

The Impact of the Achaemenids on Thrace: A Historical Review¹

Ellen Rehm

Introduction

This brief introduction² presents the region in question and the historical and political situation regarding the relationship of Thrace and the Thracian tribes with the Achaemenid Empire.

Ancient Thrace lay between the northern Carpathians and the Aegean Sea (see Fig. 1). It was largely identical to the modern state of Bulgaria, with some regions now situated within the modern states of Moldavia, Romania, northern Greece, Macedonia and Serbia. The northern frontier was the Danube. Dominant features of the landscape are the Balkan mountains, the Rodopen in the south and the Strandsha mountains in the west. Due to the distinctive landscape of the whole Balkan peninsula, there are very few natural highways. This resulted in separate and autonomous population groups and made the region difficult for an enemy to capture. The first good network of roads must date to the Roman period³.

European Thracians were mentioned by Herodotos in his *Histories*⁴ on the occasion of the campaign by Dareios I (521-486 BC):

Before arriving at the Ister, the first people whom he subdued were the Getae, who believe in their immortality. The Thracians of Salmydessus, and those who dwelt above the cities of Apoloni and Mesembria – the Scyrmiadae and Nipsaeans, as they are called – gave themselves up to Darius without a struggle; but the Getae, obstinately defending themselves, were forthwith enslaved, notwithstanding that they are the noblest as well as the most just of all the Thracian tribes (4.93).

On the tribes, he reports as follows:

The Thracians are the most powerful people in the world, except, of course, the Indians: and if they had one head, or agreed among themselves, it is my belief that their match could not found anywhere, and that they would very far surpass all other nations.



Fig. 1. Oppermann 1984, 74.

But such union is impossible for them, and there are no means of ever bringing it about. Herein therefore consists their weakness. The Thracians bear many names in the different regions of their country, but all of them have like usages in every respect, excepting only the Getae, the Trausi and those who dwell above the people of Creston (5.3).⁵

However, Thrace was not the only region where Thracian tribes lived, as they had also settled in the Anatolian regions of Mysia, Bithynia and Paphlagonia in the northeastern sector, south and east of the Sea of Marmara in present-day Turkey. Herodotus describes the Anatolian Thracians⁶ as follows:

The Thracians went to the war wearing the skins of foxes upon their heads, and about their bodies tunics, over which was thrown a long cloak of many colours. Their legs and feet were clad in buskins made from the skins of fawns; and they had for arms javelins, with light targets, and short dirks. This people, after crossing into Asia, took the name Bithynians; before they had been called Strymonians, while they dwelt upon the Strymon; whence, according to their own account, they had been driven out

by the Mysians and Teucrians. The commander of these Asiatic Thracians was Bassaces the son of Artabanus (7.75).

Herodotos mentions the European Thracians only in passing, and, unfortunately, their dress and weaponry are not described.⁷ However, we can assume that the equipment of the European Thracians must have looked like Asiatic equipment, since Xenophon describes it in the *Anabasis*, when the noses and ears of Greek soldiers fighting in the interior froze because of the icy cold:⁸

Then it became clear why the Thracians wear fox-skin caps on their heads and over their ears, and tunics not merely about their chests, but also round their thighs, and why, when on horseback, they wear long cloaks reaching to their feet instead of mantles (7.4.4).

Based on the number of finds and remains, the main emphasis of the following discussion will be on the European part of Thrace and so, in what follows, the survey is weighted in favour of this region.

In respect of the written sources and their historical classification, some issues are of significance. Whereas today it is the European region that is usually referred to as “ancient Thrace” and its inhabitants called “Thracians”, in antiquity the Thracians living in Asia Minor were also included as inhabitants of the Thracian region. This results in extremely complex problems concerning the satrapy of Thrace. First comes the question of its actual name: which names in Old Persian texts conceal these regions? (See on “Skudra”, below.) This is connected with the question as to whether there was even a name peculiar to this region or whether Thrace was only a part of a satrapy with another name. An attempt will also be made to clarify whether the European region where Thracians settled was a satrapy, part of a satrapy or only a region dependent on tribute. It should also be taken into account that there were displacements over time. These points must be researched and defined since only then will it be possible to make the best evaluation of the artefacts and finds.

However, there are uncertainties not only in respect of the names and classifications of the region and its inhabitants, but also about how far they spread. In spite of numerous excavations over the past 100 years, the structure and distribution of the individual tribes⁹ in their respective regions remain uncertain, due to the lack of written sources and other data.¹⁰ The same is also true of contact with Greek colonists. This means that it is uncertain which sites along the coast of the Black Sea were already Thracian settlements – and how large they were – at the beginning of the seventh century BC, when the Greeks built their trading centres on the coast of the Black Sea and subsequently began to settle there. It is generally accepted that in most cases this took place in agreement with the autochthonous peoples already living there. This must have been consolidated through diplomatic skill, but also by means of pay-

ment from the Greeks.¹¹ Similarly, it was the result of much intermarrying.¹² To reduce conflict in the rapprochement, it was often claimed that there were unwallled villages, but the archaeological finds in many towns have shown that they were fortified – at least in the fifth and fourth centuries BC.¹³

The history of Thrace in respect of the Persians

Little is known about Thrace in respect of the Persians. Under Dareios I, Thrace was conquered during his Scythian campaign, which began in the west in 513/512 BC, and was made part of the Achaemenid Empire.¹⁴ It is still uncertain how large the conquered Thracian region was.¹⁵ Our source is chiefly Herodotos, who describes this campaign.¹⁶ While Dareios I, coming from Bosphorus, was taking the land route over the Thracian region,¹⁷ he sent the fleet over the Black Sea up to the Danube estuary, which was crossed with a temporary bridge. Instead of breaking it up behind him – presumably on the advice of Koës, the commander of the Mytilenaeans – he left it behind under guard. This meant that after their unsuccessful campaign – there was no decisive battle – they were able to withdraw.

In this context, Hekataios¹⁸ gives a report on a city called Boryza, founded by the Persians, north of Byzantion in the area of the Thynen on the west coast of the Black Sea.

Through Herodotos we know of yet another Persian foundation: Doriskos in the plain of the Hebros estuary, north of Samothrace:

The name Doriskos is given to a beach and a vast plain upon the coast of Thrace, through the middle of which flows the strong stream of the Hebrus. Here is a royal fort which is likewise called Doriskos, where Dareios had maintained a Persian garrison ever since the time when he attacked the Scythians (7.59).

Another city in Thrace is Myrkinos on the Strymon, which Histiaios had received from Dareios I for his loyalty in the Scythian campaign, as Herodotos reports:

King Dareios had no sooner crossed the Hellespont and reached Sardis, than he bethought himself of the good deed of Histiaios the Milesian [...]. Now Histiaios, as he was already king of Miletos, did not make request for any government besides, but asked Dareiso to give him Myrkinos of the Edonians, where he wished to build a new city (5.11).

However, later, when Megabazos was in Myrkinos, he advised Dareios I to prevent Histiaios – tyrant of Miletos and father-in-law of Aristagors – from building that town:

What mad thing is this that you have done, sire, to let a Greek, a wise man and a shrewd, get hold of a town in Thrace, a place too where there is abundance of timber fit of shipbuilding, and oars in plenty, and mines of silver, and about which are many dwellers both Greek and barbarian, ready enough to take him for their chief, and by day and night to do his bidding! Make this man cease his work, if you would not be entangled in a war with your own followers (5.23).

Thereupon, Dareios I allowed Histiaios to come to Sardis and took him with him to Susa. This story shows that at least the south Thracian coast was seen as “his own country”, i.e. belonging to the Persian Empire. This excerpt also makes clear the sources of raw materials that Thrace could offer: wood and, especially, precious metals. From other sources we know of the silver mines in Dysoros¹⁹ and the gold mines in Pangonion.²⁰

The occupation of Thrace should not be underestimated, as it entailed – possibly besides preventative measures against growing interest on the part of the Scythians²¹ – also sovereignty over the Dardanelles and the Bosphorus and, therefore, control of trade between the Black Sea and the Mediterranean.²² Perhaps this region had already been in Persian hands, since it had been under the control of the Lydian king and, when conquered by Cyrus, had been added to the Achaemenid Empire. On the one hand, this sovereignty was important, in order to retain Thrace. But, on the other hand and in a wider perspective, it acquired a significant position overall, since already at this time Athens apparently was allocated an import of south Russian wheat.²³ Perhaps this was the reason why, in 499 BC, Athens decided to support the rebellion of the Ionian towns on the west coast of Asia Minor – in the hope of gaining free access to sea routes. The rebellion was sparked off in Miletos and then Sardis was sacked. However, the uprising affected not only the other Greek cities but also involved Karia and Lycia as well as Cyprus. Thrace was cut off from the Persian Empire. The Persians reacted with a strong military response. First Cyprus was recaptured and then the net was tightened round rebellious Miletos. In a decisive sea battle in 495 BC, at Lade, the Persians showed their superiority and strengthened their claim to be a world power. Miletos fell in 494 BC. Then Megabazos recaptured Thrace and advanced perhaps even further than Dareios I ever had:

The Persians left behind by King Darius in Europa, who had Megabazus for their general, reduced, before any other Hellenistic state, the people of Perinthus, who had no mind to become subjects of the king. [...] At this time the Perinthians, after a brave struggle for freedom, were overcome by numbers, and yielded to Megabazus and the Persians. After Perinthus had been brought under, Megabazus led his host through Thrace, subduing to the dominion of the king all the towns and all the

nations of those parts. For the king's command to him was, that he should conquer Thrace (5.1-2).

Whether the fortress Doriskos, mentioned above, always remained occupied is debatable, since Herodotos (5.98) tells us that the Paionen, who had been forcibly taken to Phrygia from Strymon by Megabazos, were encouraged by Aristagores (died 497 BC) to go back home. Luckily, in their flight through Chios and Lesbos, they landed in Doriskos and from there reached Paionen. They had already been pursued in vain in Asia Minor by the Persians, who gave Chios the command to send the fugitives back, which was ignored. Therefore, it can be presumed that when the Persians had settled in Doriskos, they would have seized these fugitives.²⁴

Two years later, in 492 BC, Mardonios, the son-in-law of Dareios I, was entrusted with the task of restoring control over the satrapy of Thrace on the far side of the Hellespont. In spite of losing a large part of the fleet due to a great storm, the "Thracian Bryger" were defeated (Hdt. 6.44-45, cf. also 7.9).²⁵

In addition, Thasos, which feared for its gold mines on the mainland, was captured without a fight and so the north Aegean was again in the hands of the Persians. This is confirmed by Herodotos:

Persian governors had been established in Thrace and about the Hellespont before the march of Xerxes began [note: the campaign of Xerxes 481 BC] (7.106).

In the great campaign under Xerxes of 481 BC against Athens, which is described in detail in book 7 of Herodotos, the Persian army passes through the region ruled by them, over the Hellespont and along the coast of Thrace and Macedonia.

But the land army marched eastward along the Chersonese, leaving on the right the tomb of Helle, the daughter of Athamas, and on the left the city of Cardia. Having passed through the town which is called Agora, they skirted the shores of the Black Gulf, and thence crossed the Black River, whence the gulf takes its name, the waters of which they found too scanty to supply the host. From this point their march was to the west; and after passing Aenos, an Aeolian settlement, and likewise Lake Stentoris, they came to Doriskos (7.58).

In Doriskos there was a large food store for many people.²⁶ Here, Xerxes next stopped to hold a great troop inspection. Herodotos presents all the peoples who took part in the war, together with their equipment (7.61 pp.). He also describes the route that the army marched along, names cities and rivers as well as the tribes living there, all of whom had to join the army (7.108 pp.).

Only the Satren tribe escaped. Its men were described as courageous warriors, who lived in the region of mountain and forest.

It is evident how important Doriskos, mentioned above, now was as a base, since the governor of Doriskos is mentioned by name in Herodotos and his special loyalty to the king is emphasized (7.105-106). Apparently, Maskames succeeded in this, as one of the few Persian governors to hold the city entrusted to him after the first successful Greek battles at Thermophylae and at Cape Artemision as well as the destruction of Athens and the last Persian defeat suffered at the Battle of Salamis, whereas subsequently the other Thracian cities were lost.

After the two battles at Plataiai and Mykale in 479 BC, there seems to have been a Persian garrison at Doriskos. However, together with the city of Eion (Amphipolis), besieged by the Greeks for a long time, it was probably lost in 476/475 BC. Herodotos demonstrates this when he tells us how Eion, together with the Persian governor called Boges, was besieged by the Athenian Kimon. In his distress, first Boges killed his own family, then he emptied the city's accumulated treasure of precious metals into the Strymon and next committed suicide so that he would not have to suffer the ignominy of falling into the enemy's hands (Hdt. 7.107). Nevertheless, it seems that the Persians, together with the strategist Pausanias who they had installed in Byzantion (478/477 to 472/471 BC), had left themselves an escape route to Thrace.²⁷

In 470/469 BC, the strategist Kimon, mentioned above, defeated the Persian fleet at the mouth of the Eurymedon river.²⁸ Subsequently, it seems that the royal house of the Odrysians in Thrace gained power and in about 465/464 BC emerged from the Persian shadow. The Odrysians became aware of the power vacuum resulting from the withdrawal of the Persians and claimed back supremacy over the region inhabited by several tribes. From this period onwards an indigenous ruling dynasty is comprehensible²⁹ (see below).

In the following period, the Mediterranean coast of Thrace probably came under the influence of the Athenian and Spartan spheres of power. Inland there was the Odrysian Kingdom, while on the shores of the Black Sea autonomous cities operated. Nevertheless it seems that, in addition, parts remained closely connected with the Persian Empire,³⁰ since in an episode narrated by Thoukydides, Spartan envoys, with the help of the Odrysian king Sitalkes, wished to reach the Persian satrap Pharnakes, across the Hellespont.³¹ This means not only that there was an agreement between the Odrysians and the Persians, but also that the responsibility for the Hellespont lay in their sphere of influence. Shortly before 400 BC, the Spartan Klearchos conquered the Thracian tribes on the European shore of the Hellespont and the Sea of Marmara for Cyrus the Younger, before he marched against his brother, the mighty King Artaxerxes II, as Xenophon relates.³² A little later, Thrace still appeared in lists of satrapies in the *Anabasis* (401 BC) by Xenophon. However, there the Odrysian ruler Seuthes I (424-407 BC) or Seuthes II (405-391 BC) is called an archon, not a satrap of European Thrace (Εὐρώπη Θρακῶν).³³ In book 7 of the

Anabasis, there is an account of how, at the request of Pharnabazos, the satrap of Phrygia, who feared that the troops in his satrapy could be completely destroyed, the mercenary force led by Xenophon, with the help of the Spartan admiral Anaxibios, crossed over to Europe and helped the Thracian king Seuthes to recapture the land lost by his father. Of the later Odrysian Kotys I (383/382-359 BC) it was said that he loved luxury and owned a park with trees and watercourses in the country, which could be considered a paradise based on a Persian model.³⁴ Perhaps this could be understood as an indication that the Thracian lords had clearly looked towards the east. A close connection also attests that the term “Skudra” (see below), which some equate with Thrace, occurred in the lists of Artaxerxes III³⁵ (358-337 BC).³⁶ It is noteworthy that in 352 BC the mercenary leader Charidemus obtained a permit from the satrap for the Thracian Cheronesos.³⁷ Thus it appears that at least the Hellespont at this time belonged to the region where the Persians acted. According to Arrian, in 334 Alexander accused Dareios III, perhaps correctly, of having sent an army to Thrace.³⁸ It remains unclear whether the region was retained or recaptured. Later, it was logical that European Thrace – as an erstwhile Persian region – should become part of the empire of Alexander.³⁹

*The Odrysian Empire*⁴⁰

Since the Empire of the Odrysians in European Thrace represented the largest territorial unit, as well a continuous power, and since, in addition, very many tribes relevant to this study come from this area, a brief description is given here. The ancient contemporary witnesses,⁴¹ for example Herodotus⁴², Thoukydides⁴³ and Xenophon,⁴⁴ state that numerous tribes lived in European Thrace,⁴⁵ which were partly under the yoke of the Odrysians and partly remained free. They could attach themselves to various political entities, depending on the situation at any given time. Further elements are the partly-free and partly-dependent cities on the Mediterranean coast, which for periods were of interest to Athens and Sparta and could become the playthings of both Greek states. Thus the ancient sources reveal countless rapidly changing political constellations and alliances between the various potential partners. In addition, increasing power, safeguarding mineral resources and controlling ports and the Hellespont as well as the Bosphorus each had an important role to play in these relationships.

Most of the information about the Odrysians,⁴⁶ which is far too meagre to provide an extensive picture of this tribe and of its activities, was left to us by Thoukydides (460-399/396 BC) in his *History of the Peloponnesian War*. In addition to the written sources, the numerous minted coins also provide indications of the rulers.⁴⁷ The assumption is that they were used, along with other items, to pay tribute to the Thracians.⁴⁸

The first identifiable king of the Odrysians, who lived in the fertile Upper Thracian lowland plains of the Hebros and its southern course, is Teres. He

must have ruled up to approximately the middle of the fifth century BC. Thoukydides calls him the founder of the Kingdom. However, his power was still restricted, as some parts of the land were independent.⁴⁹ To keep on good terms with his neighbours, he was courting the Scythians, since Herodotos tells us of the diplomatic marriage of the daughter of Teres to the Scythian king Ariapeithes.⁵⁰ It is not known whether the Thracians, who in 465 BC took part in the attempt by the Athenians⁵¹ to settle along the lower Strymon, belonged to tribes that in the meantime were united by the Odrysians.

Sparadokos, the son of Teres, whose reign is considered to be from 460-445 BC, is only known from Thoukydides and from minted coins.⁵² Sitalkes (445-424 BC), the second son of Teres, is mentioned in several sources. Thus, in the history as narrated by Herodotos (4.78-80), there was an exchange between a brother of the Thracian king Sitalkes who had fled to the Scythians and a brother of the Scythian king Oktamasades who had fled to the Thracians. This happened – according to Herodotos – after the Scythian king had threatened to return the Thracian ruler's treacherous brother to him by force. This episode proves that Sitalkes considered it was important to secure the northern border of his kingdom, the Danube, by diplomacy⁵³ – perhaps in order to be able to act more extensively in the Mediterranean region. Only indirectly does this prove that from 444 BC a few Greek cities on the south-east coast of Thrace no longer occurred in the lists of the Attic sea alliance or only with small amounts of tribute and, probably already at this time, that tribute had to be paid to the Odrysian rulers.⁵⁴ The display of power seems to progress in the second half of the fifth century BC. Thus, at the start of the Peloponnesian War, in 431 BC, the Athenians tried to make an alliance with Thrace, as Thoukydides (2.29) reports.⁵⁵ Among other things, this meant that Sadokos, the son of Sitalkes, was awarded Athenian citizenship and that worship of the Thracian goddess Bendis⁵⁶ was established officially in Athens (Piraeus). Sitalkes fulfilled his obligations to the extent that, in 429 BC, he marched against the Macedonians – allies of Sparta and thus enemies of the Athenians. Although Sitalkes agreed to a settlement, this campaign demonstrated the military power of the Kingdom of the Thracian Odrysian. Thoukydides describes the Empire as follows:

The Odrysian empire had a coastline reaching from Adbdera to the mouth of the Danube in the Euxine. The voyage along the coast, going by the shortest route and with a following wind all the way, takes a merchant ship four days and four nights; by land a man travelling fast and by the shortest route can get from Adbdera to the Danube in eleven days. So much for the length of the coastline. As for its extent into the interior, a man travelling fast would take thirteen days to go from Byzantium to the Laeaeans and the Strymon, which is the part that lies farthest inland (2.97).

However, the Odrysians were not the only tribe who laid claim to power in Thrace, and Sitalkes fell during a military clash with the Triballern who lived in western Thrace.⁵⁷

The successor of Sitalkes was not his son Sodokos, mentioned above, but Seuthes I (424-407 BC), who was his nephew and the son of Sparadokos.⁵⁸ The period of his reign was also shaped by the connections with Athens and Macedonia and, as a result, he was involved in the shifting power relationships between the coastal cities of the Mediterranean. As a result, the revenues of the Odrysian Empire increased. Thoukydides reports on its financial relationships:

In the reign of Seuthes, who succeeded Sitalces and raised the tribute to its highest, the total amount of tribute coming in from all the native districts and from the Hellenic cities was about 400 talents in gold and silver. Then at least an equal amount of gold and silver is contributed in presents, in addition to woven stuffs, both plain and embroidered, and other materials. These presents were not given only to the kings but also to the chief men and nobles of the Odrysians (2.97).

Subsequently, under Amadokos (Metokos/Medobas, 406-388 BC) and Seuthes II (405-391 BC) the Empire seems to have been divided.⁵⁹ In his *Anabasis*, Xenophon reports on Seuthes II, an adopted son of Amadokes. About himself, Seuthes II speaks as follows:

Maesades was my father, and his realm embraced the Melanditae, the Thynians and the Tranipsae. Now when the affairs of the Odrysians fell into a bad state, my father was driven out of this country, and thereafter sickened and died, while I, the son, was brought up as an orphan at the court of Medocus, the present king (7.2.32).

From this, we can conclude that Seuthes II did not belong to the Odrysian tribe. Even so, he attempted to obtain land and power. Thus he accepted help from Xenophon, who had set up his camp in Perinth on the north coast of the Sea of Marmara with Greek mercenaries, who had survived the arduous return journey after the battle in Mesopotamia. In this way, Seuthes II seems to have secured his own region on the southeast coast with important trading centres and wished to recapture the region of power lost by his father.

Whereas for the Odrysian kings of the fifth century and at the start of the fourth century BC there are good sources in Herodotos, Thoukydides and Xenophon, information about the later period is sparse and many details are unknown. This applies to the Odrysian Empire under Kotys I (383/382-359 BC), who came to power after the short reign of King Hebryzelmis (386/388-383/382

BC). Sources testify to actions of the ruler in the north Aegean. At the start of his rule there must have been good relationships between Athens and Kotys, who was awarded Athenian citizenship, but, in the following years, there were some changes. Kotys' expansionist politics in respect of the Thracian Chersones conflicted with Athenian interests and, after 365 BC, open warfare broke out. As a result, in 359 BC Kotys was killed by two men from Ainos, which is at the mouth of the Hebros. They were students of Plato and perhaps lived in his courtyard.⁶⁰ For this deed, one of the two was rewarded with a golden crown in Athens.

After the death of Kotys I, the Empire was weakened and split into three parts: The region east of the Hebros was administered by Kersobleptes, son of Kotys, who tried to act against the Athenians.⁶¹ The second region included the hinterland of Maoneia and was ruled by Amadokos II. Over in the west, Berisades ruled the western region of Maoneia as well as the lower reaches of the Strymon. These three rulers and their sons were able to retain the land only until 356 BC, when the Macedonian king began to settle the first Macedonians in the west Thracian region. In 342/341 BC the Macedonian conquest of Thrace took place.

The name "Skudra" in the satrapy lists and its meaning as "Thrace"

"Thrace" is not mentioned in ancient Persian sources. Taken as a whole, the Achaemenid corpus of cuneiform texts is quite small.⁶² The ancient Persian script was first used by Dareios I⁶³ and examples are limited to the long Behistun inscription and shorter texts. In some of these texts, countries which belonged to the Achaemenid Empire are listed. The sequence and number of countries varies,⁶⁴ but the starting-point is always the Persian motherland, followed by the Medes. After that, the lands in the east of the Empire are often named first followed by those in the west, but, even so, there is no fixed sequence.⁶⁵ As some inscriptions were produced by the Persians close in time to the annexation of the Thracian region, it must be accepted that the region of Thrace is to be found in these lists of countries. The name is uncertain, but it has been proposed that Thrace can be equated with "Skudra".⁶⁶

In ancient Persian inscriptions there are at least 13 lists of countries,⁶⁷ which all vary in respect of the number of countries and their sequence. The term "Skudra" occurs in four inscriptions of Dareios I (521-486 BC), one of Xerxes I (485-465 BE) as well as in two inscriptions of Arataxerxes III (358-337 BC).⁶⁸

As examples, the position of "Skudra" in two of the lists will be set out. In the Dareios inscription in Naqsh-e Rostam⁶⁹ the Skudra appear before Ionia (yauna), Scythians who are across the sea (sakā tyaiy paradraya) are followed by the *petasos*-wearing Ionians (yaunā takabarā) and the Libyans (putayā). In the Daiva-inscription of Xerxes,⁷⁰ the Skudra occur in the following sequence: Dahae⁷¹ (dahā), Amyrgian Scythians (sakā haumavargā), pointed-cap Scythians (sakā tigraxaudā), Skudra (skudrā), men of Akaufaka (Ākaufaciya), Liby-

ans (putāyā). On the whole, it is clear that the sequence does not appear to be important, and, in particular, that it does not reveal anything about the exact location of this satrapy, even though in most lists the Skudra feature near the Ionians.

There is another list of all the conquered peoples – written in hieroglyphs – on the plinth of the statue of Dareios from Susa.⁷² It mentions the Skudra (S3-k3-t̄-rw-3) after Armenia (3-rw-m'-jj-n3), Sardis (S3-p-rw-t̄-3) and Kappadokia (G-p-d-d-k3-jj) and before Syria (3-š3-w3-rw) and Hagar (H-g-rw [Arabs in the northwest]).⁷³

On some small tablets of accounts from Persepolis, from the period between the 13th and 26th years of King Dareios I, i.e. from 509 to 494 BC, there are Skudrians listed as workers, probably specialists, to whom rations were distributed.⁷⁴

In order to support the thesis that Skudra denotes European Thracians, one has to fall back on representations.⁷⁵ In Naqsh-e Rostam are the tombs of the Achaemenid rulers. All the reliefs on the rock follow the same pattern and show the Great King on an oversized couch in front of an incense altar. In each case, the couch is carried by a representative of the conquered peoples. They are characterized by their different typical dress, although this is often shown very vaguely and sketchily. Only on the tomb of Dareios I⁷⁶ are there inscriptions, which are all in the usual languages: Old Persian, Elamite and Neo-Babylonian. The individual throne bearers are also named with labels. The figure who is named as “Skudra”⁷⁷ is portrayed in various ways on tombs⁷⁸ I–VI,⁷⁹ but he is always dressed in trousers with a knee-length coat, with coat-tails cut round and a hem that is perhaps trimmed with fur.⁸⁰ He wears short boots and on the later tombs the tips curl upwards. His weapons are always two spears tied together, worn on a belt over the shoulders. In three representations, an *akinakes* completes the weaponry. The greatest variation is in the headgear: whereas on three occasions there is a sort of cap with a bobble on top and earflaps (tombs I, V, VI), once there is clearly a *petasos* (tomb IV). The other portrayals are too eroded to provide a clear picture; lines or ribbons can be made out on the portrayal on tomb II, which could indicate a *petasos*. Conspicuous is a case of clearly curly hair (tomb III), a haircut that is also sported by the figure wearing the *petasos*. The representation on the relief, that is occasionally quoted, of the people bringing tribute to Persepolis, should not be taken into consideration, since these representations are not identified by small inscriptions.⁸¹ Similarly, in Greek vase painting, specific representations are connected with the Thracians, but it is hard to differentiate clearly between Scythians, Thracians and Persians.⁸² All the figures are distinctive, since they wear a type of trousers unknown to the Greeks. These Greek representations of Thracians have been compared with those on the façade of the tomb of Dareios I and similarities have been recognized: the figures identified as Thracians on the vases occasionally also carry two spears.⁸³ However, this should not be taken as indicative, since, for

practical reasons, soldiers of other peoples,⁸⁴ such as the Scythians and Greeks, also carried two spears,⁸⁵ as depictions⁸⁶ and finds in tombs demonstrate.

In my view, on the whole the depictions should be interpreted as follows: the detail of a *petasos*⁸⁷ on tombs I, II(?), V, VI indicates a people who had contact with the Greeks and so knew this type of travelling hat. The other style of headgear, caps with a bobble on top and earflaps shown on tombs I, V, VI, fits well with the “fox pelts” described by Herodotos as being worn by the Thracians (7.75).⁸⁸ Therefore, it is certainly possible that “Skudra” does indeed refer to the Thracians, although this is by no means certain. Nevertheless, even in recent secondary literature, “Skudra” is identified with “Thrace” without comment, for example, by Briant⁸⁹ and Klinkott.⁹⁰

However, in 1996/1997, the Iranian scholar Gropp⁹¹ queried this attribution. He referred to Szemerényi,⁹² who considered the Skudra to be an Iranian people because of their name. Stimulated by this observation, and on the basis of the sequence or omission of names in the Old Persian lists of countries, mentioned above, he proposed that the Skudra had settled in Paphlagonia (Pontos) on the south coast of the Black Sea. They had then migrated in about 700 BC as a Cimmerian – and so as a Scythian – tribe to the region round Sinop. Since this region – because it is so difficult to access – was first conquered not by Cyrus but by Dareios, the Skudra appear in the lists only from Dareios I onwards.⁹³ Three arguments can be made against this proposal: first, as has already been explained, the sequences of countries in the lists is often difficult to interpret and not transparent, and so they are unsuitable as proof of the proposal. Second, the representations of the *petasos*, mentioned above, should be considered, since this is, most probably, proof for inhabitants who lived in close contact with Greece. Third, it would be surprising if the inaccessible Paphlagonian region should have produced numerous specialists who, according to the small tablet from Persepolis, were brought to the court of Dareios I. Although Gropp’s formulation is a worthwhile attempt to shed some light on this matter and reminds us that there is no certain attribution, in my opinion his proposal is not wholly convincing.

Thrace as a satrapy?

Even if we accept that Skudra denotes the Thracians in the lists of the period, the discussion remains open as to whether they were European or Asiatic Thracians. This is connected with the question as to whether European Thrace should really be considered as an independent satrapy. On this, there is already an extensive discussion,⁹⁴ which can only be sketched in outline here.

Thus Hammond and Castritius are in favour of seeing Europæan Thrace as an independent satrapy. The decisive factor in reaching this conclusion is the use of names in Old Persian texts.⁹⁵ In the building inscription of Dareios I from Persepolis,⁹⁶ “countries beyond the sea” are mentioned, which then, in the tomb inscription of Dareios I at Naqsh-e Rostam (DNA, cf. n. 68), are ac-

cepted as “Saka beyond the sea”. Also in this text, the Skudra and the Yauna are called *takabara* (shield-bearing Ionians,⁹⁷ i.e. Ionians with a hat shaped like a shield, the *petasos*). In another Dareios inscription from Susa (DSe, cf. n. 68), there is no longer reference to anyone wearing the *petasos*, and the “Saka beyond the sea” seem to have been replaced by the “Ionians beyond the sea”.⁹⁸ The specification “beyond the sea” is understood to denote inhabitants from beyond the Sea of Marmara, i.e. European groups. As additional evidence, Castritius cites the royal road in Thrace mentioned by Herodotos,⁹⁹ and from that deduces that a ruler’s residence existed there and so it was an independent satrapy.¹⁰⁰ He would like to set this circumstance only a few years after the Scythian campaign of Dareios I (513/512 BC). He speaks about a satrapy only after 492 BC.¹⁰¹ Such a conclusion sits well with the fact that Dareios I received tribute “from the inhabitants of Europe” only at the end of his reign, as Herodotos tells us (3.96).

On the one hand, this argument seems convincing. On the other hand, however, it should be noted that, first, the exact assignment of the names to the respective tribes remains unclear (see above on “Skudra”)¹⁰² and, second, the names in the Old Persian texts may not necessarily be the names of satrapies, but could, rather, denote peoples.¹⁰³ In addition, the royal road mentioned by Castritius does not go through the hinterland, but runs along the south coast, and is no proof of an independent satrapy. It simply proves that this region was under Persian rule.

Nevertheless, Pajakowski¹⁰⁴ also assumes a Thracian satrapy and would like to see the capital of that satrapy in Sestos. He derives this notion from Herodotos 9.116, where Artayktes is called *hyparchos* of Sestos. The term *hyparchos* is usually translated as “vice-regent”, but occasionally can also be read as “satrap”.¹⁰⁵ Against the translation of *hyparchos* = “satrap” in this case, Balcer notes that at this time there were three *hyparchoi* in Thrace: alongside Artayktes in Sestos, Maskames in Dorisikos and Boges in Eion are mentioned.¹⁰⁶ The existence of these three officials at the same time shows that the title of *hyparchos* denotes a person of lower rank than that of satrap.

In most recent literature, opinion is against the notion that Thrace was an independent satrapy. However, there is no unanimity as to which other satrapy the region of European Thrace belonged. It is more generally accepted that Thrace was part of the satrapy of Asia Minor. The areas of dominance of the satrapies of Asia Minor and their capitals are, however, also debated.¹⁰⁷ The reason for this is that the Greek terms are not always unequivocal: the terms “satrap”, “strategist” and “hyparch” are used in various ways.¹⁰⁸ This is why Briant, for example, considers it difficult to determine in which town the person responsible for European Thrace resided. He suggests that Artayktes, who held power in 480 BC in Sestos and the surrounding countryside (see Hdt. 9.116 and above), received his orders either from Daskyleion or from Sardis, if not directly from the king.¹⁰⁹

Jacobs also considers the seat of government responsible for Thrace to be

in Anatolia and, in reaching this conclusion, refers to two documents in which Dareios I names the outer borders of the Kingdom in every direction. On the foundation documents from the Apadana in Persepolis (DPh) as well as on the almost identical text on tablets from Hamadan (DH), Sardis (*spardā*)¹¹⁰ is mentioned as the furthest point in the (north)west. Since the construction of Persepolis, and, therefore, of the Apadana, was probably started after the Scythian campaign, i.e. during the constitution phase of Dareios I,¹¹¹ and since Thrace was by this time already part of the Persian Empire, it had to be mentioned in the texts. Thus European Thrace should be mentioned as the region furthest to the northeast. The mention of the satrapal seat of Sardis in the texts, however, can mean only that Thrace was under the sovereignty of Sardis. Jacobs considers Thrace to have been part of the principal satrapy of Lydia/Sparda for about 30 years.¹¹²

Recently, Klinkott¹¹³ has also commented on the notion of Thrace as a satrapy. He supports his thesis that Thrace was not an independent satrapy by noting that neither a capital nor a satrapy palace is known and also that, up to now, no remains of *paradeisoi* have been found. Against this argument, however, is the fact that, as yet, no such evidence is forthcoming from other satrapies, even though it is certain that they were indeed satrapies.¹¹⁴

Klinkott also concludes that the satrap of Phrygia of the Hellespont, with his headquarters in Daskyleion, was responsible for the Thracian region and refers to Diodoros for supporting evidence.¹¹⁵ This author states that the Persian king (Artaxerxes III) appointed his satraps (*σατράπας*) on the coast (the satrap Arsites of Hellespontic Phrygia)¹¹⁶ to defend the city of Perinth on the north coast of the Sea of Marmara against capture by Philip II.¹¹⁷ Klinkott considers a satrapy comprising European Thrace and Hellespontic Phrygia with a capital in Daskyleion to be a plausible proposition, as this would have united the strategically important straits within a single administrative region.¹¹⁸ A single satrapy would strengthen the cohesion of the regions otherwise separated by the straits.

Against this, however, it can be stated that, particularly in antiquity, geographical features were considered to be markers of frontiers.¹¹⁹ In addition, the eastern section of Asia Minor, up to the Sea of Marmara, was already in Lydian hands from the time when Cyrus besieged Croesus and incorporated Lydia into his empire. It does not seem implausible to consider the new conquests of Macedonia and Thrace by Dareios I to be independent administrative regions – with their own autochthonous tribes – on the other side of the sea. At a later period, in Roman times, Thrace was an independent province.

Late Babylonian lists of divisions provide apparent evidence of Thrace as a satrapy, since there is mention of the Diadochen Lysimachos¹²⁰ installed by Alexander as the satrap for Thrace and its Pontic neighbours, while Leonnatos governed Hellespontic Phrygia. This division, however, is then revoked in the registers of the conference of Triparadeios (321 BC).¹²¹

Even later, under Alexander, a *strategos* was appointed in Thrace, but he

revolted.¹²² Alexander took over the Persian Empire with its satrapies. Since Thrace now belonged to his empire, the region apparently did not completely escape from the influence of the east, with which it seems to have remained connected.

Summary

Generally speaking, Thrace is a difficult region to understand. In the 200 years dealt with here it was divided into a variety of power blocs and was subject to the interests of many foreigners. Not only the Persians, but also the Athenians and Spartans wished to have access to this region which was inhabited by numerous tribes who dominated to varying degrees. The interest of outsiders was largely prompted by the lucrative and strategically important cities along the region's coast. However, even if one considers Thrace as a single unit, much of the situation remains unclear due to the lack of sources. It has even proved difficult to define the term used to denote Thrace. In fact, it cannot be said with certainty that the term "Skudra" in Old Persian inscriptions refers to European Thrace, even though this is fairly likely to be the case. The problem of determining what the term "Thracian" means in Greek sources remains unsolved. Sometimes it seems the European Thracians are meant and sometimes the Asiatic Thracians. Alternatively, the label could even be used for both groups together. In respect of the present study, this lack of consistency affects the value of the information provided by the ancient written sources. A further question concerns the size of the region called "Skudra" and "Thrace", and it must be concluded that it is not possible to state the size of the region dominated by the Persians. It can be proposed, however, that it probably comprised the coastal region and not the hinterland, which is often accessible with difficulty. The length of time that European Thrace belonged to the Persian Empire is equally difficult to establish precisely. To judge from the Greek sources, it was conquered by Dareios I during his Scythian campaign in about 513/512 BC and was lost in about 465 BC. Nevertheless, the term "Skudra" occurs in the lists of Artaxerxes II and III, and "Thrace" occurs in Babylonian lists in Diodoros. Even if we do not know exactly which regions come under "Skudra" in the later lists, these facts should not be ignored in future discussions, since a specific orientation towards the east appears to have been important to the indigenous rulers. To what extent, through taxes or "gifts", it was bound to the Persian royal house cannot be grasped – but, at first glance, items such as the Persian bowls and rhyta, as well as their local imitations found in Thrace, indicate a strong affinity with the east.

Perhaps it should be stressed that between 512 and 465 BC direct exchange between the Thracian coastal regions and the Persian Empire was at its height, and that an ongoing connection remained. Certainly, the rulers of the Odrysian Empire, originally based in the heartland, who in the following period dominated the Thracian region, to some extent modelled themselves

on those of the east. Although their material legacy could certainly have been stimulated by the Persians, they retained their own production and forms,¹²³ allowing the conclusion that after the middle of the fifth century BC Thrace was no longer a satrapy of the Persian Empire.

Notes

- 1 I would like to express my gratitude to Wilfred G.E. Watson for translation of the text.
- 2 Several studies – especially from the aspect of ancient history – deal with the Persian campaign, as well as with the relationships between the Persians and Thrace and Macedonia. There are historical surveys in various monographs on the Thracians.
- 3 Cf. the map in Bonn 2004, 312. Danov 1976, 135pp. assumes two overland routes “seit uralten Zeiten”.
- 4 Here, it is not possible to discuss the truth of the respective reports in Herodotos, see Högemann 1992, 47pp. Inevitably, in a history of the Persians we have to refer to this source, for example cf. Briant 1996; Briant 2002. Translation: Herodotos, *The Persian Wars*, translated by George Rawlinson (1947) New York.
- 5 In book 5.4-10 there follows a description of various customs, for example rites at birth and death, beliefs, as well as a commentary on the peoples on the other side of the Danube.
- 6 In lists of tribute in Herodotos (3.90) they are always itemised as “Thracians, those in Asia”.
- 7 Hdt. 7.185: *To the amount thus reached we have still to add the forces gathered in Europe, concerning which I can only speak from conjecture. The Greeks dwelling in Thrace, and in the islands off the coast of Thrace, furnished to the fleet 120 ships; the crews of which would amount to 24,000 men. Besides these, footmen were furnished by the Thracians, the Paeonians, the Eordians, the Bottiaeanes, by the Chalcidean tribes, by the Brygians, the Pierians, the Macedonians, the Perrhaebians, the Enianians, the Dolopians, the Magnesians, the Achaeans, and by all the dwellers upon the Thracian sea-board; and the forces of these nations amounted, I believe, to 300,000 men.* Cf. also – being aware of the year of publication – the collection of customs and usages from Greek and Latin sources in Tomaschek 1893, 111-129.
- 8 Translation: Xenophon, *Anabasis*, translated by Carleton L. Brownson (1961⁴) Cambridge, Mass.
- 9 Most recently, Archibald 1998, 108, fig. 4.2.
- 10 As a priority, graves laden with treasure were dug up and less attention was paid to the architecture of the settlement, cf. Popov 2007, 36.
- 11 Thucydides (2.97) mentions 400 talents of gold and silver as tribute in the time of the Odrysian king Seuthes I (ca. 424-405 BC).
- 12 Oppermann (2007, 13) considers it to be common practice for colonists to marry foreigners, in this case, Thracian women, as the Greek settlers were exclusively men. I do not agree.
- 13 Cf., for example, Oppermann 2007, 25 (Orgame), 26 (Kallatis), 30 (Odessos), 31 (Mesambria), 32 (Appolonia).
- 14 See Castritius 1972.
- 15 See the section below discussing whether Thrace was a satrapy. The ancient sources provide exact references only for the coastal regions.

- 16 Hdt. 4.89 pp.
- 17 How far inland he came remains uncertain. Herodotos mentions the source of the Tearos, a river with healing powers where Dareios camped and had a column erected. Then it was two days' journey from Perinth – on the north coast of the Sea of Marmara – and from Apollonia. As the crow flies, the distance between the two towns is about 150km. According to Herodotos, the legendary Tearos river flows into the Kontodeskos, which in turn flows into the famous Agrianes, which runs from east to west and flows into the Hebros. The remains of the column inscribed by Dareios must still have existed in 1830. The place is about 30-40km from the coast of the Black Sea; cf. Hammond 1988, 239, 244.
- 18 Fragmente der griechischen Historiker I, Hekataios Fragment No. 166.
- 19 Hdt. 5.17.
- 20 Hdt. 7.112.
- 21 Dandamaev 1989, 148, 150. The later expedition of the Scythians as far as Asia Minor, as narrated by Herodotos (5.40), would confirm the fear that the Scythians had the potential to penetrate further into the partially fruitful Thrace. Cf. the frontier conflicts, which, according to Herodotos (4.80), indicate interest beyond the Scythians.
- 22 Briant 2002, 145: "...Darius's undertaking in Thrace ... was an essential phase of his new conquests ..."
- 23 Bengtson 1965, 44. On control of the Bosphorus, see also Klinkott 2006, 302, n. 94.
- 24 On this, see Castritius 1972, 10. He considers it more likely that the Persian garrison did not have enough men and had no connections with other troops.
- 25 Zahrnt (1992, 239) does not consider this campaign to have been a failure.
- 26 Hdt. 7.25: *The greater portion was carried to the White Headland, upon the Thracian coast; some part, however, was conveyed to Tyrodiza, in the country of the Perinthians, some to Doriskos, some to Eion upon the Strymon, and some to Macedonia.* Danov (1976, 274) locates the cape as not far from Selymbria.
- 27 Briant 2002, 561.
- 28 Briant 2002, 557-558.
- 29 Cf. also the ruling dynasties of the Pharnacides in Phrygia, the Hekatomnides in Karia and the Anaphas in Kappadokia who continually served the Achaemenids: Klinkott 2006, 47.
- 30 Differently, Jacobs (1994, 124), who proposes that Thrace became a province of the Persian Empire only 30 years after the Scythian campaign led by Dareios. Similarly, see Oppermann 2007, 22, for example.
- 31 Thuc. 2.67.
- 32 Xen. *An.* 2.6.
- 33 Klinkott 2005, 477 and Xen. *An.* 7.8.25. Seibert (1985) does not list Thrace as a satrapy, either (see maps 16-17).
- 34 Ath. 12.531.e-f.
- 35 A³Pa = Kent 1953, 156; Schmitt 2000, 114pp.; A?P/A³Pb = Kent 1953, 155-156; Schmitt 2000, 119pp.
- 36 Instead, Balcer (1988, 7) denies this primary source: "... and decades later during the reign of either Artaxerxes II or III, other scribes at Persepolis still listed Skudrians among the imperial subjects, although the Achaemenid Empire lost its Thracian territories. Those Skudrians, however, may have long been in residence in the Asian territories of the Empire and still retained their ethnic identity, even though they are strangely absent among the Persepolis Treasury Tablets".

- 37 Briant 2002, 657; Demosthenes contra Aristocrates 154-159.
- 38 Arr. *Anab. of Alexander II* 14.4-5.
- 39 Seibert 1985, 184, separation of the region in 326 BC.
- 40 See the general representations: for example, Oppermann 1984; Bonn 2004; and especially the comprehensive monographs by Danov 1976; Archibald 1998.
- 41 For a survey, see Danov 1976, 21-52.
- 42 See n. 4.
- 43 Translation: Thoukydides, *History of the Peloponnesian War*, translated by Rex Werner (1972²) London.
- 44 See n. 8.
- 45 See map in Archibald 1998, 108, fig. 4.2.
- 46 See stemma of the royal house: Archibald 1998, 104.
- 47 Youroukava 1976.
- 48 The numerous vessels made of precious metals were considered to be tribute, cf. Archibald 1998, 260.
- 49 Thuc. 2.29.
- 50 Hdt. 4.80.
- 51 Thuc. 1.100, 4.102.
- 52 Thuc. 4.101; Youroukava 1976, 8 pp. Danov (1976, 292) does not consider Sparadokos to be an Odrysian king, since otherwise Thoukydides would have mentioned him. He only says that Seuthes was the son of Sparadokos. In addition, he suggests that Olynth, generally considered to be where the coins of Sparadokos were minted, at that time did not come under the influence of the Odrysian rulers. Archibald (1998, 106-107) is in favour of Sparadokos being a ruler of a kingdom in southwest Thrace.
- 53 Cf. also Archibald 1998, 105.
- 54 Cf. the survey in Danov 1976, 294.
- 55 On the treaty and its fulfilment, cf. Danov 1976, 307-317.
- 56 Introduced in Athens in about 430 BC; cf. *Der Kleine Pauly* 1, 860-861; Bähler 1998, 190-191. Cf. also Archibald 1998, 97, n. 16 for a discussion of this fact.
- 57 Thuc. 4.101.
- 58 Thuc. 4.101.
- 59 Both rulers are mentioned in Xen. *An.* 7.3.16.
- 60 For an evaluation of it as a political act, cf. Danov 1976, 341, n. 31; Archibald 1998, 221, n. 36.
- 61 Cf. Demosthenes against Aristocrates.
- 62 Kent 1953; Schmitt 1991; Lecoq 1997; Schmitt 2000.
- 63 Hinz 1973, 15 pp.
- 64 See Jacobs 1994, 109-110, who refers to new divisions and not to an increase of provinces.
- 65 Calmeyer 1976, 111 pp.
- 66 Originally, the equivalence was based on the similarity to the place-name of Skydra in Eordaia, Thessaly, and seems to go back to F. Justi, cf. Gropp 2001, 38. For debatable etymologies, see Detschew 1957, 462; Herzfeld 1968, 348. In addition, reference is made to Junge 1942, 17, n. 6. However, no convincing explanation is given there: "Daß unter Skudra die Thraker verstanden werden müssen, zeigt die Darstellung der betr. Figur auf dem Relief; die Erklärung des Namens bereitet einige Schwierigkeiten, ohne daß jedoch dadurch der Bezug zu Thrace in Frage gestellt würde..." See also Hinz 1973, 151; Roaf 1974, 130-132. See also a collection

- of possible meanings in Hachmann & Penner 1999, 265; most recently, Jordanov 2004, 114.
- 67 For a complete catalogue of the lists of countries see Klinkott 2005, 71-73. See also Hachmann & Penner 1999, 270 pp.
- 68 In the Dareios inscription from Naqsh-e Rostam (DNa = Kent 1953, 137-138; Schmitt 2000, 25 pp.), in two Dareios inscriptions from Susa (DSe = Kent 1953, 141-142.; DSm = Kent 1953, 145), in a Xerxes inscription from Persepolis (XPh = Kent 1953, 150 pp.; Schmitt 2000, 88 pp.) and two inscriptions of Artaxerxes III from Persepolis (A³Pa = Kent 1953, 156; Schmitt 2000, 114 pp.; A³Pb = Kent 1953, 155-156. Kent still labels the inscription as "A?P", as he is unable to decide definitely whether it comes from the time of Artaxerxes II or of Artaxerxes III. Instead, Schmitt (2000, 119 pp.), on the basis of epigraphical and philological arguments, attributes it to Artaxerxes III). Schmitt 2000 translates "Skudra" basically as "Thracians".
- 69 Kent 1953, 137-138, lines 28-29.
- 70 Kent 1953, 150-151, lines 26-27.
- 71 Otherwise unattested. A group in the Iranian hill country? See Hachmann & Penner 1999, 271, n. 77.
- 72 *Cahiers de la délégation archéologique Française en Iran* 4, 61-183.
- 73 Kaplony-Heckel 1985, 612.
- 74 Hallock 1978, 122 (PFa 18); Hallock 1969, 705-706, see the text references for *Iškudra/Iškudrap*. Hallock translates "Skudra". For further unpublished references, see Balcer 1988, 7, n. 23.
- 75 Cf. Junge 1941, 17, n. 6.
- 76 Schmidt 1970, pls. 18-39.
- 77 Schmidt 1970, 109.
- 78 Schmidt 1970, fig. 44 with comment.
- 79 Only tomb I can unequivocally be said to belong to Dareios. The other attributions are based on stylistic research. Tomb I: Dareios I; tomb II: Xerxes; tomb III: Artaxerxes I; tomb IV: Dareios II; tomb V: Artaxerxes II; tomb VI: Artaxerxes III.
- 80 Schmidt 1970, fig. 44, comments: "fur-trimmed edges".
- 81 XIX Delegation with stocking-length cloaks, caps with bobbles and earflaps tied under the chin, half-length boots, sometimes armed with a round shield apparently made of reed and two spears each. Walser calls them "Skudra-Thraker" (Walser 1966, 95-96, pl. 26). Cf. also the most recent collection of meanings in Hachmann & Penner 1999, 265. See also the explanation of a fragment of relief from palace H in Persepolis, with figures understood to be Thracians in Tilia 1972, 285, fig. 8, pl. CXCI. Jacobs 2002, 376-377. The patterned cloak indicates the coloured Persian cloak, which occurs on Greek vase painting, although the trousers are missing.
- 82 Raeck 1981.
- 83 Cf. two almost identical vases by the Eretria painter depicting Thracians (Oppermann 2004, 111, pls. 17.1, 31.2; Oppermann 2007, 35, fig. 27). Raeck does not consider carrying two spears or lances as weapons to be characteristic of Thracians, even though occasionally some have (Raeck 1981, 70, 74, 75).
- 84 Cf. also the relief showing carriers of tribute with "Gandharern" (Walser 1966, pl. 21).
- 85 Basically, Greek weaponry comprises two spears, cf. Snodgrass 1967, 57-58. Only in the late fifth century BC would a single spear be the typical weapon of a hoplite (Snodgrass 1967, 97).

- 86 Raeck 1981, 74; Snodgrass 1967, fig. 37.
- 87 “Thessalischer Hut” after its origin, cf. “Petasos” in *Der Neue Pauly* 9, 660.
- 88 This description could also apply to other peoples shown wearing trousers, since this style of dress almost always includes a cap made of soft leather (Walser 1966). Also Greek vase painting shows a cap with earflaps made of soft material; see n. 83.
- 89 Briant 2002, 176.
- 90 For example, in his Persian lists of satrapies, cf. Klinkott 2006, 71 pp.
- 91 Gropp 2001.
- 92 Szemerényi 1980, 23-25.
- 93 Only a few of Gropp’s main arguments will be given here. For his extensive argumentation, see Gropp 2001.
- 94 Compare the surveys in Zahrnt 1992, 269-273; Briant 2002, 905.
- 95 Hammond 1988, 494; Castritius 1972, 5-6.
- 96 Kent 1953, 136-137. (DPh).
- 97 Cf. Kent 1953, 185: “*takabara* – adj. ‘wearing the petasos’ (...) as proved by Akk. ‘who bear shields on their heads’ ...”.
- 98 Differently, Balcer (1988, 7), who understands the term to mean the Skudra.
- 99 Hdt. 7.115: *The road which the army of Xerxes took remains to this day untouched: the Thracians neither plough nor snow it, but hold it in great honour.* Royal roads were well documented in the Persian Empire. They were kept in good condition. They were wide and broad with regular service stations and were, therefore, suitable for armies. Seibert 1985, 16 pp.; see also Briant 2002, 357 pp. Cf., for the system of roads, Archibald 1998, 112.
- 100 Castritius 1972, 11.
- 101 Castritius 1972, 6-7.
- 102 Cf. also Briant 2002, 905.
- 103 Cf. Cameron 1973, 47-56.
- 104 Pajakowski 1983.
- 105 See the list for this term which is used 23 times in Herodotos (Balcer 1988, 2 pp.
- 106 Balcer 1988, 6, 15.
- 107 For comparisons for the divisions of satrapies in general into various categories, see Jacobs 1994; cf. comments by Klinkott (2005, 61-65), who does not accept this.
- 108 *Strategoï* were under the satraps and probably one of their duties was to collect taxes, cf. Jacobs 1994, 121.
- 109 Briant 2002, 146.
- 110 Kent 1953, 136 (DPh), 147 (DH).
- 111 Cf. Jacobs 1994, 128, n. 128 with references to the date when the building of the Apadana began and related discussions.
- 112 Jacobs 1994, 124 pp.
- 113 Klinkott 2005, 477.
- 114 Only a few such capitals of satrapies are known, such as Babylon, Daskyleion, Sardis, and probably Memphis and Sidon. Besides references in texts, relevant remains and finds – such as the glazed brick from Babylon (Koldewey 1969, 123, fig. 7, pl. 39; Speyer 2006, 118) and the capital from Sidon (Nunn 2000, 237; Curtis & Tallis 2005, 41) – are rare. Thus, hardly any capitals of the satrapies lying east of Iran are known. If one considers how many paradises are mentioned in Babylonian inscriptions (cf. Tuplin 1996, 80-131, 178-182), none of which has so far been discovered, this argument centred on non-existent finds and remains should not be viewed as too significant.

- 115 Diod. 16.75.
 116 Paus. 1.29.10.
 117 Klinkott 2006, 477.
 118 Here he follows Gropp (2001, 40), who points out that the same issue remained significant in 14th century Ottoman Empire. At that time, the Balkans were ruled from Bursa.
 119 On this cf. Jacobs 1994, 115-116.
 120 List in Diod. 18.3.1-2.
 121 Klinkott 2006, 76, 477.
 122 Cf. Diod. 17.62.5-6.
 123 Also in the fifth century BC the physical distance must have been significant. Archibald (1998, 110, fig. 4.3) shows that the so-called "elite tumulus burials" in the hinterland lie west of the Hebros. Only in the fourth century BC do foreign wares seem to have provoked interest, as the finds of Greek pottery in Thrace suggest (Archibald 1998, 217, fig. 9.4). Certainly, the fully developed road system was significant in this respect.

Bibliography

- Archibald, Z.H. 1998. *The Odrysian Kingdom of Thrace. Orpheus Unmasked*. Oxford.
- Bäbler, B. 1998. *Fleißige Thrakerinnen und wehrhafte Skythen. Nichtgriechen in klassischen Athen und ihre archäologischen Hinterlassenschaften*. Stuttgart-Leipzig.
- Balcer, J.M. 1988. Persian Occupied Thrace (Skudra), *Historia* 37, 1-12.
- Bengtson, H. (ed.) 1965. *Griechen und Perser. Die Mittelmeerwelt im Altertum I* (Fischer Weltgeschichte 5). Frankfurt am Main.
- Bonn 2004. *Die Thraker. Das goldene Reich des Orpheus* (Kunst- und Ausstellungshalle der Bundesrepublik Deutschland). Bonn.
- Briant, P. 1996. *Histoire de l'empire perse de Cyrus à Alexandre*. Paris.
- Briant, P. 2002. *From Cyrus to Alexander. A History of the Persian Empire*. Winona Lake.
- Bülow, G. von. 1985. *Schätze aus Thrakien*. Leipzig.
- Calmeyer, P. 1976. Zur Genese altiranischer Motive. VIII. Die "statistische Landkarte des Perserreiches" – I, *AMI* 15, 109-187.
- Cameron, G.G. 1973. The Persian satrapies and related matters, *JNES* 32, 47-56.
- Castritius, H. 1972. Die Okkupation Thrakiens durch die Perser und der Sturz des athenischen Tyrannen Hippias, *Chiron* 2, 1-15.
- Cobet, J. 1971. *Herodots Exkurse und die Frage der Einheit seines Werkes* (Historia Einzelschriften 17). Wiesbaden.
- Curtis, J. & N. Tallis 2005. *Forgotten Empire. The World of Ancient Persia*. London.
- Dandamaev, M.A. 1989. *A Political History of the Achaemenid Empire*. Leiden – New York – Copenhagen – Cologne.
- Danov, C.M. 1976. *Altthrakien*. Berlin.
- Detschew, D. 1957. *Die thrakischen Sprachreste*. Vienna.
- Fol, A. & I. Marazov 1977. *Thrace and the Thracians*. London.

- Gropp, G. 2001. Sassen die Skudra wirklich in Thrakien? Ein Problem der Satrapieverteilung in Kleinasien, in: T. Bakır (ed.), *Achaemenid Anatolia. Proceedings of the First International Symposium on Anatolia in the Achaemenid Period. Bandırma 15-18 August 1997*. Leiden, 37-42.
- Hachmann, R. & S. Penner 1999. *Kāmid el-Lōz*. 3. *Der eisenzeitliche Friedhof und seine kulturelle Umwelt* (Saarbrücker Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 21). Bonn.
- Hallock, R.T. 1969. *Persepolis Fortification Tablets* (Oriental Institute Publications 92). Chicago.
- Hallock, R.T. 1978. Selected Fortification Texts, *Cahiers de la Délégation Archéologique Française en Iran* 8, 109-136.
- Hammond, N.G.L. 1988. The Expedition of Datis and Artaphernes, in: J. Boardman (ed.), *The Cambridge Ancient History IV. Persia, Greece and the Western Mediterranean c. 525 to 479 B.C.* Cambridge, 491-517.
- Herzfeld, E. 1968. *The Persian Empire. Studies in Geography and Ethnography of the Ancient Near East*. Wiesbaden.
- Hinz, W. 1973. *Neue Wege im Altpersischen* (Göttinger Orientforschungen III.1). Wiesbaden.
- Högemann, P. 1992. *Das alte Vorderasien und die Achämeniden* (Beihefte zum Tübinger Atlas des Vorderen Orients B 98). Wiesbaden.
- Jacobs, B. 1994. *Die Satrapienverwaltung im Perserreich zur Zeit Darius' III* (Beihefte zum Tübinger Atlas des Vorderen Orients B 87). Wiesbaden.
- Jacobs, B. 2002. Achämenidische Kunst – Kunst im Achämenidenreich: Zur Rolle der achämenidischen Großplastik als Mittel der herrscherlichen Selbstdarstellung und der Verbreitung politischer Botschaften im Reich, *AMIT* 34, 345-395.
- Jordanov, K. 2004. Thrakien und die frühen Großreiche, in: Bonn 2004, 113-117.
- Junge, P.J. 1942. Satrapie und natio. Reichsverwaltung und Reichspolitik im Staate Dareios I, *Klio. Beiträge zur alten Geschichte* 34, 1-55.
- Kaplony-Heckel, U. 1985. Die in Susa neu entdeckte Statue des Dareios I, in: O. Kaiser (ed.), *Texte aus der Umwelt des Alten Testaments Bd. I*. Gütersloh, 609-613.
- Kent, R.G. 1953. *Old Persian. Grammar, Texts, Lexicon*. New Haven.
- Klinkott, H. 2005. *Der Satrap. Ein achämenidischer Amtsträger und seine Handlungsspielräume* (Oikumene. Studien zur antiken Weltgeschichte 1). Frankfurt am Main.
- Koldewey, R. 1931. *Die Königsburgen von Babylon. 1. Teil. Die Südburg* (Wissenschaftliche Veröffentlichungen der Deutschen Orientgesellschaft). Osnabrück.
- Lecoq, P. 1997. *Les inscriptions de la Perse achéménide*. Paris.
- Nunn, A. 2000. *Der figürliche Motivschatz Phöniziens, Syriens und Transjordanien vom 6. bis zum 4. Jahrhundert v. Chr* (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis. Series Archaeologica 18). Fribourg – Göttingen.
- Oppermann, M. 1984. *Thraker zwischen Karpatenbogen und Ägäis*. Leipzig – Jena – Berlin.

- Oppermann, M. 2004. *Die westpontischen Poleis. Zentrum für Archäologie und Kulturgeschichte des Schwarzmeerraumes*. Weißbach.
- Oppermann, M. 2007. *Thraker, Griechen und Römer an der Westküste des Schwarzen Meeres*. Mainz
- Pajakowski, W. 1983. Einige Bemerkungen zur Lokalisierung der persischen Provinz (Satrapie) Skudra, *EOS* 71, 243-255.
- Popov, C. 2007. Aspekte der thrakischen Archäologie der späten Bronze- und der Eisenzeit in Bulgarien, in: *Die alte Zivilisation Bulgariens. Das Gold der Thraker* (Antikemuseum Basel und Sammlung Ludwig). Basel, 33-37.
- Raack, W. 1981. *Zum Barbarenbild in der Kunst Athens im 6. und 5. Jahrhundert v. Chr.* Bonn.
- Roaf, M. 1974. The Subject People on the Base of the Statue of Darius, *Cahiers de la Délégation Archéologique Française en Iran* 8, 73-160.
- Schmidt, E.F. 1970. *Persepolis III. The Royal Tombs and Other Monuments* (Oriental Institute Publications 70). Chicago.
- Schmitt, R. 1991. *Corpus inscriptionum Iranicarum I,1. The Bisitun Inscriptions of Darius the Great*. London.
- Schmitt, R. 2000. *Corpus inscriptionum Iranicarum I,2. The Old Persian Inscriptions of Naqsh-e Rostam and Persepolis*. London.
- Seibert, J. 1985. *Die Eroberungen des Perserreiches durch Alexander den Großen auf kartographischer Grundlage* (Beihefte zum Tübinger Atlas des Vorderen Orients B 68). Wiesbaden.
- Snodgrass, A.M. 1967. *Arms and Armour of the Greeks*. London.
- Speyer 2006. *Pracht und Prunk der Großkönige. Das Persische Weltreich* (Historisches Museum der Pfalz Speyer). Stuttgart.
- Szemerényi, O. 1980. *Four Old Iranian Ethnic Names: Scythian, Skudra, Sogdian, Saka* (Sitzungsberichte der österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philologisch-Historische Klasse 371). Vienna.
- Tilia, A.B. 1972. *Studies and Restorations at Persepolis and Other Sites of Fars* (Istituto Italiano per il medio ed estremo Oriente. Reports and Memoirs 16). Rome.
- Tomaschek, W. 1893. *Die alten Thraker* (Sitzungsberichte der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien. Philologisch-Historische Classe 128). Vienna.
- Tuplin, C. 1996. The Parks and Gardens of the Achaemenid Empire, in: C. Tuplin, *Achaemenid Studies* (Historica Einzelschriften 99). Stuttgart.
- Walser, G. 1966. *Die Völkerschaften auf den Reliefs von Persepolis. Historische Studien über den sogenannten Tributzug an der Apadanatreppe*. Berlin.
- Youroukava, Y. 1976. *Coins of the Ancient Thracians* (BAR Supplementary Series 4). Oxford.
- Zahrnt, M. 1992. Der Mardonioszug des Jahres 492 BCE und seine historische Einordnung, *Chiron* 22, 237-270.