

## V. THEORY AND INFORMATION IN GREEK ETHNOGRAPHY

Early Greek (Ionian) ethnography<sup>1</sup> was a by-product of two early sciences, geography and history. While most early ethnographers are lost beyond any reconstruction, and often we do not even have the names of the works,<sup>2</sup> there are two authors from whom at least something may be gathered. Several fragments of the *Periegesis* of Hecataeus include ethnographical material (see chapter III.2.), and the extant work of Herodotus contains many ethnographical excursuses (λόγοι). The great Egyptian, Scythian and Libyan λόγοι and many shorter ones fill a great part of the first half of his *Histories*.

Very early, it seems, there was also an ethnographic theory, a way to interpret the differences between various peoples. The variety and contrast between the customs of peoples, especially between Greeks and other peoples fascinated early ethnographers (as well as, we may suppose, their readers) and soon there were also attempts to explain this variety. On the other hand, there were some more or less theoretical ideas about the geography of the οἰκουμένη, and its edges were often compelled to fit in to some general idea which would allow logic and reason to be applied to geography. In addition to physical geography – ocean, mountains or deserts as outer boundaries – such ideas were often extended to the climate, natural world and customs of the most remote countries.

The method used by early ethnographers consists of three components expressly mentioned by Herodotus: ὄψεις, ἀκοή and γνώμη/ἱστορίη.<sup>3</sup> The first, 'seeing, what is seen' contains one's own eye-witness accounts. For our present theme, Scylax is the only author before the companions of Alexander who could use this method for India. Then ἀκοή, 'hearing, what is heard', contains the local traditions and legends obtained from local informants. The last term is the research, the ideas and conclusions one has formed from one's own opinions (γνώμη), and from what he has seen and heard (and read).

As far as opinion and judgment are concerned, we may also note an interesting contradiction among early ethnographers. On one hand, the Ionians were liable to ethnocentric

<sup>1</sup> As a general introduction to classical ethnography we can note Trüdinger 1918 and Müller 1972, to classical geography Thomson 1948. For a more detailed discussion of the latter, Bunbury 1879 can still be sometimes consulted, although it is very antiquated (not to speak of Mannert and Ukert).

<sup>2</sup> Some later works like *Airs, Waters, Places* clearly indicate that there was considerable ethnographical literature.

<sup>3</sup> Hdt 2, 99 μέχρι μὲν τούτου ὄψεις τε ἐμῆ καὶ γνώμη καὶ ἱστορίη ταῦτα λέγουσά ἐστι, τὸ δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦδε Αἰγυπτίους ἔρχομαι λόγους ἐρέων κατὰ τὰ ἤκουον· προσέσται δὲ τι αὐτοῖσι καὶ τῆς ἐμῆς ὄψεως. Written sources, though used, are not specifically mentioned. See also Jacoby 1913, 392ff.

thinking, seeing their own country as a kind of ideal place for human life with all the blessings of climate and nature. But there are also marked utopian tendencies in early ethnography, and ethnographic theory promulgated the view that the remotest countries were places of perpetual happiness and richness of nature.

### I. Οι τόποι

The conception of a literary commonplace, or using a Greek word a τόπος,<sup>4</sup> is well-known in classical philology, and studies paying attention to it have revealed many important facts concerning both classical literary traditions and individual authors, their literary technique and way of using their sources. It was pointed out a long time ago that the common tendency to use τόποι in any literary production was very important in ethnographical literature in the early phase.<sup>5</sup> In this discussion I mean by a τόπος specifically the τόπος as used in early Greek ethnography. Very often it is closely related to such methods as *interpretatio Graeca* and the application of ethnographic theory to the facts.

Ignorance concerning the use of these τόποι and of their actual realizations can easily lead a modern student completely astray, as may sometimes be noticed in studies about Graeco-Indian questions written by Indologists.<sup>6</sup> As an important example of such τόποι commonly met with in Greek ethnographical literature in general and in the descriptions of India in particular, we can note the various realizations of the tendency to see everything situated on the margins of the known world as greater and better than in the middle (i.e. in Greece). Typical references are the exceptional happiness, wisdom and righteousness of the remote peoples, the extraordinary size and miraculous characteristics of plants and animals, the intense heat of the sun, great rivers and heavy rains or total dryness,<sup>7</sup> the extraordinary fertility of the soil,<sup>8</sup> and so on. In many respects this

<sup>4</sup> The concept of τόπος (κοινός τόπος, Latin *locus communis*) is borrowed from classical rhetoric.

<sup>5</sup> See e.g. Schwarz 1896, 26ff. and Rohde 1900, 184ff., for Herodotus also Rossellini & Saïd 1978.

<sup>6</sup> Without pointing out individual names of scholars I would like to refer to a tendency to use as historical sources such texts that are known to be little more than mere collections of τόποι from the point of view of ethnographical information. There are e.g. the many versions of the Alexander Romance, the *Vita Apollonii* of Philostratus, the *Dionysiaca* of Nonnus and the apocryphal tales about the Indian travels of early Greek philosophers mentioned in chapter IV.2. The only real worth of such compilations for Graeco-Indian studies lies in the fact that they often derive part of their information from the then existing sources on India. But here we must always keep in mind that their authors were rarely scrupulous where geography was concerned, and suitable marvels originally connected with some other distant country could easily be used too.

means that the golden age still prevails on the peripheries, though the centre of the οἰκουμένη lives under the hardships of the iron age.<sup>9</sup>

In a way this tendency to use superlatives is also seen in the manner of populating the distant regions with various fabulous peoples and animals. It must be emphasized that such tendencies concerning distant countries are by no means confined to Greece for they are common to many peoples. Another important ethnographical τόπος is the distinction between civilized (especially Greek) and savage peoples, with semi-savage nomads as an intermediary state. In nearly every corner of the known world we find Herodotus making these distinctions and characterizing people according to their way of living and food habits,<sup>10</sup> sexual behaviour and social institutions,<sup>11</sup> and religion.<sup>12</sup>

There are many ways to view these ethnographical τόποι. Sometimes the important part is the general idea, the theory used as a model from which the individual τόποι are derived. On the other hand, many τόποι have their origin in folklore. They may be common to different peoples and places, perhaps they were carried over wide distances at an early date. They may have lain hidden in unwritten oral lore and shown up only much later in our written sources. But often we cannot exclude the possibility of independent appearances at different times and in many places. And then there are cases which may originate in some real incident and only then become a τόπος.

The question is thus rather complicated, and it has not always received the attention it deserves. The classical studies on τόποι were written at a time when it was fashionable to examine classical antiquity as a kind of isolated phenomenon which was self-created and developed with no (or at least with as few as possible) outside influences.<sup>13</sup> The last few decades have more or less given the deathblow to such an attitude,<sup>14</sup> but many of its

<sup>7</sup> There are three different ideas about the nature of the very borders of the earth. The ocean flowing around the world is found as early as in Homer. Herodotus did not believe in the idea (see Hdt 2, 23), instead he thought either deserts or high mountains (and often both) were the borders at each end of the world. But the ocean theory still had many advocates a long time after Herodotus.

<sup>8</sup> See the interesting discussion in Dihle 1962 and Rossellini & Saïd 1978, 963ff.

<sup>9</sup> This is emphasized by Rossellini & Saïd (1978, 963ff.).

<sup>10</sup> A contrast between the "eaters of bread" (e.g. *Od.* 10, 101 σῖτον ἔδοντες) and savages appears in Homer. Later there were three contrasting sets of customs: bread-eating and wine-drinking agriculturalists; meat-eating and milk-drinking nomads; and cannibal (and blood-drinking) savages. The same opposition is also seen in residences: settled homes in Greece; the mobile homes (e.g. chariots) of nomads; and savages living under the open sky with no homes at all. See Rossellini & Saïd 1978, 955ff. and Karttunen 1988.

<sup>11</sup> A contrast between marriage as a fixed institution and more or less the only allowed place for sex, and various degrees of promiscuity. A diminution or change in the roles or differences between the sexes is also often seen. See Rossellini & Saïd 1978, *passim*, and Carlier 1979, 397.

<sup>12</sup> A contrast between elaborate Greek cults of many gods and funeral customs; simple cults of perhaps one god only and a simple funeral if any; and extreme savagery with no religion at all and cannibalism instead of a funeral. See e.g. Rossellini & Saïd 1978, 953ff.

<sup>13</sup> A similar attitude has been (and sometimes still is) quite familiar also in Indology. To some extent it can here be explained as a reaction to the excessive foreign (especially Greek) influences often suggested on weak grounds by several scholars of the late 19th and early 20th century (like A. Weber, E. Windisch and V. A. Smith).

<sup>14</sup> The many Near Eastern influences in the archaic period (see e.g. Dunbabin 1957 and Schachermeyr

manifestations still linger on. I think that considering the τόποι as a kind of eternal literary feature with no origin is at least in some cases an example of the same tendency. Yet even a τόπος which was transferred from one author to another, and was in existence throughout the whole of antiquity,<sup>15</sup> could still have a definite origin. And this origin was not necessarily either the creative imagination of some early Greek author or a mere abstraction from a general theory, though both should not and cannot be excluded in every case.

Moreover, a τόπος may not only have an origin, it may also have a history. We must keep in mind that many τόποι were at the same time a kind of dogma. Many people actually believed – especially in the early period<sup>16</sup> we are presently discussing – in happy and just peoples, exceptional fertility, huge plants and animals and fabulous races said to be found in the extreme corners of the inhabited world.<sup>17</sup> An ethnographical author repeated such τόποι with full or partial belief, and if he found some real information which seemed to corroborate the tradition, he happily added it to the τόποι. From the point of view of classical ethnography it is often not so important if a τόπος has a real origin,<sup>18</sup> but as our study concerns the Greek accounts of India it is highly important. The general ethnographic theory with its τόποι should not be neglected, but even if a Herodotus actually selected and twisted the facts in order to have them match the theory he was a scrupulous enough ethnographer not to invent them in his own imagination. It was part of the theory that the extreme fertility produced marvellous and useful plants in the distant countries, and probably he was happy enough with an account of Indian cotton, which was not his own invention.<sup>19</sup> He accepted it because it fitted the theory, probably he ignored much that he heard that was contrary to the theory and therefore “irrelevant”.

Some τόποι probably arose purely from the theory. The general τόπος of the happiness and justness of remote peoples has hardly any foundation in actual fact. An attempt to explain it purely from the supposed reality of India<sup>20</sup> falls down as the same τόπος is reported elsewhere, for example in Homer. And the righteous Phaeaceans of the *Odyssey* so clearly represent a case of a distant utopia that any attempt to explain Scheria

1967) and the “Mischkultur” of Hellenism (see e.g. Momigliano 1975) are good examples of arguments used.

<sup>15</sup> Very often it also continued into the Middle Ages and even later. See Karttunen 1987.

<sup>16</sup> In fact primitive and remote peoples were still exceptionally righteous and happy to Tacitus, as they were also to Rousseau. The exceptional fertility of the soil was still a common theme in 18th century European literature about China.

<sup>17</sup> The historians of the expedition of Alexander and apparently Alexander himself are good examples of this belief. In the northeast, Amazons were expected to be found and they were found (cf. Brown 1973, 83). And when the campaign reached India there was no difficulty in finding and identifying the marvels described by Herodotus, Ctesias and others (e.g. gold-digging ants). Similarly, Columbus expected to find the Indian marvels of classical literature in his India, and consequently did so (see Laufer 1931 and Karttunen *forthcoming a*).

<sup>18</sup> As pointed out by Carlier (1979, 381) in the case of the Amazons.

<sup>19</sup> Hdt 3, 106 quoted in chapter II.7.

<sup>20</sup> Such an attempt is made by Vofchuk (1982a, 68ff.) with the righteous Indians of Ctesias. See also Arora 1982b, 481.

either as a real place (Corcyra or even Tartessus<sup>21</sup>) or as a reminiscence of the Mycenaean period<sup>22</sup> seems rather superfluous.<sup>23</sup> In addition to Scheria, there were also the Μακάρων νῆσοι in the extreme West and other utopias.<sup>24</sup>

As to the τόποι derived from real information about distant countries, tales of marvels and solid facts are in a way equal if they really were obtained from the country in question or perhaps from their neighbours (which often seems to have been the case) and not from Greek literary tradition or from the author's own imagination. When a piece of information was thus obtained, it was still often given a Greek garb. What was too strange or too much against the theory was likely to be discarded or changed. The tendency to place fabulous peoples and marvels in remote countries came from the theory, but the individual marvels were often not the same in different countries, at least not in the earliest sources. Many of them might thus have a definite origin, although with the Greek interpretation and with the lack of original sources of other peoples it may often be difficult to find out. But when a marvel was introduced into Greek literature, it often became a regular τόπος that was simply copied from earlier authors in order to give some colour to a perhaps more or less fictitious story.<sup>25</sup> An interesting example is found in Strabo, whose account of the inhabitants of Ireland curiously resembles that of Herodotus on India.<sup>26</sup>

It is true that several fabulous peoples living in remote parts of the earth were already mentioned by Homer and Hesiodus, who evidently could have had no knowledge of India or its confines.<sup>27</sup> Sometimes it has been even claimed that all the fabulous peoples mentioned in later literature are no more than a growth of this purely Greek τόπος already established in the Homeric age. But though the old idea has undoubtedly contributed, it does not explain everything. When a Scylax travelled in Northwest India he would already be familiar with the old traditions about marvels and fabulous peoples<sup>28</sup> and

<sup>21</sup> Hennig 1925, 38ff.

<sup>22</sup> Willman-Grabowska (1934, *passim* and esp. 228f.) suggested that Scheria was the prototype of all (including Indian) distant utopias and that it originally represented a vague recollection of the long by-gone Mycenaean times transposed by "Homer" from temporal to spatial distance, to the extreme west.

<sup>23</sup> But even if it is "pure" fantasy, it must necessarily contain elements borrowed from reality. A story cannot be invented out of nothing, and a good story must necessarily bear some resemblance to reality. Thus even a fairy land is not safe from attempts to place it on a map.

<sup>24</sup> On utopias in ethnographic literature see Rohde 1900, 218ff., and chapter V.4., on the idealization of remote barbarians Rohde 1900, 215ff.

<sup>25</sup> Thus we meet again many Indian τόποι in such works as the Alexander Romance and Nonnus' *Dionysiaca*, but now their relation to India is only secondary, pertaining not directly to India but to a Western literary conception of India. It also contained other marvels derived from old descriptions of other distant corners. For the later history of this literary India see Karttunen 1987 (with further references).

<sup>26</sup> Strabo 4, 5, 4. His Irishmen are both vegetarians (cf. Hdt 3, 100) and cannibals who eat their own parents (Hdt 3, 99). See also chapter VIII.2. It was shown by Rossellini and Saïd (1978, 955f.) that the Indian "vegetarians" of Herodotus are pure savages. It is not their vegetarianism that is important, but the fact that they eat wild plants and do not sow (οὔτε τι σπεύρουσι). It is possible – but not so clear as has been supposed – that they are somehow connected with some real Indian people or sect with vegetarian habits, but from the point of view of classical ethnography they represent savagery. This is why they are included in the Indian λόγος, and why we also meet the eating of wild plants as a characteristic of savages elsewhere. See my note in Karttunen 1988.

<sup>27</sup> See chapter IV.1.

therefore expected to find some similar marvels. If he was then told of some, why should he not combine them with the traditional τόπος, which the marvels seemed to confirm? It seems that in fact it turned out precisely in this way. We have clear Indian parallels with some of the fabulous peoples mentioned by Scylax as Indian.<sup>29</sup> I think we can safely assume them to be a kind of "souvenir" of his travels, not merely an example of traditional Greek fiction.

In the *Indica* of Ctesias (or its remains) we have several similar cases. Ctesias was very fond of the traditions concerning remote marvels, but his approach seems to have been to collect as many facts *and* tales told of India as he could, and repeat them, sometimes with a Greek interpretation.<sup>30</sup>

In the case of Herodotus we are better off because his *Histories* have been preserved in their entirety. In his long digressions on remote countries and peoples living in various corners of the earth – like Ethiopia, India, Arabia, Scythia and Libya – he often twists together old τόποι and actual information that sometimes can still be shown to be such. That the theory and τόποι connected with it are important for him, has already been emphasized on another occasion.<sup>31</sup> Often he simply selected and interpreted the actual facts, the information that was given him to suit ethnographic theory. It was a τόπος to have an expedition to exploit the distant riches, but the details of the expedition vary greatly in each case and were hardly likely to be invented by Herodotus or found in the Greek tradition.

Of course there were many other τόποι than those related to the remote peoples and natural phenomena discussed above. History was a discipline where the Greeks seem to have been most sceptical with the traditions of other peoples. While other kinds of tales were easily accepted, the traditions peoples told of their own origin were accepted only when they could be adapted to Greek traditions.<sup>32</sup> Megasthenes perhaps used to some extent Indian (partly Northwest Indian as we shall see) traditions but gave them a wholly Greek interpretation so that his accounts of the Indian Dionysus and Heracles have ever since defied the explanations of scholars. As Bickerman rightly pointed out, this reflects in fact an attempt to practise critical research. The "barbarian" (e.g. Persian, Assyrian and Roman) traditions were thought to be mere fiction, and it was the duty of a historian to correct them and integrate them with Greek mythic protohistory. The method failed because the Greeks took their own gods and traditions for granted. What they thought to be reliable evidence of early history were of course mere legends and myths. The same has been done later, for instance in 16th to 18th century books, when Western historians tried to link everything to the Bible, to find all peoples in Genesis, to derive them from Noah and every language from Babel.<sup>33</sup>

<sup>28</sup> Like Homer's Eastern Ethiopians, though Homer did not think of India in connection with them. However, when the sphere of geographical knowledge extended, the already existing marvels were relocated in more distant countries.

<sup>29</sup> Stein 1927 and chapter VIII.1.

<sup>30</sup> See the discussion of Pygmies in Ctesias and Megasthenes in chapter V.2.

<sup>31</sup> Karttunen 1988.

<sup>32</sup> Bickerman 1952, 68ff.

## 2. Fabulous Peoples in Greek Sources

As we saw in the preceding chapter, the fabulous peoples and other marvels belong to the edges of the world, not only India. But the classical sources on India contain a remarkably large number of such accounts, so that India later became the country of marvels *κατ' ἐξοχήν* in the West.<sup>34</sup> In the studies on the classical accounts of India the fabulous peoples have often presented a problem, that is if they have not been passed over in silence. They seem to be an inseparable part of the classical conception of India and often the physical and other properties ascribed to them are quite incredible. In the early days of modern scholarship they were a question of faith – either uncritical approval or wise denial. Many scholars also put considerable effort and ingenuity into attempts to find natural explanations for how these and other marvels of nature described by the ancients could have originated.<sup>35</sup> According to some, the real origin of the fabulous peoples was to be found in various species of apes and monkeys living in India or elsewhere in Asia.<sup>36</sup> Then it was noted that these peoples might go back to genuine *Indian* tales, which were repeated by classical authors.

In the middle of the 19th century Wilson, Lassen and Schwanbeck could indeed announce that some names found in the great epics of India and in the *Harivahśa-Purāna* corresponded to the fabulous peoples of classical ethnography and literature on India.<sup>37</sup> Their evidence consisted of some ethnic names and names of demons. Later, new parallels were added by Kern,<sup>38</sup> Stein<sup>39</sup> and others from *Purāṇas* and *Varāhamihira's*

<sup>33</sup> Bickerman 1952, 70f. Yet there were some interesting exceptions in both. The Egyptian, Mesopotamian and Jewish traditions were offered in Greek by Manetho, Berossus and Josephus. The great antiquity of Egyptian and Chinese traditions led some early Western scholars to suggest an antediluvian origin. An interesting extreme case can be seen the pre-Adamites of Isaac de La Peyrère.

<sup>34</sup> See e.g. Wittkower 1942 and Karttunen 1987.

<sup>35</sup> The early 19th century studies on Herodotus and Ctesias like Veltheim 1800, Weyrauch 1814, Malte-Brun 1819, Lion 1823 and Baehr 1824 are good examples of this.

<sup>36</sup> E.g. Weyrauch 1814. The idea has recently been revived by Puskás and Kádár (1980) in a way that demands a comment. Their main argument is the correct identification of the "Indian satyrs" of Pliny (*N. H.* 7, 2, 24) with Indian langurs (*Presbytis entellus*). But the other identifications they make with a zoological book in hand (like Prater 1965, which I have used) are not always so happy. Especially the attempt to give an earlier northwestern distribution to a species (Bonnet Macaque, *Macaca radiata*) now found only in the South (Prater 1965, 35: "as far north as Bombay on the west and the Godavari River on the east") on the weak ground of a supposed identification with some accounts in the historians of Alexander (Puskás & Kádár 1980, 16), is methodically unfortunate. When they suggest that several other fabulous races mentioned in classical ethnography also owe their origin to different species of Indian apes (*ibid.* 15 and *passim*), I cannot agree with them at all.

<sup>37</sup> See e.g. Wilson 1836 and 1843, Lassen 1839 and 1852 and Schwanbeck 1846.

*Bḡhatsarḡhitā*. But most of these parallels have never been properly examined, and some of the relevant material has even remained unnoticed in this connection. I shall come back to this later in chapter VIII.1.

But before we delve into the Indian evidence, we must discuss the other side of the question, already alluded to in the preceding chapters. Although India is the favourite home for all kind of wondrous stories in classical literature, it is not the only one, and certainly not the first. Homer and other archaic authors<sup>40</sup> mentioned several fabulous peoples and Herodotus, perhaps following Hecataeus, located some of them in Africa.

The supposed knowledge of India in Homeric epics was discussed in chapter IV.1. As was shown there, no argument suggested for such a knowledge can stand critical analysis. There is no indication of any knowledge of India in Greece before the expedition Scylax participated in. In the case of archaic literature, such knowledge is improbable, its geographical perspective did not reach even to much nearer regions.<sup>41</sup>

If we can now find some fabulous peoples or other marvels later described as Indian in this archaic literature, there would be strong grounds to think that such tales have in fact nothing to do with India. But the situation is not as simple as that. We must also find out whether the same people were in fact meant as, for instance, in the case of the Pygmies in Homer<sup>42</sup> and in Ctesias. As the Pygmies and their fight with cranes were already known to Homer,<sup>43</sup> they cannot be derived from India. Now, it is sometimes claimed that Ctesias described the Pygmies' fight with cranes – a τόπος he must have obtained from Greek literature and apparently transferred to India. This has been pointed out as a proof of the unreliability of Ctesias.

There is a relatively well-preserved passage in Ctesias' *Indica*<sup>44</sup> on a people he calls Pygmies (Πυγμαῖοι), and some of their characteristics make them worthy members in the company of the fabulous peoples. Their hair and beards extend below their knees – therefore they need no clothes – and their penises extend to their ankles. However, they do not fight cranes or any birds at all! It was in fact Megasthenes who wrote about Indian Pygmies fighting cranes.<sup>45</sup> This has sometimes been explained in the following way: as

<sup>38</sup> Kern 1872.

<sup>39</sup> Especially in Stein 1927.

<sup>40</sup> In the following pages I use the word "archaic" authors or literature to refer to the earliest period of Greek literature, including everything written before our "early" authors who deal with India. The most important and at the same time the earliest extant works are those ascribed to Homer and Hesiodus.

<sup>41</sup> See Thomson 1948, 19ff.

<sup>42</sup> As I said in chapter IV.1. I am using the name "Homer" for the sake of convenience. On the Greek pygmy tradition (most often connected with Africa) see e.g. Hennig 1932 and Wüst 1959.

<sup>43</sup> *Iliad* 3, 3–7

Τρῶες μὲν κλαγγῆ τ' ἐνοπῆ τ' ἴσαν, ὄρνιθες ὤς,  
 ἥύτε περ κλαγγῆ γεράνων πέλει οὐρανόθι πρό,  
 αἵ τ' ἐπεὶ οὖν χειμῶνα φύγον καὶ ἀλέσφατον ὄμβρον,  
 κλαγγῆ ταί γε πέτονται ἐπ' Ὀκεανοῖο ῥοάων,  
 ἀνδράσι Πυγμαῖοισι φόνον καὶ κῆρα φέρουσαι·  
 ἥέριαι δ' ἄρα ταί γε κακῆν ἔριδα προφέρονταί.

<sup>44</sup> Ctesias F 45, 21 and 45f. (from Byzantine sources).



Megasthenes with his high scrupulosity (in the sense of the old Schwanbeck school interpretation of Megasthenes) cannot himself have transferred Pygmies from the Greek tradition to India, he must have heard them described somewhere as Indian. In Ctesias there is an account of Pygmies living in India. Therefore, as Megasthenes has the *geranomachia*, he must have found it in Ctesias.<sup>46</sup>

But this is not so certain at all. Of course, we cannot be absolutely certain that Ctesias did not tell about the *geranomachia*. But we have both a long passage by Photius and a still longer fragment, and nothing about the *geranomachia*. The Pygmies of Megasthenes and Homer and those of Ctesias have only one point in common, their size. I think that Ctesias did not even intend to identify his Pygmies with those of Homer. He simply derived the story about his Indian dwarfs from some source and gave them a familiar name indicating their most prominent feature, their smallness.

It is even possible that he never called them Pygmies. Our two texts expressly ascribing Πυγμαῖοι to Ctesias are from the Byzantine period, it is quite possible that a more familiar name has replaced the original in the manuscripts of Ctesias (and certainly there were not many still remaining). At the end of the fragments it is stated that all domestic animals of the Pygmies are similarly of pygmy size.<sup>47</sup> In Aelianus we find a short account of Indian Ψύλλοι, whose domestic animals are also of pygmy size.<sup>48</sup> He does not give his source, but elsewhere he has often used Ctesias. That Ctesias is the source even here is rather clear for two reasons. Aelianus mentions the same animals in the same order as Ctesias, and he often uses even the same words. After this comes, again without a reference, the remark that there are no pigs, either wild or domestic in India and that the Indians never eat pork.<sup>49</sup> The same is found in Ctesias,<sup>50</sup> and one of the fragments corresponds very closely with Aelianus.<sup>51</sup> Others are shorter and one of them – 45kβ – comes from another part (3, 3) of Aelianus' work. Of course Aelianus may have erroneously read Ψύλλοι instead of Πυγμαῖοι, but Ψύλλοι is a respectable

<sup>45</sup> F 27b and 29.

<sup>46</sup> So it is stated e.g. by Lassen (1852, 657, but with an attempted Indian parallel). *Geranomachia* is ascribed to Ctesias also in Wittkower 1942, 160.

<sup>47</sup> F 45, 22 τὰ δὲ πρόβατα αὐτῶν ὡς ἄρνες, καὶ οἱ ὄνοι καὶ αἱ βόες σχεδὸν ὅσον κριοί, καὶ οἱ ἵπποι αὐτῶν καὶ ἡμίονοι καὶ τὰ ἄλλα κτήνη πάντα οὐδὲν μείζω κριῶν. Last lines of F 45fa καὶ οἱ ἵπποι αὐτῶν εἰσιν ὡσπερ κριοί καὶ ὀλίγοι μείζονες· τὰ δὲ πρόβατα αὐτῶν ἐστί μικρὰ ὡσπερ οἱ ἄρνες· καὶ οἱ ὄνοι καὶ οἱ ἡμίονοι καὶ τὰ ἄλλα κτήνη πάντα οὐδὲν μείζον κριῶν.

<sup>48</sup> N. An. 16, 37 παρά γε τοῖς Ψύλλοις καλουμένοις τῶν Ἰνδῶν (εἰσὶ γὰρ καὶ Λιβύων ἕτεροι) <οἱ> ἵπποι γίνονται τῶν κριῶν οὐ μείζους, καὶ τὰ πρόβατα ἰδεῖν μικρὰ κατὰ τοὺς ἄρνας, καὶ οἱ ὄνοι δὲ τοσοῦτοι γίνονται τὸ μέγεθος καὶ οἱ ἡμίονοι καὶ οἱ βοῦς καὶ πᾶν κτήνος ἕτερον ὀτιοῦν. There were also other Ψύλλοι known to Hecataeus (F 332) and Hdt (4, 173) in Libya.

<sup>49</sup> N. An. 16, 37 (immediately following the preceding quotation) ὅν δὲ ἐν Ἰνδοῖς οὐ φασι γίνεσθαι οὔτε ἡμερον οὔτε ἄγριον· μυσάττονται δὲ καὶ ἐσθίειν τοῦ ζῴου Ἰνδοί, καὶ οὐκ ἂν γεύσαιντό ποτε ὑείων, ὡσπερ οὖν οὐδὲ ἀνθρωπέων οἱ αὐτοί.

<sup>50</sup> F 45, 29 and 45ka-γ.

<sup>51</sup> F 45kγ ὅς οὔτε ἡμερός ἐστιν οὔτε ἄγριος ἐν τῇ Ἰνδικῇ ὅλως γῆ, οὐδ' ἂν φάγοι Ἰνδῶν οὐδεὶς ὑὸς κρέας οὐδὲν περ μάλλον ἢ ἀνθρώπου.

*lectio difficilior* and it is possible that this was the name Ctesias gave his people.<sup>52</sup>

Some scholars have found it very difficult to accept that the roles of the liar Ctesias and the reliable Megasthenes are changed in this way. Lassen ascribed the geranomachia motif to Ctesias on account of its existence in Megasthenes, and then took great scruples to find even some vague parallels in India. Of course he found some, but their relation to the Greek motif of geranomachia is rather artificial.<sup>53</sup> Ctesias may still have been the culprit concerning Megasthenes' error, but this is not a sufficient reason to ascribe the geranomachia motif to Ctesias.<sup>54</sup> The earlier work was probably familiar to Megasthenes, and perhaps its reference to the Pygmies in India, even without geranomachia, induced Megasthenes to tell everything he knew of the Pygmies of Greek tradition in connection with India. With Ctesias we have thus a case of a mild *interpretatio Graeca*, with Megasthenes a careless reading of his sources.<sup>55</sup> It is ironic that some modern scholars have been as careless as he in reading Ctesias' fragments.

But there were other examples of fabulous peoples in archaic Greek literature. Odysseus met several during his travels, but mostly they have no relation at all to those described as Indian. The most famous are perhaps the one-eyed Cyclopes,<sup>56</sup> the direct or indirect prototype of many one-eyed peoples met in later literature. In the *Iliad* there are fewer of them. The Ἰππημολγοί mentioned by Hesiodus, too,<sup>57</sup> have never been connected with India, though they help us to eliminate one pseudo-Indian people.<sup>58</sup> The Eastern Ethiopians will be dealt with in the next chapter.<sup>59</sup>

As to Hesiodus, fragment 150 of his *Catalogue of Women* mentioned above contains several other fabulous peoples. Pygmies<sup>60</sup> have already been mentioned, Eastern Ethiopians<sup>61</sup> and Hyperboreans<sup>62</sup> will be taken up soon. In other fragments of the same

<sup>52</sup> The idea is not wholly new. McCrindle 1881, 43 suggested that Ctesias used both names.

<sup>53</sup> Lassen 1852, 657f. still followed e.g. by Puskás (1986, 261), but aptly criticized by Rönnow (1936, 107f.). A recent attempt (Greppin 1976) to again connect Greek Pygmies and the geranomachia motif with the Indian Garuḍa supposedly habitually eating the Kirātas was no better. See also Schmidt 1980, 6 and 80 (note 12). Both Greppin and Schmidt also connect the Camrōš/Cināmroš bird of Middle Persian literature with geranomachia. This giant bird is said to peck "the attackers of Iran as birds peck grain" (Schmidt). On the other hand, the geranomachia motif is met with among many peoples in different parts of the earth, even in North America (see Toivonen 1937).

<sup>54</sup> As we saw in chapter III.1., there is a possibility that Scylax too wrote about a Pygmy tribe in India. Ctesias as the middleman between Homer etc. and Megasthenes is suggested i. a. by Lasserre (1975).

<sup>55</sup> With the idea of Megasthenes' intention to give a parallel to the Egypt of Hecataeus of Abdera (see chapter III.8.) it is also possible that Megasthenes transferred to India some marvels others told about countries beyond Egypt. Beyond Egypt is the most common location for the crane-fighting Pygmies.

<sup>56</sup> Κύκλωπες, especially in *Od.* 9, 105ff.

<sup>57</sup> *Iliad* 13, 5f. καὶ ἀγαυῶν Ἰππημολγῶν/ γλακτοφάγων, Hesiodus F 150, line 15 (from an *Oxyrhynchus papyrus*) Αἰθίοπας] τε Λίβυς τε ἰδέ Σκύλιθας Ἰππημολγούους and perhaps also F 151 γλακτοφάγων ἐς γαῖαν ἀπήνας οἰκί' ἐχόντων.

<sup>58</sup> The Κυναμολγοί or milkers of bitches are apparently a later parallel to these milkers of mares. Their ascription to Ctesias and India seems to be a mere error and the real context is Agatharchides and Ethiopia. The Ἰππημολγοί belong in the northeast. See Lindegger 1982, 67f., also Karttunen 1984.

<sup>59</sup> On the fabulous peoples in Homer see also Müller 1972, 58ff.

<sup>60</sup> Lines 9 and 18 (Πυγμαῖ[οι] ἄμενηνοί).

work we meet many other fabulous peoples, all of them also known in later literature and some mentioned even in connection with India.<sup>63</sup> Unfortunately, the fragments of Hesiodus give no hint of a geographical location, at least India seems to be out of the question as it belongs wholly beyond the geographical sphere of Hesiodus and his time.

All these peoples mentioned in archaic literature are known in later sources, and at least there they are situated clearly on the edges of the known world. But a similar location can often be noted in Homer, too, and the tendency to populate distant countries with fabulous peoples was already a τόπος in the archaic period. Of course this seems to be common everywhere. Neighbouring peoples who speak different languages and follow different customs are despised, but remote peoples are furnished with various fantastic properties.<sup>64</sup> As to the individual peoples mentioned, only Pygmies, Macrocephali and to some extent the Cyclopes have some relevance to a discussion of the fabulous peoples of India.<sup>65</sup>

Another argument against the Indian origin of the fabulous peoples mentioned in the early accounts on India is their occasional appearance in other geographical contexts, especially in Africa. The most striking example is the case of the Σκιάποδες, mentioned by Scylax in India, by Hecataeus in Ethiopia and by Antiphon in Libya.<sup>66</sup> In a chapter perhaps derived from Hecataeus, Herodotus mentions some fabulous beasts and peoples (among them the Κυνοκέφαλοι) in the most remote part of Libya.<sup>67</sup> But it will be seen in the next chapter that Africa as the place of origin is not so clear. From another source, the *Arimaspeia* of Aristeas, Herodotus takes the one-eyed Ἀριμασποί living in the extreme northeast.<sup>68</sup>

When we now review the early accounts of India, we face some problems. Especially the Scylax' fragments on fabulous races seem to have some points in common with the sources just mentioned.<sup>69</sup> In addition to the Ὠτόλικνοι and Ἐνοτίκτονες,<sup>70</sup> who are

<sup>61</sup> Line 15 quoted above.

<sup>62</sup> Line 21 Ὑ]περβορέων εὐίππων.

<sup>63</sup> E.g. in F 153 the Ἡμίκυνες, in later literature specified as northern or northeastern people, the Μακροκέφαλοι (discussed later) and the Pygmies.

<sup>64</sup> See Müller 1972, 5 with examples from Africa and Arabia. In anthropological literature there are many examples of this from nearly every corner of the world. McCartney 1941 collects several examples of such tales originating in modern times, and also shows how real features could be the origin of monstrous ones.

<sup>65</sup> Perhaps I should point out that I think any connection between Ctesias' Indian Cynocephali and the Hesiodic Ἡμίκυνες unlikely. The latter are "half-dogs", but we are not told in what way, and anything told by Ctesias concerning the former ("dog-heads") is never mentioned in connection with the latter.

<sup>66</sup> See Reese 1914, 49 and Diels 1887, 422.

<sup>67</sup> Hdt 4, 191. Cf. Karttunen 1984.

<sup>68</sup> Hdt 3, 116 and elsewhere, see chapter VII.7.

<sup>69</sup> *FGrH* 709 F 7 a) (Philostratus *V. Ap.* 3, 47) τοὺς δὲ Πυγμαίους οἰκεῖν μὲν ὑπογείους, κεῖσθαι δὲ ὑπὲρ τὸν Γάγγην, ζῶντας τρόπον ὅς πᾶσιν εἴρηται. Σκιάποδας δὲ ἀνθρώπους ἢ Μακροκεφάλους ἢ ὅποσα Σκύλακος ξυγγραφαὶ περὶ τούτων ἄδουσιν, οὔτε ἄλλοσέ ποι βιοτεύειν τῆς γῆς οὔτε μὴν ἐν Ἰνδοῖς and b) (Tzetzes *Chil.* 7, 629ff.) Καρυανδέως Σκύλακος ὑπάρχει τι βιβλίον/ περὶ τὴν Ἰνδικὴν γράφον ἀνθρώπους πεφύκεναι, / οὔσπερ φασὶ Σκιάποδας, καὶ γε τοὺς

not met anywhere outside India (at least not in the early sources) there are the Σκιάποδες, Μακροκέφαλοι and Μονόφθαλμοι with their clearly non-Indian parallels. Reese thought that this was enough to suppose a purely Greek literary motif moved arbitrarily to India by Scylax. In first two the real Indian counterparts had contributed, but the other three were only Greek fantasy.<sup>71</sup>

An examination of the Indian parallels somewhat changes this picture.<sup>72</sup> Of the two "Indian" peoples acknowledged by Reese the Ὠτόλικνοι have a good Indian counterpart in the *karnaprāvaraṇa* or 'blanket-ears' encountered in several Sanskrit lists of peoples. But the 'once-bearing' Ἐνοτίκτονες are still without a clear Indian parallel.<sup>73</sup> As to the "Greek" peoples of Reese, in spite of a somewhat different name, the Σκιάποδες or 'shadow-footed' have an Indian parallel in Sanskrit *ekapāda*, 'one-footed' people,<sup>74</sup> mentioned in most of the lists of peoples. Even the Μακροκέφαλοι, the 'long-headed' people, can be given a Sanskrit parallel, though it is much more poorly attested.<sup>75</sup> Before we go further, it must be emphasized that the peoples from the Sanskrit lists are mentioned only as parallels to the peoples mentioned by Scylax, I do not think they have anything to do with those mentioned by Hesiodus. Scylax could have heard Northwest

Ὠτόλικνοι/ ὧν οἱ Σκιάποδες πλατεῖς ἔχουσιν ἄγαν πόδας,/ καιρῷ τῆς μεσημβρίας δὲ πρὸς γῆν καταπεσόντες,/ τοὺς πόδας ἀνατείναντες σκιὰν αὐτοῖς ποιοῦσι/ μεγάλα δ' οἱ Ὠτόλικνοι τὰ ὧτα κεκτημένοι/ ὁμοίως σκέπουσιν αὐτοὺς τρόπῳ τῶν σκιαδείων./ ὁ Σκύλαξ οὗτος γράφει δὲ καὶ ἕτερα μυρία/ περὶ γε Μονοφθάλμων τε καὶ τῶν Ἐνοτικτόντων/ καὶ ἔκτραπέλων ἄλλων δὲ μυρίων θεαμάτων./ ταῦτα φησι δ' ὡς ἀληθῆ μηδὲ τῶν ἐψευσμένων/ ἐγὼ τῆ ἀπειρία δὲ ταῦτα ψευδῆ νομίζω.

<sup>70</sup> The Ἐνωτοκοῖται of Megasthenes (F 27a) and the Ἐνοτίκτονες mentioned without being named by Ctesias (F 45, 50) are probably related. There are some (not wholly improbable) emendations giving Ἐνωτοκοῖται in a location outside India, see Bergk's note to Alcman F 118. The Megasthenian fragment contains several fabulous peoples known already from earlier sources: διαφερόντως δ' ἀπιστεῖν ἄξιον Δηιμάχῳ τε καὶ Μεγασθένει· οὗτοι γάρ εἰσιν οἱ τοὺς Ἐνωτοκοῖτας καὶ τοὺς Ἀστόμους καὶ Ἄρρινας ἱστοροῦντες, Μονοφθάλμους τε καὶ Μακροσκελεῖς καὶ Ὀπισθοδακτύλους. ἀνεκαίνισαν δὲ καὶ τὴν Ὀμηρικὴν τῶν Πυγμαῶν γερανομαχίαν, τρισπιθᾶμους εἰπόντες. οὗτοι δὲ καὶ τοὺς χρυσορύχους μύρμηκας καὶ Πᾶνας σφηνοκεφάλους ὄφεις τε καὶ βοῦς καὶ ἐλάφους σὺν κέρασι καταπίνοντας· περὶ ὧν ἕτερος τὸν ἕτερον ἐλέγχει, ὅπερ καὶ Ἐρατοσθένους φησὶν. F 27b (also from Strabo) contains more or less the same peoples, but is longer and ascribes everything to Megasthenes. It is difficult to say how much comes from Deimachus, as most of the text is found among the fragments of Megasthenes (see F 22–23 and 28–30).

<sup>71</sup> Reese 1914, 49–51, to some extent contested already by Stein (1927, 313f. and passim). See also Gisinger 1929, 628. A strong opinion against such Greek explanations was expressed by Charpentier (1918, 475). See also Stein 1932, 305 and 1936b, 1032f.

<sup>72</sup> The fabulous peoples of India mentioned in early Greek sources and their Indian counterparts (only peoples, demons are excluded) are given in a separate table. See also chapter VIII.1.

<sup>73</sup> The attempts to give Sanskrit parallels to them by Reese (1914, 51 on the basis of earlier literature) and especially Stein (1927, 317ff.) are quite unconvincing (as Stein himself admitted).

<sup>74</sup> Later sources (beginning with Ctesias and Megasthenes) confirm the one-footedness of the Σκιάποδες, who are known to sleep in the shadow of their one foot. If the word were not attested in several sources and did not make such good sense in Greek, it would be tempting to see it as a corruption of \*Εἰκάποδες < *ekapāda*. See also Stein 1927, 313.

<sup>75</sup> Cf. Stein 1927, 314.

Indian tales and identified them partly with familiar Greek names.

Then there is the case of the one-eyed people, or rather one-eyed peoples. Reese thought it as self-evident that the *Μονόφθαλμοι* of Scylax (and probably the *Μονόμμα-τοί* of Megasthenes, too) are nothing else than the Cyclopes of Homer.<sup>76</sup> Curiously, he did not even mention the one-eyed Arimaspeans in this connection. But in this case Reese's knowledge of the Sanskrit sources was defective. One-eyed races and peoples are well attested in Sanskrit works, in particular in the lists of peoples.<sup>77</sup> Therefore, there is no need to resort to the names of demons as was done in the 19th century studies so aptly criticized by Reese.<sup>78</sup> But neither is there a need to go back to the Cyclopes in order to explain the Scylax passage.

Similarly, there have been some attempts to identify the Arimaspeans with the Homeric Cyclopes,<sup>79</sup> but much more commonly they have been interpreted as derived from an Iranian or at least a northeastern tale.<sup>80</sup> Their profession, seizing gold from the griffins, is so contrary to the shepherding habits of the Cyclopes that there is hardly any connection between the two peoples. A tale about one-eyed people is not so hard to invent – in this case we can point to the Indian demons, too<sup>81</sup> – that it cannot appear several times in different (or even in the same) traditions.

Thus it seems that there were at least three different traditions about one-eyed peoples in the ancient world: in the epic world (Cyclopes),<sup>82</sup> in Northeastern Eurasia (Arimaspeans) and in India (one-eyed peoples in Sanskrit sources). Therefore, it is quite acceptable that Scylax really had heard something of the Indian people.<sup>83</sup> In any case, it is not clear at all that he was referring to the Cyclopes of Homer.

The *Μακροκέφαλοι* (also called *Μεγαλοκέφαλοι*) are often mentioned in later sources as a people of Colchis or Pontus, and these may well have been meant by Hesiodus. Probably they were related to the *Μάκρωνες* mentioned in the same region by several authors beginning with Hecataeus.<sup>84</sup> Though a real people, they have often been

<sup>76</sup> Reese 1914, 50, but see Stein 1927, 316f.

<sup>77</sup> With various names, see table. In present-day Dardistan there are stories about one-eyed demons (Jetmar 1975, 222 and 224).

<sup>78</sup> Reese 1914, 50. Some early scholars (e.g. Lassen and Schwanbeck) even used the attributes of demons in their comparisons, and Reese pointed out justly that one-eyed demons mentioned together with two-eyed and three-eyed ones do not have anything to do with the fabulous races of India. Stein (1927) had a more sober approach to the names of demons, but I think it is wiser to pay them no attention at all.

<sup>79</sup> This was done e.g. by Schwartz (1896, 28f.), who supposed that Aristeas gave exact geographical and ethnographical information up to the Issedones and then filled the rest with Greek tales. This theory can be understood as a case of the excessive Hellenization fashionable during his times.

<sup>80</sup> E.g. Junge 1939, 17ff., Thomson 1948, 63f., Phillips 1955, 172ff., Pekkanen 1986, 173ff. and many others (see Bolton 1962, 74ff.), see chapter VII.7.

<sup>81</sup> The one-eyed demons of India can be compared typologically with the Cyclopes, but this does not mean a common origin (if it cannot be found in their Indo-European origins).

<sup>82</sup> They were living in a western island, perhaps Sicily.

<sup>83</sup> In chapter VIII.1. an attempt will be made to connect the fabulous peoples of Indian sources with the Northwest.

<sup>84</sup> Herrmann 1930, 815 (with references). The most important account on *Μακροκέφαλοι* is found in the Hippocratic *Airs, Waters, Places* 14.

described with features which belong to ethnographical theory. They are either long-living and righteous or savage. They may have been known to Scylax, but it is not necessary to think that he moved them from Colchis to India. He may have heard some local (Indian) tale and identified it with a more familiar Greek name.

### 3. *India and Ethiopia – the Old Confusion*

There are two fabulous peoples (Eastern Ethiopians and Sciapodes) who are relevant to our discussion of the old confusion between India and Ethiopia.<sup>85</sup> The difficulty of keeping these two countries separate began with the first accounts on India (the seeds were sown by Homer) and continued for two whole millennia.<sup>86</sup> There were different degrees of confusion. While some could apparently make no difference at all between the two countries, others simply transplanted some features from one to another. Homer with his two Ethiopians started things off, and when the Eastern Ethiopians were identified with an Indian people the confusion began. But it was not merely a question of the Ethiopians, ethnographic theory and actual data (water and growth provided by one big river, a hot climate, black people,<sup>87</sup> tropical plants and animals in both countries) both pointed to the same conclusion – the two countries were clearly similar or identical. What was found in one, was probably also found in another.

For us the two countries are, at least geographically, well separated from each other, but this was not always so clearly understood. For Homer both Ethiopians lived by the Ocean surrounding the earth, but probably there was no too exact geographical idea involved (and of course the Eastern Ethiopians were still not placed in India). Later the theory of a continuous land mass beyond the Indian Ocean<sup>88</sup> gave a geographical connection – the two countries were thought to meet somewhere. Alexander is said to have made the curious error that the Indus could be the upper course of the Nile, although he

<sup>85</sup> A classical discussion is given in the long note of Schwanbeck (1846, 1–5), more recently e.g. Dihle 1962 and Arora 1982.

<sup>86</sup> Some 16th century European scholars followed classical usage and called the Ethiopian language (Ge<sup>c</sup>ez) 'Indic', causing much confusion, which ended finally only with Hiob Ludolf's classical studies on Ethiopian in the second half of the 17th century. There is an early precedent for the confusion in Mesopotamia, where *Meluhha* meant (though in different periods) both India (the Indus civilization) and Nubia. In both countries the inhabitants were black, and both were sources of ivory (communicated orally by Prof. A. Parpola).

<sup>87</sup> In addition to the two Ethiopians both the Ethiopian and Gedrosian coasts were inhabited by ἰχθυοφάγοι. Of course there probably really were primitive fish-eating tribes on both coasts, but the eating of raw fish fitted well into the ethnographic theory and the similarity of the two peoples probably contributed to the confusion.

<sup>88</sup> The country of Antipodes or *Terra australis incognita* of later geography.

was wise enough to find out the real circumstances.

It may well be that a tradition about black men living to the south from Egypt originated in Greece as early as the Mycenaean period,<sup>89</sup> but in the epic period they had become quite fabulous people living at the end of the world. At some stage an idea of two Ethiopias was introduced. The Eastern Ethiopians of Homer have already been discussed in chapter IV.1. It was shown that they can hardly be thought to be any people living in or near India, as India is wholly outside the geographical sphere of Homer. From Hesiodus we know only a reference to the Ethiopian king Memnon<sup>90</sup> and another to the Ethiopians who form a southern counterpart to the mare-milking Scythians of the north.<sup>91</sup> The Eastern Ethiopians are given a geographical location only by Herodotus, who put them near the borders of India, probably somewhere in Gedrosia.<sup>92</sup> They are often ascribed to Scylax with the idea that everything told by Herodotus about India necessarily comes from Scylax, but their mention in the taxation list of Darius (even Artaxerxes?) and in the army of Xerxes makes this impossible. It may be that Scylax's lost work contained an account of them, but it is certain that Herodotus identified them with some real people.

This is perhaps already enough to refute Reese's conjectural (we have no fragment of Scylax about Eastern Ethiopians!) hypothesis that Scylax simply moved the Homeric Ethiopians thousands of kilometres eastward in order to have them in India.<sup>93</sup> Yet there is something in this idea. The Eastern Ethiopians as well as several other fabulous peoples were located in ever more distant places. We do not know what people (if any) were meant by Homer. At some stage their location may have been somewhere in southwestern Iran.<sup>94</sup> Then some dark people of Gedrosia<sup>95</sup> were given the familiar name, and later they are again encountered still further in the east.<sup>96</sup> Had it not been stated already by Homer that they live at the very end of the world? But Scylax (if it was he) did not simply place the Homeric tale in Gedrosia, he used the acknowledged method of *interpretatio*

<sup>89</sup> The origin of the Greek word and idea of the Ethiopians is discussed by Dihle (1965, 67ff.), who emphasizes that notwithstanding this real Nubian origin they soon became a mythical people whose real place of origin was entirely forgotten. See also Herminghausen 1964, 2ff.

<sup>90</sup> *Theogony* 984f.

Τιθωνῶ δ' Ἡὼς τέκε Μέμνονα χαλκοκορυστήν,  
Αἰθιοπῶν βασιλῆα, καὶ Ἡμαθίωνα ἄνακτα.

<sup>91</sup> F 150, line 15 quoted above.

<sup>92</sup> Hdt 3, 94 Παρικάνιοι δὲ καὶ Αἰθίοπες οἱ ἐκ τῆς Ἀσίας τετρακόσια τάλαντα ἀπαγίνεον· νομὸς ἑβδομος καὶ δέκατος οὗτος; 7, 70 quoted in chapter II.5.

<sup>93</sup> Reese 1914, 37.

<sup>94</sup> König 1972, 31, 38 and 146, note 1, constantly identifies the Eastern Ethiopians with "black Elamites", though he seems to be too certain with his idea.

<sup>95</sup> Many (e.g. Pisani 1940, 97f.) have simply identified them as Dravidians, the forefathers of the present-day Brahuīs, but though this may well be possible, it remains a hypothesis. The Brahuīs and Indo-Iranians of today do not fully represent the ancient ethnic situation of the area. In addition, it is dangerous to speak too much and too lightly of Dravidians, as this leads some to suppose that Dravidian South India is meant.

<sup>96</sup> Mela 3, 7, 67 *a Gange ad Colida, nisi ubi magis quam ut habitetur exaestuat, atrae gentes et quodammodo Aethiopes*; Ptolemy 7, 3, 3 καὶ ἐν τῷ τῶν Σίνων κόλπῳ ὄν περιουκοῦσιν Ἰχθυοφάγοι Αἰθίοπες.

*Graeca.*

In fact, there might be more Eastern Ethiopians in early Greek literature. With our established geographical nomenclature we are perhaps too apt to think that Ethiopia is, or at least should be, in Africa, and when Ethiopians are not expressly located elsewhere, a location in Africa is supposed. But it has also been suggested that in early literature the term Αἰθίοπες usually designates the Eastern Ethiopians, wherever they were thought to be living.<sup>97</sup> When Aeschylus in *Supplices* (quoted in chapter II.5.) mentions Ethiopians together with Indians, Friis Johansen and Whittle take this to refer to Eastern Ethiopians. They also refer to his *Prometheus* 808f., where a black people live near the springs of the sun and the river Aethiops.<sup>98</sup> It may well have been so. This is part of the wanderings of Io, which carry her from the north (Graiae) and the northeast (Arimaspeans) apparently through the east (if the springs of the sun refer to the rising sun) to the south, where she arrives at the Nile in verse 812. In this way his Ethiopians could easily be located in India, but of course here they are a mythical people as are the others mentioned by Aeschylus.<sup>99</sup> On the whole, Io's route forms an interesting sightseeing of the fabulous rims of the οἰκουμένη.

The rising sun is the clue for another and very early case of Ethiopians probably belonging to the east (but not – in the seventh or at least early sixth century – India). In an elegy Mimnermus described the daily (and nightly) course of Helios, and the country of the Ethiopians is given as the place of sunrise.<sup>100</sup> As a people of the sunrise country, the Ethiopians seem to be purely mythical, only later are they given a geographical location in the south or east. So it was claimed by West,<sup>101</sup> who also points out that Memnon, the king of the Ethiopians in Homer and Hesiodus, is the son of Eos, and that Poseidon, coming from the Ethiopians, seems to come from the east.<sup>102</sup>

The same method can also be used to explain the Sciapodes of India mentioned by Scylax and later authors. The Σκιάποδες are mentioned as Ethiopian people by Hecataeus<sup>103</sup> and Antiphon, and the Στεγανόποδες of Alcman<sup>104</sup> are perhaps related. But it

<sup>97</sup> Friis Johansen & Whittle 1980, 228, see also West 1966, 426.

<sup>98</sup> *Prom.* 807–809:

τούτος σὺ μὴ πέλαζε· τηλουρὸν δὲ γῆν  
ἤξεις, κελαινὸν φύλον, οἷ πρὸς ἡλίου  
ναίουσι πηγαῖς, ἔνθα ποταμὸς Αἰθίοψ.

<sup>99</sup> Dihle 1965, 69 remarks that in archaic literature it is nowhere stated that they were black-skinned. Later when the blackness was firmly established, the traditional white skin of Andromeda caused some difficulty.

<sup>100</sup> Mimnermus 5 (Diehl 10), 5–11:

τὸν μὲν γὰρ δια κῦμα φέρει πολυήρατος εὐνή  
κοίλη Ἥφαιστου χερσὶν ἔληλαμένη  
χρυσέου τιμηέντος, ὑπόπτερος, ἄκρον ἔφ' ὕδωρ  
εὔδονθ' ἀρπαλέως χώρου ἀφ' Ἑσπερίδων  
γαῖαν ἐς Αἰθίοπων, ἴνα δὴ θοὸν ἄρμα καὶ ἵπποι  
ἔστασ', ὄφρ' Ἠὼς ἠριγένεια μόλη  
ἔνθ' ἐπεβήσεθ' ἔων ὀχέων Ὑπερίονος υἱός.

<sup>101</sup> West 1966, 426 (on Hesiodus' *Theogony* 985).

<sup>102</sup> *Od.* 5, 282f.

<sup>103</sup> F 347 (Jacoby)/ 342 (Nenci) from Stephanus: Σκιάποδες· ἔθνος Αἰθιοπικόν, ὡς Ἐκα-



is not so difficult to encounter traditions about one-footed peoples in several countries. Defective or additional limbs are a very common feature of fabulous peoples everywhere, and one foot instead of two is a very simple idea to invent. I suppose again that Scylax heard some tales of Indian fabulous peoples, and here as well as in other cases gave a familiar name to them without perhaps even intending a straightforward identification. The tales he heard were to some extent also told further in the east and are reflected then in the *Mahābhārata* and other Sanskrit works.<sup>105</sup>

Perhaps I should mention two further points which may help to explain some of the confusion. Scylax's voyage ended at the northern end of the Red Sea. If there really was a book written by him about this voyage, it could well contain an account of Ethiopia (in the later sense), too. So few seem to have really read his work, and our fragments of it are so scarce, that such an idea is by no means impossible. But this opens up the possibility of even greater confusion, as something told in connection with India may be erroneously moved to Ethiopia and vice versa. There is also some evidence which might indicate that Herodotus or Hecataeus perhaps gave some Asian (Indian) information in connection with the African Ethiopians.<sup>106</sup>

There are still further possibilities for speculation. In his *RE*-article on Sciapodes, Herrmann stated that the fragments about fabulous peoples<sup>107</sup> do not hail from the ancient Scylax at all but from the younger Scylax, the same man who wrote the *Periplus* c. 350 B.C.<sup>108</sup> This would certainly open up interesting possibilities. In this case, Ctesias would be the original source for the fabulous peoples of India ascribed to Scylax,<sup>109</sup> but then it

ταῖος ἐν Περιγησίαι Αἰγύπτου.

<sup>104</sup> F 118 (without any geographical location). The name Στεγανόποδες is often used of some wading birds, but here a fabulous people is clearly meant (Bergk's note ad locum).

<sup>105</sup> I think this is a much easier explanation for the few common points than to suggest that the tales we meet with in the Greek sources (e.g. Herodotus and Ctesias) were actually derived from the Indian epos known by Persians, as proposed by Puskás (Puskás 1983, 206, 1986, 262 and Puskás & Kádár 1980, 9). It is rather unlikely that the *Mahābhārata* as such would have been known in Persia at so early a date, but of course our accounts go back to traditions also incorporated into the epics (stated as an alternative explanation by Puskás too in 1986, 262). See also Stein 1927, 313. On Herrmann 1929 see below.

<sup>106</sup> Reese 1914, 91 mentions Hdt 4, 191 on horned asses, dog-heads and headless people in Libya (ὄνοι οἱ τὰ κέρα ἔχοντες καὶ οἱ κυνοκέφαλοι καὶ οἱ ἀκέφαλοι οἱ ἐν στήθει τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ἔχοντες) and 4, 192 on no pigs found in Libya (ὄς ἄγριος ἐν Λιβύῃ πάμπαν οὐκ ἔστι), which are all found to belong to India in Ctesias, who could have them directly from Scylax (for another explanation of Libyan dog-heads see Karttunen 1984). Another set of parallels is found in the Herodotean description of (Southern) Ethiopia (Hdt 3, 17ff.), where a fountain with miraculously light water (cf. VII.9.), the table of the (rising) sun, long-living Ethiopians (μακροβίοι, in Ctesias a people of India) and Ichthyophagi were found. See Lesky 1959 and Karttunen 1985, 59f. To these we must add Sciapodes in Ethiopia/Libya and India, and perhaps the Sophocles' fragment on the gold-digging ants (see chapter III.5.). See also Pullé 1901, 57f.

<sup>107</sup> From Tzetzes and Philostratus. Herrmann (1929, 517) refers erroneously to Pliny (Ctesias' fragment on fabulous peoples) instead of Tzetzes. Of course the two fragments are certainly related but I have an impression that they are perhaps not too reliable.

<sup>108</sup> Herrmann 1929, 518.

<sup>109</sup> According to Herrmann the original source was Hecataeus. But his attempt to derive Sciapodes solely from Hecataeus, whose great Southern Ethiopia extending to India should have been divided into two

is just a case of Greek interpretation in Ctesias instead of Scylax, as the Indian parallels are still there. On the other hand, however, Herrmann's hypothesis is simply a way of presenting facts as one would like to have them, as there seems to be no evidence otherwise. Even the identity of this younger Scylax, not to speak of his date, is suspect.<sup>110</sup> The extant *Periplus* does not deal with India.

#### 4. The Northern Paradise

In later literature on India there are some striking parallels where unquestionably Indian information (even with the Northwestern aspect) is connected with a purely Greek tradition. This will be the subject of chapters VII.–VIII., but I shall take here briefly one case where a purely Greek conception is involved.

It seems to have been Megasthenes who heard the Indian legend about the happy Uttarakuru of the remote north.<sup>111</sup> The idea of a remote and happy northern people, as well as the similarity of the names, made an identification with the Greek Ὑπερβόρειοι very natural, and yet the Greek tradition is definitely non-Indian.<sup>112</sup> The Indian tradition is met again in the Ὀπτοροκόρραι of Ptolemy and in the *Attacori* of a certain Amometus mentioned by Pliny.<sup>113</sup>

A remote paradise as such is a very common element in folklore. In classical literature we meet many such utopias like, Scheria, Μακάρων νῆσοι and Atlantis in the far West, Meropis beyond the Ocean, the islands of Euhemerus and Iambulus and *Fortunatae insulae* in the Indian Ocean. In Indian cosmography there are the ring-continents surrounding Jambūdvīpa, described as places of happiness and bliss, while the central continent is subject to the hardships of karma.<sup>114</sup>

halves (by whom?) – African and Indian – on the basis of the expansion of geographical knowledge brought by the Scylax expedition, is purely conjectural.

<sup>110</sup> See Gisinger 1929, 635ff.

<sup>111</sup> The first vague mention is already in the *AB* 8, 14, 23, then several times in the *Mbh*. Cf. e.g. Thapar 1971, 415f., and Karttunen 1985. There is some difficulty about their location, in the Veda it seems that they were still a real people (northern Kurus opposed to southern) living somewhere in the Western Himalayas. Yet I can hardly see how they could be located as south as the region of Mathurā, as suggested by Eggermont (1966a, 290ff.) on slight evidence. Later they undoubtedly lived in a remote and inaccessible northern paradise. The connection between Greek and Indian accounts was first suggested, if I am right, by Lassen (1827, 83).

<sup>112</sup> On the Hyperboreans see e.g. Rohde 1900, 226ff. and Bolton 1962, passim (index s.v.), on similarities between them and Indian Uttarakurus as well as some other remote utopias see Pisani 1955 and Bolton 1962, 98ff.

<sup>113</sup> Pliny (6, 55) says that he even wrote a book about them, but none of it has been preserved. Pliny compares them also with the Hyperboreans. See Herrmann 1939 and Aalto & Pekkanen 1975, s.v. *Attacori*.

#### V. Theory and Information in Greek Ethnography

In connection with the Uttarakuru we must include the river or spring where nothing floats (*Silas* or *Sides* in classical sources). This is proved by the fact that, the river *Ṣailodā*, its counterpart in Indian tradition, where everything turns into stone (and consequently cannot float) is the boundary of the country of Uttarakuru. I shall discuss it again in a later chapter (VII.9.).

\* \* \*

In the preceding pages I have tried to show that there are two sides to Greek ethnographic writing both clearly present in the accounts on India. First there is the theory, which is very important. In a way it seems to dominate everything that is told and the way it is told. On the other hand, the facts are also there, the accounts were not mere phantasy or abstraction based on theory. Authors, even those who personally visited the country they were describing, selected and (perhaps unconsciously) adapted their data to fit the theory, but still they tried to find reliable data and give a reliable picture. They also constantly explained and interpreted their data from the Greek viewpoint. The fabulous peoples acquired Greek names, and if there were similar peoples who were already known, their names could be used.<sup>115</sup> In many respects they became part of Greek tradition, but they still could owe their origin to Eastern lore.

With the fabulous Indian peoples the case is made more difficult by the fact that the early Greek information was obtained – partly directly, partly through the Persians and Bactrians – from the Northwestern country. This country was not the same as the India we know as the home of Old Indian literature and culture. From the Northwest we do not have direct written sources. But something was carried over to the Sanskrit sources as well as to the Greek, and by combining these two some results can perhaps be obtained. This I shall attempt to do in chapters VII.–VIII., but first we must consider the Indian texts and their respective worth as sources.

---

<sup>114</sup> Cf. the Greek idea of the happiness of the golden age still prevailing on the edges of the οἴκου-μένη, while the centre is struggling under the hardships of the iron age.

<sup>115</sup> Though nobody was bold enough to call Μονόφθαλμοι or Μονόμματοι or Ἀριμασποί by the Homeric name of Κύκλωπες.

FABULOUS PEOPLES OF INDIA AS MENTIONED IN CLASSICAL AND INDIAN SOURCES

Name	Greek name	Scylax	Ctesias	Megasth. <sup>5</sup>	Mahābhārata	Rāmāyana	Bṛhat-Saṁhitā	Purānas <sup>5</sup>	Sanskrit name
Shadow-footed	Sciapodes	F 7ab	F 51 ibid.	F 27b	2, 28, 47 S 2, 47, 16 -	4, 39, 25 E	14, 31 NE <sup>4</sup> 14, 7 E	E NE? <sup>4</sup> SW	Ekapāda Ekacarana
Swift-footed	Ocyropes	F 7a					14, 23 NW		Dirghagrīvāsyaśeṣa
Long-headed	Macrocephali	F 7b	(F 45, 50)	F 27b	2, 28, 44 S 2, after 48, 17 E <sup>1</sup> 6, 47, 13 -	4, 39, 24 E	E		Kaṁapṛavaraṇa
Blanket-ears	Otolioni Enotocoeatae								
One-eyed	Monophthalmi Monommati	F 7b	F 27a F 27b		2, 47, 15 -		14, 18 SW		Kaṁapṛaveya
Once-bearers	Henotictones (Enotocoetae) (Pandarae, Macrobii) (nameless people with large ears)	F 7b	F 52 F 45, 50	(F 27b) F 13d	(6, 10, 64 W <sup>7</sup> )		14, 23 NW W		Lalataksa, Ekavi- locana, Ekeksana (*Sakṛdgarbha) <sup>6</sup>
Pygmies	Pygmaei	(F 7a)	F 45, 21	F 27ab, 29					(Kirāta)
Dog-heads <sup>1</sup>	Cynocephali <sup>2</sup> Calystrii (Cynamolgi) <sup>3</sup>		F 45, 37ff. ibid. (F 46)	(F 28) <sup>6</sup>				W	Sunāmukha, Svamukha
Cave-dwellers <sup>2</sup>	Trog(Dodytae	F 6 (7a?)	F 51						
Headless <sup>1</sup>	Acephali		F 51	F 51					
Cannibals	Calatians, Padaeans <sup>4</sup>			F 27b				14, 25 N	
					2, 28, 44 S <sup>3</sup> 2, 47, 15 -	4, 39, 25 E	14, 6 E		Puruṣāda(ka)
Hyperboreans	Opisthodactylī			F 27a, 28 F 27b, 29					- (Uttarakuru)

Notes on classical sources:

1 According to Herodotus 4, 191 in Libya.

2 Probably belong to Ethiopia.

3 Erroneously ascribed to Ctesias and India, but the proper context is Agatharchides and Ethiopia.

4 Herodotus 3, 38 & 97, 3, 99 (and Hecataeus F 298), Megasthenes gives no name.

5 Such peoples who are mentioned only by Megasthenes and later authors are ignored.

6 Fragment of Ctesias erroneously ascribed to Megasthenes by Solinus.

Notes on Indian sources:

1 Interpolation occurring in some northern manuscripts.

2 The Kālamukhas, identified by Puskās with Calystrii.

3 The following verse mentions the Kālamukhas, identified by Puskās with Calatians.  
4 Called the Northeast, but containing Northwestern peoples.

5 Cited from the lists given in Sircar 1967 and 1971.

6 O. Stein's (1927) conjecture, the critical edition reads *sakṣudrahih*.

7 Mbh 10, 8, 129 *pasācāraṅgulayah* is a class of demons.