ants forms eventually into hills of gold-dust which are so many that the whole plain shines, bringing blindness to anyone who looked at them. The people who go to collect the gold are mentioned as going at midday, a detail which corresponds with Herodotus' account, but are described as using chariots drawn by fast horses to get there,

62 Inasmuch as leopards are cats, it would be possible to say that Pliny's statement is in accordance with Nearchus'. The fact, however, that Pliny does not specifically say "of leopards" (leopardorum) makes it more likely that he had the general colour of cats, tawny, in mind rather than the spotted colour of leopards.
a statement in clear opposition to Herodotus'. It seems here that Dio used Herodotus to get the general story of the gold-digging ants but felt free to add to it and even to change it around where he saw information which did not make sense to him. Such a piece of information must have been the ability of the gold snatchers to escape from ants which had supernatural speed only with camels. To Dio, it must have seemed that such a task could only have been carried out with chariots and swift horses.

Arrian also mentions these ants (Indica 15.4-7). Although he describes Nearchus as having seen their skins (Indica 15.4) and Megasthenes as reporting, on hearsay, the true existence of these animals (Indica 15.5), he nonetheless rejects the whole validity of the story. He gives no reason for doing this but it seems that he must have believed the skins which Nearchus saw to have belonged to some other burrowing animal, and Megasthenes' report to have been not worth much credit, since it was based not on an eyewitness account but on stories told by others.

Philostratus' version, however, of the ant story (Life of Apollonius of Tyana 6.1) differs from all the others in two ways: first of all, he locates these ants in Ethiopia, and second, their job is simply to guard the gold there rather than dig it. That they guarded the gold there could simply be a development of any of the stories concerning gold-digging ants which must have been present at that time. Their placement in Ethiopia, however, seems very awkward. The only other place in literature where ants may have been mentioned as existing in Ethiopia is in the lost play of
Sophocles called Ethiopians (Ἀθίοις) of which only fragments exist today. It was the Byzantine Patriarch Photius who quoted the fragment which mentions these ants in his Lexicon (p. 22, 15). The whole entry runs as follows: "Sophocles, in his [play] Ethiopians, [says the following] about ants which are clamped tight in [various parts of] their outer skin: 'for the black-skinned insects, which are four-winged in respect to their back, are in fetters'." The problem with this fragment, however, is that it does not specifically say that the ants described here were actually to be found in Ethiopia. It is possible that they were mentioned by Sophocles as living elsewhere. If they were described, however, as inhabiting Ethiopia, then it is very likely that Philostratus had this play in mind when he described these ants.

Aelian also makes mention of these ants (3.4). He says that they were located in India, but describes them as guarding the gold there, thus making it very likely that he, just as Philostratus, developed the story from either Herodotus or one of the other authors who wrote about gold-digging ants. He adds, however, a certain informative, yet unusual detail to this story: he says that these ants will not cross the river "Campylinus" (Καμπύλινος). The identification of this river does not seem to have been established  

---


64 "Σοφοκλῆς Ἀθίοις τοὺς ἑσφιγμένους μύρμηκας τῇ σαρκώσει· "τετράπτεροι γὰρ νότον ἐν δεσμώμασιν σφηκοί κελαινόρινες."
yet. His source for this piece of information also seems to be undiscovered. It seems that he either used a source which has not yet been found or that he drew this conclusion himself from looking perhaps at a map of India and keeping in mind both Herodotus' location of the ants in a desert and that of Megasthenes' in the land of the Dards.

As for modern explanations of this story, there is much that has been said. Larcher, in 1786, was the first one to propose that these creatures might have actually been real gold-digging ants. Rennel, two years later, in 1788, tried to develop a more logical theory by proposing that the gold-digging ants may have been either real ants or white termites. In 1800, Veltheim suggested that the whole story may have had its origins in children washing gold with fox-skins, a theory which would, no doubt, explain Pliny's observation of the skins of these gold-digging ants. Moorcroft, in 1813, was the first one to put forward the theory that these creatures may have been marmots. In 1819, Malte-

---

65 Pierre Henri Larcher, to be found in the 1873 publication of Frederik Schierins Über den Ursprung der Sage von den Goldgrabenden Ameisen (Kopenhagen), p. 9, n. 3.


Brun\textsuperscript{69} combined all these theories together, and suggested that termites, fox-skins, and marmots all had a role to play in the development of this story.

It was Wilson, in 1841,\textsuperscript{70} who first noted the appearance of Herodotus' legend in the Indian epic the \textit{Mahābhārata}. In it there is mention of a certain gold called "ant-gold" (Pipīlaka) which was named so because of the ants (pipīlaka) which dug it up. The passage runs as follows: "The kings who live by the river Śailodā between Mount Meru and Mount Mandara and enjoy the pleasing shade of bamboo and cane, the Khasas, Ekāśanas, Jyohas, Pradaras, Dīrghavenus, Paśupas, Kunindas, Tanganas, and Further Tanganas, they brought the gold called Pipīlaka, which is granted as a boon by the pipīlaka ants, and they brought it by bucketsful and piles."\textsuperscript{71} Wilson thus concluded that the story had an Indian origin and that it was simply developed from there by Greek writers, without offering any explanation as to the origin of the Indian version.

Cunningham, in 1853,\textsuperscript{72} also proposed marmots (Arctomys) as the creatures concerning whom classical writers were talking and even added the rat-hares (Lagonys) of Tibet to them, arguing that

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{69}Malte-Brun, "Mémoire sur l'Inde Septentrionale d'Hérodote et de Ctésias Comparée au Petit-Tibet des Modernes," \textit{Nouvelles Annales des Voyages} 2 (1819), pp. 380 ff.}

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{70}H. H. Wilson, \textit{Ariana Antiqua}, pp. 135-136.}


\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{72}Sir Alexander Cunningham, \textit{Ladāk}, pp. 232-233.}
the dirt which these creatures throw up when digging their burrows contains gold which is then taken by the Indians, a practice which, he argued, was to be still seen in his day. In other words, Cunningham proposed Tibet as the source of the legend. He argued that either the Tibetan word for marmot, "phyi-pa", or "chipa", or "chupa", may have been confused by Alexander the Great's soldiers with the Indian word for large ant, "chunta", a theory which would unfortunately not explain the existence of this legend in pre-Alexander times, or that "phyi-pa" may have been confused by the Indians themselves with the Sanskrit and Bengali name for large ant, "pipilaka", an argument which would explain the appearance of this legend in the Mahābhārata.

Sir H. Rawlinson, in 1869,\(^7\) was the first one to propose Tibetan miners as an explanation for the story of the gold-digging ants. It was quickly supported the following year, in 1870, by Schiern\(^7\) who argued first of all that in the Mahābhārata passage referred to by Wilson there is mention of a tribe called the "Khásas" who were ancestors of the modern "Khasiyas", a people to be found today on the borders of Tibet. Herodotus' location, he

\(^7\)"Thibetan Discovery," *Pall Mall Gazette* (March 16, 1869).

\(^7\)Frederik Schiern's essay was first published in 1870 in the *Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Dänischen Gesselschaft der Wissenschaft* (Om oprindelsen til sagnet om de guldgravende myrer. Meddeelt i det Kgl. danske videnskabernes selskabs mode den 2 december 1870, af Frederik Schiern. Kjobenhaven, B. Lunos bogtrykkeri, 1873.). It was translated into English five years later by Anna M. H. Childers as "The Tradition of the Gold-Digging Ants," in *The Indian Antiquary* (August 4, 1875), pp. 225-232. The pages concerned here, as taken from the English version, are 227-232.
argues, of the ants in a desert (ἐρμηνίς) and Strabo's mention of the plateau which was near the ants' dwelling place and which was 3000 stadia in circumference closely corresponds with a certain plateau in Tibet which contains gold-fields. The habit of the gold-miners there of dressing in furs during the winter, of greeting each other by sticking out their tongues, grinning, nodding, and scratching their ears, of sleeping by curling up into a ball, of dwelling in pits which are 7-8 ft (c. 2 m) below the ground, in addition to their flat noses which, Schiern argues, would have seemed very strange to any Aryan, makes it very likely that these people were mistaken for something other than human beings. He continues his argument by saying that their preference for working in the winter rather than in the summer would correspond very well with Megasthenes' (Strabo 15.1.44) and Pliny's (33.21.66) statement about the working habits of the ants.75 The ants' aggressiveness could be explained, he argues, by the fact that these Tibetan miners live by hunting and keep great fierce dogs to fight off intruders, animals which may have been confused with their masters by classical story-tellers. Schiern finishes his argument by stating that Pliny's remark (11.36.111) that there were horns of an Indian ant in the temple of Heracles at Erythrae could actually have been the horns of a Yak which are worn along with the skin of

75 According to Schiern, the number of tents which were up in the summer was only 300 as opposed to the 600 which was the normal amount for winter. The following reason is given for their preference to work in the winter: "the frozen soil then stands well, and is not likely to trouble them much by falling in" (p. 230).
this animal by these miners.

Laufer, in 1908,\(^7_6\) proposed the theory that the whole legend of the gold-digging ants may have evolved out of a confusion between the names "Shiraighol", which was a Mongolian tribe, and "Shirgol", the Mongolian word for ant. In 1939, Regenos,\(^7_7\) upon observation of the burrowing habits of badgers in Nevada and their usefulness to miners tossing up dirt from deep below, which is then tested by these miners to see if the surrounding area has gold, suggested that the creature which Herodotus and later authors referred to may have been an animal very similar to this one.

It was Puskás, in 1977,\(^7_8\) who first proposed the theory that the whole legend of gold-digging ants, including both the Greek and the Indian versions, may not have had its origins in an actual living being, whether human or animal, but rather in the peculiar size and form of the alluvial gold grains which were washed from the region of Dardistan. To Puskás, all the other theories fail to explain all the peculiarities of the gold-digging ants. Even the theory of Tibetan miners could not be accepted for the main reason that Tibetan history itself, according to Puskás, does not start until the 6th to 7th centuries A.D. Puskás argues that in the area


\[^7_8\]Ildikó Puskás, "On an Ethnographical Topos in the Classical Literature (the Gold-Digging Ants)," *Annales Universitatis Scientiarum Budapestinensis de Rolando Eotvos Nominatae. Sectio Classica*. 5-6 (1977-78), pp. 78-83.
of Dardistan, probably from the 3rd millennium B.C., people retrieved gold from the river. This gold was granular and was exported in this form to countries as far away as Sumer and India. This gold, due to its size and shape, must have been given the name "ant-gold". The various legends concerning the gold-digging ants may have evolved, argues Puskás, either as a direct result of its name, or as a means of keeping away would-be gold-miners from outside. Inasmuch as the term "pipīlaka" (ant-gold), argues Puskás, is of non-Indo-Aryan origin, it is very likely that this term as well as the technique of gold washing was passed down from generation to generation from the inhabitants of Dardistan before the coming of the Indo-Aryans, to the Indo-Aryans themselves. Since the Tibetan version of gold-digging ants, according to Puskás, speaks of ants obtaining gold from the depths of a lake by drawing it up with a thread, it is very likely that the various versions of legends concerning gold-digging ants could all have been independent developments and embellishments originally used to explain the strange name. The fact that the only similarity which the Greek, Indian, and Tibetan versions have in common is that of ants being responsible for the obtaining of gold makes Puskás' theory the most convincing of them all.

14. Conclusion

Herodotus' account of India gives modern scholars an
accurate idea of what he, and consequently the rest of the Greeks, knew of India at this time. He was aware not only that a part of it lay within the Persian borders and that it paid an enormous tribute in gold to the Persian king but also that it extended beyond, towards the south. He knew much about its topography, for reference is made to the Great Indian Desert and to the Indus which flowed through this country and which supplied gold to its inhabitants. He knew of its extreme heat and did not fail to exaggerate it in view of his belief that this country lay at the eastern edge of the world. His exaggeration of the size of its animals is also understandable as nothing more than a conclusion drawn from the observation of the richness of this country when it came to gold supply, and to its ability to do such marvellous things as provide its inhabitants with "wool grown from trees".

Herodotus' belief that the Indians did not all speak the same language shows at least a partial knowledge of the co-existence of the Indo-Aryan and Dravidian languages. This knowledge is also shown by his statement that there were black-skinned Indians living far to the south, beyond the Persian Empire, a remark which could only have referred to the much darker-skinned Dravidians who did indeed live in the southern part of India. This statement, in fact, could also show knowledge on Herodotus' part of the extension of the Indian subcontinent to the south since the southern part of the Indus did belong to Darius' Empire at one point in time and could not, therefore, have been the dwelling place of these people.
His mention of river-dwellers shows that he knew at least something about the habits of the people who dwelled by the Indus Delta. His account of the Padaei reveals knowledge of an actual Indian tribe known to have lived at that time, the Pāṇḍyas, even though he attached to them cannibalistic customs which are known to have not been practised by this tribe but which may have belonged to another tribe of the same region. His placement at least of the Padaei to the east of the Indus Delta reveals an awareness on his part of the existence of an India which was habitable to the east of this river. The anthropophagous customs of the Padaei were also attributed to another tribe called the Callatiae who have not yet been identified but who may have been an actual tribe living in India at that time. His belief that the Callatiae and Padaei had black semen shows his belief that anyone who has black skin must surely have black semen as well. Herodotus' mention of vegetarians could perhaps show at least a partial knowledge of either Buddhist monks or the Brahman caste of India if a date as early as the 5th century B.C. for the practice of vegetarianism among either of these two groups is allowed, and, if Lassen's theory is correct, it could indicate a confusion on either Herodotus' part or on that of his source of Indo-Aryans with Dravidians. As for the Indians who lived in the north, Herodotus shows an ample knowledge of their customs, no doubt because they would have lived within the Persian Empire and would therefore have been one of the more well-known tribes of India.

Herodotus' sources must have been more than one. He
obviously used Hecataeus to gain information on the Callatiae and on the Great Indian Desert. Since it is also known that Hecataeus must have used Scylax' book, it would not be improbable if Herodotus used Hecataeus for information on the inhabitants of the Indus Delta since Scylax would most likely have written about them on his voyage through their country. Whether Herodotus used Scylax directly, however, is uncertain since he makes no mention of his work. It is also known that he borrowed some, if not much, from the Persians, who would have known quite a bit about the India which lay within their borders. As for knowledge of the India which was outside the Persian Empire, it must have been gained from either the Persians, who themselves may have acquired it from Indians who were subject to Persian rule, from Hecataeus, who may in turn have taken it from Scylax, who must have ultimately taken it from the Indians of the Indus, and perhaps even from the voyager who sailed down the Ganges.

As for his account of the legend of the gold-digging ants, it may have been taken either directly from the Persians, or indirectly from merchants or travellers from India. It shows at least that Herodotus did not fabricate the whole story but that this story does, in fact, have its origin in the country which Herodotus knew enough about to dedicate at least a few chapters of his work to its description. His depiction of its topography, climate, animals, people, and even its legend of gold-digging ants

---

79 See n. 5 below.

80 For this voyage, see Chapter 1 below, pp. 25 ff.
show that Herodotus was not a fabricator of stories but simply a narrator of existing knowledge.
CONCLUSION

As can be seen from the preceding chapters, ancient Greek knowledge of India down to the end of the 5th century B.C. was fairly extensive. It has been shown first of all that the land which they referred to as India covered an area which extended from as far north as Kashmir to as far south as at least the Indus Delta and from as far west as the Kabul valley and north-eastern Afghanistan to as far east as the Punjab. The ancient Greeks knew something about the topography of this area, such as the springs which watered the country, the Great Indian Desert which lay east of the Indus, the Indus itself which ran through the country, and the mountains which flanked this river during the initial part of its course. Their knowledge extended even to the types of vegetation which covered these mountains such as the wild trees and artichokes as well as other kinds of plants such as the cotton shrub which was until the fifth century B.C. completely unknown in Greece. The ancient Greeks also had knowledge about the animals which roamed the Indian country such as the horse which was used in battle by the northern Indians, and the dogs which developed a reputation in later times for their fierce and savage nature.
It was known by the ancient Greeks that India occupied two places in the list of Persian satrapies: the 7th which included the northern section of the Indus valley known as "Gandarice" by the Greeks, "Gandara" by the Persians, and "Gandhara" by the Indians, and the 20th which encompassed the whole southern section of the Indus valley and which was referred to as "Hindus" by the Persians and "India" proper by Herodotus, even though the ancient Greek idea of India included Gandhara and the Kabul valley as can be seen from Hecataeus. Even the amount of tribute which these two provinces paid was known, 170 talents by the satrapy of which Gandhara was a part, and 360 talents by the province which was known as "Hindus" by the Persians.

As for individual regions within India, two were known by their proper names: that of Gandarice as mentioned above, and that of Pactyice which was located in north-eastern Afghanistan. Names of individual cities were also known by the Greeks such as Caspapyros in Kashmir and Argante just west of the city Kabul.

The ancient Greeks knew quite a bit about the inhabitants, for they were aware that the Indians did not all belong to the same linguistic or racial group. Although they did not know that the Indians were composed of Indo-Aryans and Dravidians, for knowledge of these specific groups did not yet exist, they were surprisingly aware that the Indians belonged to different races and spoke different languages. The ruling system of the Indians was also known for it had been depicted by Scylax as consisting of a king whose position was considered to be very important. Even a bit of
either Buddhist practices or the Indian caste system may have been known if the Indian race which is described by Herodotus as practising vegetarianism is identified with either Buddhist monks or the Brahman caste of India respectively.

As for actual material constructions, it was known by the ancient Greeks that the Indians had developed a system of waterways, or canals, to carry water, no doubt, from the Indus to various parts of the country for irrigation. The ancient Greeks had even learned something about the various methods by which the Indians retrieved gold, such as washing it from the river, a practice which is to be still seen in modern times, and possibly mining.

The people themselves were known in reasonable detail by the Greeks. They were divided up into various tribes according to customs and location and names in some cases, even though some of these customs, such as cannibalism for example, which may have belonged to other tribes were attributed to the wrong Indians. These tribes were many. They were the Gandarii who, as has already been shown, were known and were described as having the same equipment in the Persian army as the Bactrians. They were located around the northern section of the Indus and correspond with the ancient inhabitants of Gandhara. There were the Callatiae who were regarded as cannibals. They have been placed east of the Indus Delta, but no ancient Indian equivalent for their name has yet been found. There were the Opiae who occupied a royal fortress of the Persians. They were located somewhere along the Indus and as far
north as the area around the city of Charikar, just north of Kabul. A modern equivalent for their name has been found in the latter location. A people identified simply as river-dwellers were known. They lived on raw fish which they would catch from boats made of reed, and dressed themselves in garments made of rush. They have been placed by the Indus Delta, but had not been given a name by Herodotus. There were the Padaei who also, like the Callatiae, are described as practising cannibalism. They have been placed east of the Indus Delta and have been identified with the Pândyas of south India, even though this latter race is known to have not possessed anthropophagous customs, an attribute which was, no doubt, borrowed from some other tribe which did indeed practise cannibalism. A tribe identified merely as vegetarians were known. They are described as neither sowing nor owning any houses and as expelling the sick from their community. They have been placed south-east of the Indus Delta and have been possibly identified with either Buddhist monks or the Brahman caste of India, even though they were described as having black skin, a characteristic which belongs more with the Asiatic Dravidians than with the Indo-Aryans and which would seem to show that accounts of two races have somehow been blended into one. There was also another tribe of Indians who were simply known as living north of the rest of the Indians. They were described as being the most warlike of all the Indians and resembled the Bactrians in their lifestyle. They were located somewhere in between Kashmir in the east and the land of Pactyice in north-eastern Afghanistan in the west. These people, although
possibly the same as the Gandarii due to their location and manner of dress, would nonetheless best be identified with the Dards who inhabited an area around the northern section of the Indus, no doubt side by side with the Gandarii, and who, like these "northern Indians", had been assigned the task of retrieving gold from the gold-digging ants. This last characteristic also shows partial knowledge on the part of the Greeks of a Persian legend which developed as a result of the granular form of the gold which was found on the upper banks of the Indus river.

As for the sources for all of this information, it is clear that Herodotus used Hecataeus, even though he does not cite him for India, inasmuch as Herodotus, like Hecataeus, mentions both the Callatiae and the Gandarii as well as the Great Indian Desert which lay east of the Indus. If we take into consideration also that Hecataeus must have used Scylax, since both describe the artichoke as growing by the Indus, it is not difficult to conclude that Herodotus' ultimate source was Scylax. This is not to say, however, that Herodotus had Scylax' book in his hands when he was writing the Indian section of his Histories, for he does not mention this work when he describes Scylax' voyage. It can be safely concluded, therefore, that he simply used Scylax indirectly through Hecataeus possibly without knowing that Hecataeus' source was Scylax for Hecataeus may not have specifically mentioned Scylax as his source. Nor should it be concluded that Herodotus' or even Hecataeus' only source was Scylax. It is conceivable that the Persians were consulted by both these men, even though Herodotus is
the only one who, as far as we know, specifically mentions them as a source. The possibility also of contact with Persians in Greece, such as Zopyrus (Herodotus 3.160) who defected to Athens around the middle of the 5th century B.C., or even with Indians who may have been taken as prisoners of war during the Persian Wars, cannot be excluded. However, all of this is purely hypothetical. It should simply be remembered that indirect contacts between Greeks and Indians are not inconceivable for the 5th century B.C.

In view of the fact, therefore, that Scylax had travelled to India and written an eyewitness account of what he saw and that one of the sources, if not the main one, of Hecataeus' and, at least indirectly, Herodotus' works was Scylax, then Scylax' and Hecataeus' fragments, and Herodotus' writings on India can be used to determine what accurate knowledge the ancient Greeks had about India before Alexander the Great.

Ctesias, on the other hand, who also wrote a work on India before Alexander the Great's campaign, represents a new development, for his source, or at least his most probable one, was Persian and his account is filled with the fabulous and the mythical, a trait in clear contrast to the more accurate Greek account of India as it appeared in Greek literature up to that time and which was ultimately founded not on speculations about a mysterious land but on the personal observations of a Greek who had travelled there at the end of the 6th century B.C. Ctesias' desire, in other words, to mix fiction with fact clearly shows that his aim, unlike that of Hecataeus and Herodotus, was not to
contribute to the accurate knowledge which the ancient Greeks had about India at that time, but rather to create a work which stood apart in its depiction of an India full of mythical creatures and other strange phenomena.

This is not to say that there exists a clear break between Herodotus and Ctesias, for Herodotus, as already mentioned, also included Persian beliefs on India which were far from realistic, such as the story of the gold-digging ants. Since, however, it can be seen from the lack of any substantial number of fabulous stories in Herodotus' work that his account is much nearer to the truth, and therefore closer to Scylax' account, than Ctesias', it would be safe to say that the representation of accurate Greek knowledge of India before Alexander the Great stops with Herodotus and does not continue until Nearchus, almost a century later, travelled to India with Alexander the Great and wrote an account of this country which was based, like Scylax' report, on the personal observations of an eyewitness.
1. Ancient Sources


______. Physical Problems (Φυσικὰ Προβλήματα). Edition used:


Callimachus of Cyrene (c. 305-240 B.C.). **Pinakes (Πίνακες).** Fragment concerning Hecataeus to be found in Athenaeus 2.70a.


Dionysius of Halicarnassus (1st century B.C.). **On Thucydides (Περὶ
Dionysius 'Periegetes' (2nd century A.D.). Bassarica (Βασσαρικά). Fragments as collected by Stephanus of Byzantium to be found in Müller, vol. 2, pp. xxvii-xxviii.


Megasthenes (c. 350-290 B.C.). Indica (Ἰνδικά). Fragments
collected by Jacoby, vol. 3:C:2, pp. 603-639.

Nearuchus of Crete (4th century B.C.). Title of work on India unknown. Fragment concerning gold-digging ants to be found in Strabo 15.1.44.


Polemon of Ilium (c. 190 B.C.). Concerning the Inscriptions Which Are to be Found in Various Cities (Περὶ τῶν κατὰ Πόλεις Ἐπιγραφάων). Fragment concerning India and possibly belonging to Polemon to be found in Athenaeus 2.70b-c.

Polo, Marco. Travels. Passage concerning climatic conditions at Ormuz (Persian Gulf) to be found in Cary's article, pp. 148-149.

Polyaenus (2nd century A.D.). Stratagems. Fragment concerning the land of Pandaea to be found in McCrindle, pp. 163-164, fr. 58.


Scylax of Caryanda (c. 510 B.C.). Title of work on India unknown. Fragments collected by Jacoby, vol. 3:C:2, pp. 589-591.
Scylax (Pseudo-) of Caryanda (c. 350 B.C.). *Periplus* (Περίπλονς). Text to be found in Müller, vol. 1, pp. 15-96.

Solinus, Gaius Iulius (c. 200 A.D.). *A Collection of Memorable Things* (Collectanea Rerum Memorabilum). Fragment concerning the land of Pandaea to be found in McCrindle, p. 161, fr. 56.B.


2. Modern Sources


"Herodotus' Publication Date." Athenaeum 57 (1979): 145-149.


Herrmann, A. "Kaspapyros." Paulys Realencyclopadie der Classischen Altertumskunde.

Herzfeld, Ernst Emil. Archäologische Mitteilungen aus Iran. Berlin: D. Reimer, 1929-.


"On an Ethnographical Topos in the Classical Literature (the Gold-Digging Ants)." Annales Universitatis Scientiarum Budapestinensis de Rolando Eotvos Nominateae. Sectio Classica. 5-6 (1977-78): 73-87.


Rawlinson, Sir H. "Thibetan Discovery." Pall Mall Gazette (March 16, 1869).


