



<https://publications.dainst.org>

iDAI.publications

ELEKTRONISCHE PUBLIKATIONEN DES
DEUTSCHEN ARCHÄOLOGISCHEN INSTITUTS

Dies ist ein digitaler Sonderdruck des Beitrags / This is a digital offprint of the article

N. G. L. Hammond The Extent of Persian Occupation in Thrace

aus / from

Chiron

Ausgabe / Issue **10 • 1980**

Seite / Page **53–62**

<https://publications.dainst.org/journals/chiron/1332/5681> • urn:nbn:de:0048-chiron-1980-10-p53-62-v5681.0

Verantwortliche Redaktion / Publishing editor

Redaktion Chiron | Kommission für Alte Geschichte und Epigraphik des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Amalienstr. 73 b, 80799 München

Weitere Informationen unter / For further information see <https://publications.dainst.org/journals/chiron>

ISSN der Online-Ausgabe / ISSN of the online edition **2510-5396**

Verlag / Publisher **Verlag C. H. Beck, München**

©2017 Deutsches Archäologisches Institut

Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Zentrale, Podbielskiallee 69–71, 14195 Berlin, Tel: +49 30 187711-0

Email: info@dainst.de / Web: dainst.org

Nutzungsbedingungen: Mit dem Herunterladen erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen (<https://publications.dainst.org/terms-of-use>) von iDAI.publications an. Die Nutzung der Inhalte ist ausschließlich privaten Nutzerinnen / Nutzern für den eigenen wissenschaftlichen und sonstigen privaten Gebrauch gestattet. Sämtliche Texte, Bilder und sonstige Inhalte in diesem Dokument unterliegen dem Schutz des Urheberrechts gemäß dem Urheberrechtsgesetz der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. Die Inhalte können von Ihnen nur dann genutzt und vervielfältigt werden, wenn Ihnen dies im Einzelfall durch den Rechteinhaber oder die Schrankenregelungen des Urheberrechts gestattet ist. Jede Art der Nutzung zu gewerblichen Zwecken ist untersagt. Zu den Möglichkeiten einer Lizenzierung von Nutzungsrechten wenden Sie sich bitte direkt an die verantwortlichen Herausgeberinnen/Herausgeber der entsprechenden Publikationsorgane oder an die Online-Redaktion des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts (info@dainst.de).

Terms of use: By downloading you accept the terms of use (<https://publications.dainst.org/terms-of-use>) of iDAI.publications. All materials including texts, articles, images and other content contained in this document are subject to the German copyright. The contents are for personal use only and may only be reproduced or made accessible to third parties if you have gained permission from the copyright owner. Any form of commercial use is expressly prohibited. When seeking the granting of licenses of use or permission to reproduce any kind of material please contact the responsible editors of the publications or contact the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut (info@dainst.de).

N. G. L. HAMMOND

The Extent of Persian Occupation in Thrace*

The general opinion is that Persia conquered no more than the coastal areas of Thrace and that the Persian satrapy «Skudra» consisted only of those areas as far as Thrace was concerned. The contention of this paper is that Persia conquered the central plain of Thrace, namely the plain of Marica (the town taking its name from the river Marica, the ancient Hebrus), and that it was this plain which gave to the satrapy its inner unity and strategic centre. The argument turns upon a close interpretation of what Herodotus writes, upon the Persian records and upon geographical probability. On the last point it is essential to realise that the Marica valley route linked Doriscus on the Aegean coast not only with the central plain but also with the Black Sea ports of Apollonia, Mesambria and Odessus. As CASSON wrote in 1926 (cf. n. 3, p. 255), «before the construction of the railway trade (to and from the Black Sea ports) largely followed this route». If the possessors of the central plain are hostile, communications and trade between the two coastal areas of Thrace have to be conducted by sea.

Herodotus is not at his best in Thrace. He had not visited the interior; his own interests were rather in the Greek cities of the coasts, and he derived his information mainly from them. What excited him about the expedition of Darius, c. 513 B. C., was the campaign into Scythia and the decision of the Greeks about the bridge over the Danube.¹ Thus Herodotus made little of Darius' passage through Thrace, and many scholars have made even less of it. The following is not untypical. «Darius in person led a great army across the Bosphoros into Europe and mar-

* The following abbreviations are used: BURN = A. R. BURN, *Persia and the Greeks*, London 1962. CASTRITIUS = H. CASTRITIUS, *Die Okkupation Thrakiens durch die Perser und der Sturz des athenischen Tyrannen Hippias*, Chiron 2, 1972, 1 ff. DANOV = C. M. DANOV, *Althrakien*, Berlin 1976. GRUNDY = G. B. GRUNDY, *The Great Persian War*, London 1901. HERZFELD = E. HERZFELD, *The Persian Empire*, Wiesbaden 1968. HIGNETT = C. HIGNETT, *Xerxes' Invasion of Greece*, Oxford 1963. HMac = *A History of Macedonia I* by N. G. L. HAMMOND, Oxford 1972, and II by him and G. T. GRIFFITH, 1979. HW = W. W. HOW and J. WELLS, *A Commentary on Herodotus*, Oxford 1912. WALSER = G. WALSER, *Die Völkerschaften auf den Reliefs von Persepolis*, Berlin 1966. The writer has travelled in Greek Thrace, and in the western and central parts of Bulgarian Thrace. He is most grateful to G. T. GRIFFITH for reading and commenting on this article.

¹ See HMac II 98 f. and Hdt. 4, 95, 1 for his sources; the chronology used in this paper is taken from HMac II.

ched northwards . . . he merely reduced the coastal tribes between Byzantium and the Danube.»² If this were so, we should expect to find the usual sensible pattern of conquest, namely fleet and army proceeding together along the coast, as in operations against Miletus and in the campaign of Xerxes. The facts, as narrated briefly and with little comment by Herodotus, are just the opposite. Darius ordered his fleet to sail directly from the Bosphorus to the mouth of the Danube and await him two days' voyage up the river (perhaps near Cernavoda) where a bridge was to be prepared (4, 89, 1-2); thus the fleet was not to provide supplies nor the army to march along the coast.

As Herodotus says, the army led by Darius «marched through Thrace». Shortly after leaving Byzantium Darius had to make a choice: either to strike north from Babaeski to the Black Sea coast and proceed along it past the Greek cities, or to go westwards into what MYRES called «the great valley-route of the Hebrus».³ Darius chose the latter. Halting at the sources of the Tearus (Semerdere) in the catchment area of the lower Hebrus, he set up a pillar. From there he went on «to another river called the Artescus, which flows through the Odrisians» (4, 89, 3-92). Here too he left his mark, by having his army build great cairns of stones. As the Artescus is to be identified with the Ardas,⁴ Darius had already crossed the Hebrus (into which the waters of the Tearus eventually flowed, 4, 90, 2), just below Edirne (Adrianople). Darius was now marching beyond the Ardas up the famous valley-route, just as the Turkish army of the Sultan Murad was to do in A. D. 1361. This route brought him unavoidably into the great plain of Marica.

During its march of some 300 kilometres to this point the army must have drawn heavily upon its transported supplies. The Hebrus was probably crossed by boats, there being no fords below Edirne, and it is likely that Darius sent a detachment down the navigable river to occupy Doriscus as a key-point for communications and supply in his rear. Herodotus reports that Darius placed a garrison there when «advancing with an army against Scythia» (ἐπείτε ἐπὶ Σκύθας ἐστρατεύετο, 7, 59, 1). On reaching the plain of Marica, where his superb cavalry could take control, Darius was able to replenish his stocks and, more important, create a base of supply for the projected advance northwards.⁵ There is no doubt that Darius was claiming

² HIGNETT 84; cf. DANOV 121: «Der Perserkönig zog mit seinen Fußsoldaten durch das östliche Randgebiet Thrakiens».

³ J. L. MYRES, *Herodotus*, Oxford 1953, 170. For the trade-routes up the valley to the central plain and to the Black Sea coast see S. CASSON, *Macedonia, Thrace and Illyria*, Oxford 1926, 23, 255 and Map XIII.

⁴ So V. VELKOV, *Bull. de l'inst. de la langue bulgare* 16, 1968, 79; some doubts are expressed by DANOV 266, but he takes Darius to the Black Sea coast. Hesiod, *Theog.* 343, mentioned the «Ardescus» but not the Hebrus, the greatest river of the northern Aegean; it is probable that he used the name Ardescus for the lower course of the Hebrus.

⁵ Darius certainly had a very large army; nothing less than the central plain was enough to maintain it and mount its advance over the Haemus range, probably by the Kotel pass.

as his the land which he had now conquered. That was the point of setting up pillars and cairns.

The narrative of Herodotus jumps from the river Artescus to the Getae, who lived just south of the Danube (4, 93; cf. 4, 118, 5). These, he says, were the *first* people that Darius «captured» (αἰρέει). The rest, we may infer, including the Odrysians, had submitted without a struggle; and of them Herodotus, dependent on his Greek sources, mentioned only the Thracians near the Black Sea coast by Salmydessus, Apollonia and Mesambria. The submissions were made, no doubt, in response to envoys sent by Darius to the Thracian tribes not only on the line of his march but over a wide area; and submission involved the provision of supplies and troops (the Getae, for instance, having to serve with the army, 4, 96, 2). Although Herodotus conveyed the information in a fictitious speech, there is certainly truth in his statement that Darius had «reduced everyone on his march» from Byzantium to the Danube and had «made the Thracians subject to himself and in particular the Getae» (4, 118, 1 and 5).

On his return from Scythia Darius' army marched «through Thrace» (4, 143), presumably taking the same route since it was well provided with supplies. He met the fleet this time at Sestus, from which he intended to cross to Asia. He left Megabazus as «general in Europe» and gave him from the army 80,000 men (4, 143, 1 and 3), a large force, even if Herodotus' numbers are inflated. As it was late in the campaigning season, Megabazus «began to reduce those in the Hellespontine area who did not medize»,⁶ i.e. those who rejected the demands of the Persian envoys (4, 144, 3), and first among these the people of Perinthus «who did not wish to be subjects of Darius» (5, 1, 1). These demands for submission, ranging from the Bosphorus and the Hellespont to the peoples on his march through Thrace, and from the Getae to the Thracians inland of the Black Sea coast and to Perinthus should leave us in no doubt that Darius was establishing a satrapy in Europe and that Megabazus was engaged in rounding off the satrapy. Herodotus, in fact, makes this clear. «After he had defeated Perinthus, Megabazus marched the army through Thrace, reducing to the rule of the king every city and every tribe of those who lived there. His orders from Darius were these, to make Thrace subject to him».⁷ The very next sentence pictures the Thracian race as the greatest in the world after

⁶ The imperfect tense, resumed in 4, 145, 1, is used to give the chronological overlap with the expedition to Libya, τὸν αὐτὸν δὲ τοῦτον χρόνον. This indisputable instance enables us to understand the use of the imperfect tense at 5, 10 fin. κατήκοα ἐποίεε. The present (contemporary) tense of μηδίζοντας is also to be noted.

⁷ HIGNETT loc. cit. disregards the first part of the sentence. He represents Herodotus as saying that «on his return Darius ordered his general Megabazus to subdue Thrace», and adds «but the conquests made by Megabazus seem to have been confined to the parts of Thrace near the Aegean.» This method of disregarding a plain statement πᾶσαν πόλιν καὶ πᾶν ἔθνος τῶν ταύτη οικημένων ἡμεροῦμενος is not to be commended. HW II, 1 comment on the march «through Thrace» as «from East to West along the south coast (ch. 10)», but

that of the Indians (5, 2, 2 and 3, 1). <Thrace>, then, was to Herodotus a very large area. What were its limits?

To the west the Paeonians were a separate people with their own territories. These included the entire Strymon valley (5, 1, 2 and 13, 2), Mt Rhodope east of the Strymon and sources of the Sciurus (4, 49, 1), the Oscus of Thucydides (2, 96, 4), which is to be identified with the Iskar.⁸ Thus Thrace extended from east of that general line up to the Crobyzi near the mouth of the Danube.⁹ It included the Black Sea coast in as far as the Greek cities did not hold it; the coasts of the Bosphorus, the Propontis and the Hellespont except for the enclaves of the Greek cities and Miltiades' realm in the Chersonese; and the Aegean coast apart from the Greek possessions and cities. Those who had not <medized> were probably the westernmost Thracians in the interior and the Thracians and Greeks of the Aegean coast. Megabazus dealt probably in 512 B.C. with the former. Herodotus, being interested in the Greek cities, concentrated his attention on the coastal sector which «Megabazus was making subject to Persia» (5, 10).¹⁰ That was evidently achieved without difficulty; for Herodotus treats next of Megabazus' action against the Paeonians in which he obtained the services of guides from <Thrace>, the already subjected area (5, 14, 2).

Whereas the Thracian tribes had been weakened by disunity (5, 3, 1), the Paeonians of the Strymon valley (5, 1, 2) acted together, as in the past against Perinthus, and resisted Megabazus, probably in 511 B.C. But to no avail; for the Thracian guides took Megabazus along an inland route (via Drama),¹¹ and the Persians captured the cities when the Paeonian army had concentrated in defence of the coastal route (5, 15). As resistance collapsed, Megabazus deported the leading families of the

this is to impose their concept of what constitutes Thrace upon Herodotus. GRUNDY 71 accepted that the aim of Megabazus was «to complete the reduction of Thrace», but he scaled Herodotus' statement down to GRUNDY's own conclusion: «it seems to have been but half accomplished». It is true that Herodotus does not say *how* Megabazus overcame opposition in Thrace; he probably did not know. CASTRITIUS 2 interprets ταύτη at 5, 2, 2 by 5, 10 fin.

⁸ For the period of Paeonian power see HMac II 55 f. and 82 f.; for the Oscus A. W. GOMME, *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides II*, Oxford 1956, 243.

⁹ In the north <Thrace> began probably with the valley of the Jantra, with which the ancient Athrys of Hdt. 4, 49, 1 is usually identified (e.g. F. PAPAZOGLU, *The Central Balkan Tribes in Pre-Roman Times*, Amsterdam 1978, 77 n. 214); it ended at the mouth of the Danube (Hdt. 4, 99, 1-2).

¹⁰ The imperfect tense marks the contemporary activities of Megabazus in Thrace and Darius in Asia (cf. n. 5); it does not limit Megabazus' actions to the coast or cancel what Herodotus had already said at 5, 2, 2. This is one of the places where Herodotus' chronology is palpably wrong; for Darius had no control over the Strymon valley on his arrival back in Asia and did not until Megabazus had conquered the Paeonians.

¹¹ See HMac 57. CASTRITIUS 2 is mistaken in making Megabazus invade the upper Strymon.

Paeonians¹² (and no doubt gave their lands as far as Lake Prasias to loyal Thracians). But, continues Herodotus, «those of the Paeonians around Mt Pangaeus, Doberes, Agrianes, Odomanti and Lake Prasias itself were not worsted at all by Megabazus» (5, 16, 1: Παιόνων . . . οἱ δὲ περὶ τὸ Πάγγαιον ὄρος καὶ Δόβηρας καὶ Ἀγριᾶνας καὶ Ὀδομάντους καὶ αὐτὴν τὴν λίμνην τὴν Πρασιάδα οὐκ ἐχειρώθησαν ἀρχὴν ὑπὸ Μεγαβάζου).

In this passage Herodotus gives us the limits of Megabazus' advance not in the coastal sector, since envoys were sent to demand the submission of Amyntas, king of Macedon, but in the interior. As I have argued elsewhere,¹³ Lake Prasias is Lake Butkova, the Odomanti lived in the Paroreia to the east of the Rupel defile, the Doberes in the Strumitsa valley and the Agrianes on the upper Strymon below Mt Scombrus (Vitoshka).¹⁴ The implication of these limits is that Megabazus tried but failed to carry the Rupel defile from the south or to reach the middle Strymon from the east, and to enter the Agrianian territory from the vicinity of Kostenec. It was in this region that the Turks succeeded in A.D. 1385, capturing Sofia and passing through the basin of the upper Strymon to reach Štip on the Bregalnitsa.¹⁵ Thus the passage in Herodotus suggests that the Persians were in control of the area to the east of Kostenec, Mt Rila (2925 m.) and Mt Pirin (2915 m.), both regarded in ancient times as part of Mt Rhodope.¹⁶

On the other hand, the significance of the passage has been lost through the action of STEIN, followed by HUDE, in excluding the words καὶ Δόβηρας καὶ Ἀγριᾶνας καὶ Ὀδομάντους. For this there is no justification. The words occur in all manuscripts, and the Doberes and the Odomanti are mentioned at 7, 112–113 in relation to the march of Xerxes. The Agrianes do not appear again, but that is natural since they lived so far away from the line of Xerxes' march. The use of περὶ with a geographical feature and a tribal name may seem strange to us but it is a Greek practice; it is found, for instance, in Strabo 440: τὴν ὄρεινὴν . . . τὴν περὶ Πίνδον καὶ Ἀθαμᾶνας καὶ Δόλοπας, another region where city-names were rare or lacking. Unless other objections can be lodged, the words should be retained in the text.¹⁷

¹² Herodotus dramatised the deportation by representing the victims as entire peoples (or as BURN 136 and MERKER, BS 6, 1965, 42: «all of them that could be rounded up»); but they occupied only a village and its district in Phrygia and escaped to the coast apparently without difficulty (5, 98).

¹³ For the identification HMac I, 193 f.

¹⁴ Thuc. 2, 96, 3.

¹⁵ See N. G. L. HAMMOND, *Migrations and Invasions in Greece*, New Jersey 1976, 68 and map 15.

¹⁶ Compare Thuc. 2, 96, 4 with Strabo 7 fr. 36 and 37.

¹⁷ HW II, 6 seem to misinterpret the meaning of περὶ when they say: «How can Paeonians be said to dwell near them (i.e. Paeonians)?» Herodotus is mentioning two sets of Paeonians, Παιόνων (5, 15, 3 fin.): those defeated by Megabazus and those who escaped conquest. He defines the second group by location, either by a place (as in our idiom) or by

When Megabazus returned to Asia with the deported Paeonians, probably in 510 B.C., he had gone beyond the orders of Darius to conquer <Thrace>; for he had added southern Paeonia from the Strymon basin to the river Axius (these conquests are referred to at 6, 44, 1, «all tribes on that side of the Macedones had already been made subject»), and he had obtained the submission of Amyntas, king of Macedon (5, 18, 1). The Persian empire extended now to the borders of Thessaly. Fortresses were built and garrisons placed at strategic points, such as Doriscus, in «Thrace and the Hellespont» (7, 106), and tribute was paid to Darius by «those who lived in Europe up to Thessaly» (3, 96, 1).

In the Persian records the first mention of the «lands beyond the sea», i. e. beyond the waters of Asia Minor, occurred in the inscription on the terrace-wall of Persepolis, c. 513 B.C.¹⁸ The peoples of the lands beyond the sea were named first in the records of c. 492 B.C. They were three: the «saka paradarya» or «Sacaе beyond the sea», being probably the Getae who were nomadic or semi-nomadic, like the Sacae of Asia;¹⁹ «Skudra», a Phrygian word, probably referring to the original home in Europe of the Asiatic Phrygians (7, 73);²⁰ and the «yauna takabara» or «Ionians (viz. Greeks) with a shield-like hat», such as was shown later on coins of Macedonian kings.²¹ If the first were the Getae and the third the Macedonians (and

a tribe (Doberes instead of Doberus). We may translate entirely in our idiom: «those of Mt Pangaeum, Doberus, Agriana, Odomantis and Lake Prasias itself».

¹⁸ HERZFELD 295: «in or shortly after 514 B.C.», his year for the invasion of Scythia being 515 B.C.

¹⁹ The identifications by scholars who are concerned primarily with the Persian inscriptions and reliefs are in dispute. But if one begins with the account of Herodotus one can only infer that the conquered peoples «beyond the sea» (viewed from Persia) lay between the Danube and the Aegean; for Darius failed signally to conquer the Scythians beyond the Danube (this alone rules out HERZFELD's equation of the «saka» with such Scythians, whether near the Danube or the Sea of Azov). The best candidates for «Sacaе beyond the sea» are the Getae whom Darius conquered and compelled to send troops (4, 96, 2), and who resembled the Scythians in being semi-nomadic, practising suttee and fighting with similar equipment (Thuc. 2, 96, 1). BURN 110, «Scythians or perhaps only Getae and Odrysae», casts his net wide.

²⁰ Skudra, like Skodra in Illyria, Skidra in western Macedonia, Kudrai in Pelagonia and Kudrara on the Phrygian border in Asia, is a Phrygian word alluding probably to watery places (O. HAAS, *Die phrygischen Sprachdenkmäler*, Sofia 1966, 20 and 70 f.). As the name of a nation or satrapy «Skudra» probably recalled the homeland in Europe from which the Phrygians had moved to Phrygia in Asia (Hdt. 7, 73 and 8, 138, 3). See HMac I, 414 and II, 59 f. WALSER 35 remarks that «Skudra» is mostly identified with Thracians; but he himself thinks of eastern Thracians near the Black Sea (p. 96). The dress of the tribute-bearing Skudra on the reliefs is very mixed; but the two javelins, small round shield and long knife are typical of Thracians (cf. HMac II, 148). BURN 110 thinks Skudra is both Thrace and Macedonia; H. BENGTSON, *The Greeks and the Persians*, New York 1968, 11 and 23 and CASTRITIUS 5 take it to be Thrace without question.

²¹ See e.g. C. SELTMAN, *Greek Coins*, London 1933, Pl. xlv. WALSER 47 and HERZFELD 310 and 349 support the identification of «yauna takabara» with Macedonians; CASTRITIUS 6 with them or Greeks in Thrace.

Herodotus offers no alternatives to 4, 118, 5 and 5, 18, 1), then «Skudra» covered the Thracians, the Paeonians and other peoples between the Getae and the Macedones. Thus «Skudra» was the main part of Persia's possessions in Europe; and the importance of the Hebrus valley in its inner communications was shown by the permanent Persian garrison at Doriscus, the terminal of the valley-route and the chief station on the road along the Aegean coast (7, 59, 1). The description of the Macedones as «yauna» is particularly interesting. It provides the earliest and perhaps the most striking evidence that the Macedones were a Greek-speaking people, at least in Persian opinion. Our identifications are supported by the «daiva-inscription» of 479 or 478 B.C. in which only «Skudra» is mentioned.²² By then the Getae were independent (they had not been among the conscripts in Xerxes' army), and Alexander of Macedon was on the attack ([D.] xii, 21).

As the owner of his conquests Darius was able to give to Histiaeus, tyrant of Miletus, a district on the east bank of the then navigable Strymon, which was called Myrcinus. When Megabazus returned from Europe, probably in 510 B.C., he met Darius who happened to be at Sardis and he persuaded the king to recall Histiaeus. Thus Myrcinus reverted to the Edones, a Thracian tribe (5, 11, 2 and 23–24). Farther inland, the town Siris, i.e. Serres, belonged to the Paeonians (8, 115, 3). It seems, then, that the fertile basin of the Strymon was divided by Persia between the Thracians and the Paeonians, the former being entrusted with the sector of greater strategic importance. There was probably another line of administrative division between «Thrace» and «the Hellespont» (7, 106; cf. 7, 95, 2 and 185, 1). For when Darius appointed Otanes «general of the men of the sea» (5, 25, 1), Otanes captured Byzantium, Chalcedon, Antandrus, Lamponium, Imbros and Lemnos, the last probably in 509 B.C.;²³ and this shows that his command extended over the Bosphorus, the Propontis, the Hellespont and the approaches to the Hellespont. Someone else was no doubt made general of «Thrace».

During the Ionian Revolt it seems from the silence of Herodotus that the Thracians did not help the rebels. This is not surprising; for the Thracians had been treated with favour and had gained territory under Persian rule, and they must have realised that Persian administration helped to protect them from encroachment by the Greeks and raids by the Scythians (the latter reached even the Chersonese, probably in 511/10 B.C., 6, 40, 2). When Persian forces were engaged in quelling the revolt, Aristagoras of Miletus captured Myrcinus from the Edones and attacked another Thracian city before he was killed (5, 126). Herodotus reports a remarkable escape-story of the deported Paeonians. They left their village and its district in Phrygia and reached the coast just ahead of the Persian cavalry. Once at sea with the help of Chios and Lesbos, they were safe. They made a landing at (or

²² WALSER 352. The Getae were certainly independent before 480 B.C. since they are not among Xerxes' troops from Europe in the list of Herodotus (7, 185).

²³ See also CQ 49, 1956, 125 and 129 where this chronology was proposed.

near) Doriscus, before any news could reach the Persian garrison, and made their way over the hills to the independent parts of Paeonia. The story shows the spirit of the Paeonians, not the weakness of Persian rule in Thrace (5, 98).²⁴

In 492 B. C. Mardonius crossed the Hellespont, where a large fleet and army had been assembled. They made their way «through Europe». Herodotus, obsessed by the false idea that Mardonius was marching on Eretria and Athens, does not tell us where he went; only that he subjugated Thasos and re-asserted his authority over Macedonia (6, 43, 4–44, 1). He suffered losses when he was attacked at night by the Thracian Brygi in Macedonia, probably in the vicinity of Lake Doiran and Valandovo, whence passes lead into the upper Vardar valley and into the Strumitsa valley.²⁵ He evidently attained his objective since he forced the Brygi to submit. Herodotus has nothing to say of inland Thrace, and we may guess that there was no insurrection to report.

In his account of Xerxes' expedition Herodotus mentions the contingents of troops conscripted from the European territories, some in the course of Xerxes' march and then a general list of those at Thermopylae. His divisions are as follows. (1) «Hellespontii» except Abydos (this shows that «Hellespontii» came from both sides of the waters) and others from the Black Sea, equipped in the Greek manner, provided 100 ships (7, 95, 2). (2) «The Greeks of Thrace and the islands off Thrace» provided 120 ships with 24,000 men (7, 185, 1). (3) The infantry (from Europe), 300,000 in Herodotus' own opinion, were provided by «Thracians, Paeonians, Eordi, Bottiaei, the Chalcidian race, Brygi, Pieres,²⁶ Macedones, Perrhaebi, Aenianes, Dolopes, Magnetes and Achaei (cf. 7, 132) and all those inhabiting the coastal district of Thrace» (ἄσσοι τῆς Θρηίκης τὴν παραλίην νέμονται). In this group Thracians occur twice.²⁷ For «all those inhabiting the coastal district of Thrace» does not include the Greeks of Thrace who were mentioned already under (2) but refers back to the troops recruited from Thracian tribes (ἔθνεα Θρηίκων) during the march of Xerxes up to Pistyrus (7, 110), i.e. before he reached the territory of the Pieres (7, 112). In that passage too he kept the naval conscripts and the military conscripts apart: «those by the sea followed in the fleet, and those of them who lived in the inland part, as listed by me, followed on foot, all except the Satrae.»²⁸ The names he gave were Paeti, Cicones, Bistones,

²⁴ CASTRITIUS, for instance, held that the homecoming of the Paeonians showed that Persian power in Thrace was weak; he does not allow for the methods refugees use to escape detection.

²⁵ See HMac I, 200 and II, 61; and Map 17 in I.

²⁶ The Pieres south of Mt Pangaeum as mentioned earlier in this book (7, 112), whom Xerxes reached after the Satrae (7, 110), and not, as HW II, 213 supposed, Pieres from Pieria; for Pieria was the homeland of the Macedones (HMac I, 193 and 430 f.).

²⁷ This point seems not to have been noticed hitherto.

²⁸ The Doberes, Odomanti and Agrianes of 5, 16, 1 were evidently still independent of Persia.

Sapaei, Dersaei, Edoni and Satrae. It follows from the mention of the Thracians of the coastal district, both on the coast and inland of the coast (i.e. up to the hills of Mt Rhodope) that the Thracians who head the list at 7, 185, 2 are the Thracians of the interior, i. e. those north of Rhodope in the central plain and in adjacent areas. It is conclusive evidence that «Skudra» in Xerxes' time included central Thrace. And it was these Thracians who evidently contributed the bulk of what Herodotus estimated as 300, 000 infantry.²⁹

When the forces of Xerxes and Mardonius had been defeated in Greece, the Athenians and the Macedonians began their attacks on the Persian satrapy in Europe. They were resisted by the Thracians as well as the Persians. We hear of Thracians sending supplies to the Persian governor of Eïon (Plut. Cim. 7, 2) in 476/5, when Athens and her Allies were besieging the town. The action of the Thracians was reasonable enough; for when Eïon fell Cimon «handed over that very fine and fertile area to Athens for settlement». In the 460s when Athenian seapower dominated the Hellespont and the north Aegean, Persia still retained her hold on the coast. This was possible only because she had a base in central Thrace and recruited Thracians. One instance is recorded by Plutarch (Cim. 14, 1): the Persians were determined not to lose the Chersonese and so called in «the Thracians from inland» (τοὺς Θράκας ἄνωθεν ἐπεκαλοῦντο), c. 465 B.C. Even after that date they held Doriscus. Herodotus praised the Persian governor, Mascames (7, 106), for resisting so many attacks by the Greeks. The key to his success was certainly the authority of Persia in central Thrace and the co-operation of the Thracians in sending supplies and troops down the great valley-route of the Hebrus. It was probably at that time that the foundations of Odrysian power were being laid by Teres (for the Hebrus flowed through their territory). The activities of Persia in Europe prompted unforeseen consequences: the rise to power of the Athenians, the Macedones and the Odrysae, each in their own sphere.

²⁹ Herodotus may have known much more about the tribes of central Thrace than he chose to say in his History; for his purpose was to describe the expedition of Xerxes and not to present his own knowledge of Thrace.

