

Herodotus on Bactria between Achaemenid Mobility and Alexander's campaign. Some reflections

Marco Ferrario

ABSTRACT

Thanks to a recent monographic study by Chiara Matarese we are now able to understand more clearly both the reasons and the goals of a phenomenon, that of the so-called 'deportations' characteristic of the Achaemenid empire. In addition, considerable attention has been devoted in recent years to the ways in which classical authors perceived events such as the dissolution of a community against the backdrop of, for example, military defeats. All this makes possible an analysis of a Herodotus' passage (IV, 204) which has so far received less consideration than it deserves. On the basis of these premises, two purposes will be pursued in the following pages.

First, I aim to show that a study of the fate – as recounted by Herodotus – of a small community of Greeks settled in Libya against the backdrop of the mobility characteristic of the Achaemenid world substantiates the hypothesis that Central Asia (and Bactria in particular) was far less alien to the mental horizon – and in some cases to individual and group experience – than the representation of this region of the empire as a remote periphery at the edge of the world has long suggested.

Secondly, a direct consequence of this hypothesis is that, if indeed the presence of a Greek diaspora in Central Asia was less sporadic than usually admitted, the process of (ethno)genesis of the first community of Graeco-Bactrians needs to be reconsidered in the light of a socio-cultural complexity that historiography tends to consider a feature of Hellenistic Bactrian history, whereas the passage from Herodotus' *Histories* discussed in these pages suggests that there is an entire prehistory of this phenomenon yet to be explored.

KEYWORDS

Achaemenids; Bactria; displacements; diaspora; Herodotus; Hellenism; social memory.

HERODOTUS, LYBIA AND BACTRIA

At the end of the Fourth book of the *Histories*, Herodotus tells us about a small Libyan community, that of the Barcaeans, whose inhabitants had been besieged by 'the Persians that Aryandes sent from Egypt to avenge Pheretima' (Herodotus IV, 200.1). The Barcaeans resisted for many months, but at the end Amasis, the Persian general, 'devised a plot, knowing that Barce could not be taken by force but might be taken by guile' (Herodotus IV, 201.1). The city eventually fell to the Persians, who showed no mercy. Herodotus describes the fate of the community in a terse paragraph. The text runs as follows: 'As for the Barcaeans whom they had taken as slaves, they carried them from Egypt into banishment and brought them to the king, and Darius gave them a town of Bactria to live in. They gave this town the name Barce, and it remained an inhabited place in Bactria until my own lifetime' (Herodotus IV, 204). Since we know very little about the relationships between the Greeks and what we might call – paraphrasing the title of a seminal monograph by Rachel Mairs – the *Achaemenid Far East* (MAIRS 2014b) during the decades before Alexander's campaign, the passage above constitutes a very

remarkable testimony, the implications of which do not seem to have been fully explored by contemporary scholarship.¹

To give but some examples: in his 1993 commentary on the Fourth book, Aldo Corcella states simply ‘the Bactrian spot is otherwise unknown’ (CORCELLA *et al.* 1993, 389). In the Oxford commentary on the same passage, edited by Oswyn Murray and Alfonso Moreno, the Italian scholar lists some bibliographical items related to the ‘possible archaeological traces of the passage of the Persians’ (ASHERI – LLOYD – CORCELLA 2007, 721). Then he provides an overview of the *loci paralleli* referring to the deportations by the Persian kings, thus implicitly supporting – so it seems – the authenticity of the information as Herodotus had it. As in the 1993 commentary, he concludes the section dedicated to paragraph 204 saying that ‘the locality of Barce in Bactria is otherwise unknown’.

In a 2010 essay dedicated to *Cyrene, Barce and the Persians*, Maurizio Giangliulio has raised doubts about the historical reality of the information provided by Herodotus (GIANGIULIO 2010, 185).² As he puts it: ‘the tradition’s strong tendentiousness suggest a careful examination of the possibility that the picture of the events as they are described may have been manipulated. When it comes to Barce, it seems possible to raise doubts as much about the enslavement of the inhabitants as about the Bactrian deportation, which could have been an etiological history based upon a popular etymology, since the ancient tradition is aware of an ethnonym that could have been referred to Barce’ (GIANGIULIO 2010, 185, footnote 19). The ethnonym which Giangliulio is referring to can be found in Ctesias and in Curtius’ *History of Alexander*.³ The point raised by Giangliulio is indeed a strong one, but it appears to downplay Herodotus’ statement that ‘down to my own days’ the community of the Barcaeans lived in Bactria. When Herodotus uses a formula like ‘περ ἔτι καὶ ἐς ἐμὲ’ or comparable expressions, we are dealing with information that needs to be taken very seriously.⁴ From a linguistic point of view, it is impossible to demonstrate beyond any doubt that Herodotus’ information is based on a false etymology. Certainly, there is also no possibility to prove the contrary, but it should be the sceptics’ burden to provide evidence in favor of their case. Although it has been said that there are other examples of alleged displacement based on assonances or popular etymologies, as far as I am aware no such examples have so far been clearly identified in Herodotus’ text. Furthermore, one should remember that, in Greek, -ανιος is not a suffix: if in Βαρκανίωι there is no possibility to find an -ανιος suffix (because it has no morphological autonomy), the probability that in our word a base Βαρκη- was perceived becomes more likely. Finally, it

1 MATERESE 2021, 45–56 provides to the best of my knowledge the most recent treatment of the passage to be discussed in the following pages.

2 The same paper was originally entitled *Greeks and Persians in Cyrenaica. The campaigns towards the Greek cities* and was delivered at the international conference (24th–28th of November 2008, Innsbruck) *Herodot und das Perserreich / Herodot and the Persian Empire*.

3 *FGrH* 688 F 1b 3 (= 1b 3 Lenfant: Βορκανίων, which is to be found again at *FGrH* 688 F 9 (6) = 9a Lenfant). According to Ctesias, furthermore (*apud* Tzetzes I, 90–103), Cyrus established a satrapy of the Barcanians (see LENFANT, 2004, 258–259). One should also remember the paramount importance of the origins in the *Histories*’ project (VAN WEES, 2002, 324–328): information about colonization and displacements are thus of primary interest for Herodotus. Cf. also Curtius III, 2. 5.

4 Parallel examples recur abundantly in Herodotus’ narrative (cf. e.g., Herodotus II, 154.5, III, 97.4, IV, 124.1, V, 115.1). In each of these passages, the phraseology of the context leaves open the concrete possibility that, even though he himself was not a direct witness to the events narrated, the historian had access to first-hand oral sources: either from direct witnesses of those events or, at least, from a local tradition within which the episode(s) under discussion had an extremely important function for the collective memory of the community concerned. On this aspect of Herodotus’ inquiry cf. e.g., MAZZARINO 1966 I, 166–172; MURRAY 2001.

is Ctesias who cites the Βορκανίοι, not Herodotus: if we assume this to be a case of popular etymology, which still needs to be proved, would it not be more logical to think that it is Ctesias who depends on Herodotus, and that the former might have misunderstood the latter, if not deliberately manipulated him in accordance with his own (Ctesias') narrative agenda?⁵

It is probably impossible to say more, and consequently, we need to return to Herodotus. The first question one should ask is: is there any evidence that the historian had access to local knowledge stemming from the Persian Empire, including its easternmost territories? And if so, what are the implications in terms of cultural memory, self-understanding and stories circulating – at least a century and a half before Alexander – about a Greek diaspora in the East?

In what follows, I will firstly attempt to tackle the problem of Herodotus' relationship with the past. The second paragraph changes perspective and deals with the topic of population displacements from a Persian point of view. The third paragraph is devoted to reconsidering the siege and the (supposed) displacement of the Barcaeans through the concept of war trauma. Be the event historical or not, I argue that the stories circulating about the fate of the Barcaeans – of which Herodotus' version should be seen as the terminal stage – could have worked as a first step in building a 'shared intersubjective reality' (HARARI 2011, 209; HARARI 2016, 344)⁶ that played a critical role in two different, but very related contexts. Firstly, during the bitter years of Alexander's campaign to Bactria and Sogdiana; secondly in the formation of the first Graeco-Bactrian settlements, with the remarkable consequence of having contributed to the shaping of Classical sources' shared view (one may say a *communis opinio*) regarding the feral way of life of the local people. The conclusion assesses the paramount importance of the interplay between oral history, social memory, and the colonial and military experience for the birth of the new Greek power in Bactria at the dawn of the Hellenistic era.

HERODOTUS AND THE PAST: SOME REMARKS

From the points made above, it is clear that any hint made by Herodotus has to be taken very seriously: this is true also when speaking of Bactria. If, as, among others, Robert Rollinger pointed out, the 12th satrapy was located in a place perceived as the 'world's end', one faces the problem of explaining how the detailed piece of information we find in IV, 204 reached Herodotus (ROLLINGER 2017c, 198).⁷ In fact, we are dealing here with an example of what Luraghi called 'local knowledge': that is, information whose historical reliability cannot be dismissed *a priori*, just because it does not fit the standards of modern scholarship (LURAGHI

5 I owe the linguistic observation to prof. Alessandro Parenti (University of Trento), and to him goes my gratitude. It may also be remarked that in Old Persian a form *Varkāna* (New Persian *Gurgān*) is to be found, that is Greek Ὑρκανία (cf. Diodorus II, 2 and Curtius III, 2.5). Pomponius Mela also distinguished between the *Paricani*, on the one hand, and the Bactrians, Sogdians, and Gandhārans on the other (Pomponius I, 2, but see also Pliny VI, 48). From an inscription dated to the age of Sargon an ethnonym *Barikānu* is also attested. It seems then that the plausibility of a Herodotean misunderstanding is to be scaled down.

6 See also, although in a very different context and with a very different aim than that of Harari, FENTRESS – WICKHAM 1992, 51–59.

7 According to Rollinger, in the Achaemenid inscriptions the monarchs did not call the satrapies provinces but, following a sort of mental map, countries (sing. *dahyu-*, pl. *dahyāva*): the entire Achaemenian κόσμος relied upon this kind of topography. In explaining the term *dahyu*, Jacobs (2017, 5) underlines that here we are confronted with a choronym, not with an ethnonym, as it has been usually termed but see KING 2021, 1–28 favoring an ethnic understanding of *dahyu-*. On Achaemenid cartography and its possible influences on Herodotus cf. RAPIN 2018.

2001, 138–160).⁸ Although our sources tell us nothing about Herodotus' stay in Bactria, there is no proof that the information is to be deemed unreliable, because, as Luraghi has shown, those pieces of evidence – as Jacoby's famous *Epichorioi Zitate* – are an important indicator concerning the origin of the information itself (LURAGHI 2001, 159).⁹ The self-awareness displayed by Herodotus in his work has been observed many times. As van Wees puts it, '[Herodotus] dealt mostly with oral traditions that are at least one generation old and extending into the realm of myth, so that he often felt unable to establish the facts and could do no better than repeat what he had been told, while keeping his critical distance' (VAN WEES 2002, 322). A case in point is Herodotus I, 5.4, where the historian says that he is 'not going to say whether these things happened in this way or in some other manner' (Herodotus I, 5.4).¹⁰ Again, in van Wees' words, however, 'whenever he felt that his evidence was reliable enough [...], Herodotus, no less than any of his successors, tried to find the "truth" about the past. There may have been a good deal of the poet and storyteller in him, but Herodotus was above all a historian insofar as his main concern was to make his record of the past as much accurate as possible' (VAN WEES 2002, 322–323).

Returning to the Barcaeans, one has to admit that, in our case, we are not confronted with one of those situations in which 'the Libyans say that...'; nonetheless, either Herodotus' sources knew about the existence of a Cyrenaic settlement in the Persian Far East, or they had good reasons to consider the information trustworthy.¹¹ Saying more about this passage is risky; however, the fact that Herodotus his source(s) and his audience thought it possible that a contingent of men could be displaced without significant problems from Libya to Central Asia, makes the picture of Bactria as a 'Last Thule', completely isolated as much from the rest of the empire as from the Mediterranean Basin, simply untenable.¹² The image of Bactria as a 'kind of Siberia' (RAWLINSON 1909, 23) is indeed to be found in our sources. However, we should never forget what kind of source we are dealing with: to take a piece of information out of the whole work's context is usually dangerous, and methodologically flawed. It is not by chance that the Siberia-like picture of Bactria is to be found in poetry: it is a literary τόπος (precisely the one of the 'exile's spot') or, if one prefers, a rhetorical device, an ἀδύνατον.¹³ The matter, however, is far more complicated: as we will see below, fact and fiction are deeply entangled, and sometimes appear to have been used together in order to create a very powerful narrative.¹⁴ Let us take a closer look.

8 Cf. *contra* ARMAYOR 1978a; 1978b; FEHLING 1971. Less scepticism is to be found in DOVER 1998, although he lacks Luraghi's methodological insight.

9 In an important recent essay, Robert Rollinger (2017a) has shown with breadth of detail to what extent Herodotus had access to Near Eastern cultural traditions relating even to extremely specific contexts, such as oracular folklore.

10 δὲ περὶ μὲν τούτων οὐκ ἔρχομαι ἐρέων ὡς οὕτω ἢ ἄλλως κως ταῦτα ἐγένετο.

11 From the narrative's context it seems possible to infer that Herodotus' source bears all the hallmarks of deeply entrenched local knowledge of the Libyan context. For a comparable example, just think of the mention of dietary taboos at Herodotus IV, 186.

12 To argue, for example, that the movement of a significant contingent of human beings through the Libyan desert would have exceeded the logistical capabilities of the empire does not seem convincing, given the evidence from the Persepolis archive, which attests to hundreds of Central Asian *kurtaš* crossing no less rugged territories when heading to the Persian Gulf (cf., HENKELMAN 2018 and now KING 2021, 266–314. In the light of such evidence, Matarese's doubts seems unwarranted).

13 Some examples: Virgil *Georg.* 2.138; *Aen.* VIII, 688; Propertius II, 4.3, III, 1; Silius III, 613–615, XIII, 762–766.

14 On fact and fiction in literary works cf. LANDO 1993.

In the opening lines of the Sixth book of the *Histories*, the Persian generals gain knowledge of the Ionians' fleet. Fearing not to be able to tame the insurgents, they summon those who have been ousted by Aristagoras (Herodotus V, 37), and address them with the following speech: 'Men of Ionia, let each one of you now show that he has done good service to the king's house; let each one of you try to separate your own countrymen from the rest of the allied power. Set this promise before them: they will suffer no harm for their rebellion, neither their temples nor their houses will be burnt, nor will they in any way be treated more violently than before. But if they will not do so and are set on fighting, then utter a threat that will restrain them: if they are defeated in battle, they will be enslaved; we will make eunuchs of their boys, and carry their maidens captive to Bactra, and hand over their land to others' (Herodotus VI, 9.3-4). The threat seems to contradict what we have just said, but one should not forget who is speaking (Darius' lieutenants), and that their words have to be set in a Persian context. As noted by Briant, from a Persian point of view Bactria was a land worthy of colonization, no doubt thanks to its huge quantity of resources (See also RAPIN 1996; MAIRS 2014a, 1-19). As the French scholar has stated in relation to Xerxes' endeavours to strengthen the control of his domains, 'royal concessions were part of a strategic design to protect Achaemenid interests in a vitally important region. This colonization movement did not contradict the expansion of the imperial diaspora; on the contrary, it reinforced it. To give but one example, Persian colonies were founded 'in particularly large numbers in the valley of the Caicus and its tributaries' (BRIANT 2002, 563). This is a fact worth mentioning, for it signals the Achaemenids' attention towards the imperial frontier zones, which needed to be at the same time controlled and exploited (a goal which might usefully be fulfilled by making use of warfare prisoners and other kind of colonists).¹⁵ It is important to stress here that, in Herodotus IV, 204, it is explicitly said that the Libyans were given an amount of land (χώρα). Later on (BRIANT 2002, 599), Briant again states that with no doubts the colonization strategy was pursued with strength already during Darius' days.¹⁶ One is thus allowed to ask if the Ionians of Herodotus VI, 9 and the Barcaeans of Herodotus IV, 204 are part of the same pattern. It is interesting to note that Bactria's status is marked by ambiguity also in Persian imagery. On the one hand, a prosperous land, with a great quantity of resources and an adequate work force to exploit them; on the other hand, 'a sort of Siberia', in Rowlinson's words, that could be used as a scarecrow to force enemies – who apparently lacked the information surely available to the Persian concerning what Bactria actually was – to surrender (RAWLINSON 1909, 23).¹⁷ It could be worth more deeply investigating the impact on the Greek perception of such (Persian) narratives concerning Bactria, its landscape and its ἔθνη (Herodotus VII, 66-100) and the role they could have played during the hardest years of Alexander's campaign in Central Asia.

HERODOTUS AND THE PERSIAN SOURCES: BEYOND THE MIRROR

We suggested earlier that the ultimate source of the Barcaeans' fate could have been a local – that is, a Cyrenean, or even a Persian one. It goes without saying that, in order to support this statement, we should ask ourselves to what degree Herodotus had access to the eastern (in our case, broadly speaking, Persian) sources, and if and to what degree the assumptions he

15 Briant is referring to Mysia, but Bactria was no less important.

16 Cf. BRIANT 2002, 751 on Bactria's colonization as a result of diasporic movements inside the empire itself.

17 For the role played in the Persian sources and in the oriental tradition behind them by border zones, see ROLLINGER – BICHLER 2017, 6.

made about them are worthy of consideration. As in the case concerning his travels, many critics have raised doubts about the reliability of the *Histories* when it comes to the ‘Other’. One of the most authoritative scholars in this field, François Hartog, has stated that Herodotus’ ethnographic writing could be compared to a mirror: what we are able to gain from his description of foreign people – say, for example, the Scythians – is at the very best his own representation of them (HARTOG 1991). Speaking of foreign sources, be they Persian, Libyan, Egyptian or Scythian, why should it be any different?¹⁸

In order to better address this topic it may be useful to recall some thoughts by the Italian scholar Mauro Moggi (MOGGI 2005, 193–214).¹⁹ Speaking of Xerxes’ dream in his Seventh book, Herodotus glosses ‘as it is said among the Persians’ (ὡς λέγεται ὑπὸ Περσέων; Herodotus VII, 12.1). According to Moggi, Herodotus ‘takes for granted that for him the information about this event, that took place at the King’s court, must have come from Persia’ (MOGGI 2005, 200). To tackle only one famous example: even if Herodotus did not know any oriental language and was unaware of the Bīsutūn inscriptions, according to Moggi ‘the conspirators’ list and the treatment of the whole episode imply that Herodotus had access to Persian traditions, at least in some cases derived from documentary sources, but still different from the official narrative that was engraved on Darius’ order – and whose origins have to be retraced either in the Persian aristocracy’s background or in the imperial bureaucracy context’ (MOGGI 2005, 204).²⁰ Such observations are worthy of special attention, because they give a completely different value to most of the details that are displayed in Herodotus’ work. They are more than anecdotes: especially in the Persian case, they seem to point in the direction of a very precise, context-situated knowledge of the events regarding Darius in the year 522–511 BC. In Herodotus I, 130.2, for instance, reporting Astyages’ loss of the kingdom, Herodotus states that ‘at a later time they repented of what they now did and rebelled against Darius; but they were defeated in battle and brought back into subjection’.²¹ If we consider that one of the nine Liar Kings pictured at Bīsutūn, Fravartiš, calls himself ‘King in Media’²² and pretended to be ‘born from Cyaxares’ offspring’, it is tempting to see in this passage an external prolepsis which, in a reticent but very Herodotean way of storytelling,²³ hints at a boundless underbrush of information that the historian possesses – and the origin of which we are ultimately unaware of because it is often left implicit (GIANGIULIO 2005, 95–110).²⁴ This kind of narrative device reads the past with the eyes of the present or even in the light of future events: this is indeed

18 A powerful counter argument to Hartog’s scepticism has recently been put forward by SKINNER 2012; 2018, who has shown the degree of complexity of the ethnography shared through the Archaic Mediterranean world, that is, decades, if not centuries, before Herodotus’ birth (which included Scythians as well, who were *not* as exotic to the Greek public as Hartog assumes).

19 It should be stressed that the same was probably true also for Herodotus’ audience. This is of paramount importance when it comes to the impact of such narratives, which were thought all the more reliable the more ancient and authoritative their provenience was.

20 On the inscription cf. also HERZFELD 1968, 289.

21 See also Diodorus XI, 6.3. Pompeius Trogus was also aware of this tradition if Justin I, 7.2–3 writes that ‘those cities which once payed tribute to the Medes [...] rebelled against Cyrus, which caused Cyrus to fight a great number of battles’ (*civitates, quae Medorum tributaria fuerant [...] a Cyro defecerunt, quae res multorum bellorum Cyro causa et origo fuit*).

22 In Herodotus III, 65.5 Cambyses, on his deathbed, exhorts the nobles around him to ‘prevent the Medes from taking power again’ (τῆν ἡγεμονίην αὐτίς ἐς Μήδους περιελθοῦσαν’).

23 See, for example, Herodotus V, 73.3.

24 This point has recently been made also by SKINNER 2018.

the external feature of the prolepsis, which is a crucial narrative device connecting the single λόγοι to the whole picture of the *Histories* (CATALDI 2005, 130–150).

Thus, one should be careful in dismissing the history of the Barcaeans as told by Herodotus, and this for two reasons: if the source was a Persian one, we have more than enough evidence that he had indeed access to very reliable information, coming even from the highest stratum of the Persian society. This is for instance the case concerning Darius' plot against Gaumāta. If the source, on the contrary, came from 'local knowledge', in light of the acquaintance Herodotus clearly had with the world of Greek colonies and their histories, as it has been shown by Maurizio Giangliulio, the story must be accepted as reliable: that is, it had an important meaning for the Barcaean community's self-perception (GIANGIULIO 1981).

Assuming that the displacement of the Barcaeans could really have taken place (or at least that it was regarded by the Libyans in Herodotus' time as having taken place, which in the light of what has been said seems beyond doubt), we have to look closer at the phenomenon of ἀνδραποδισμός (= enslaving, selling into slavery, deportation). The Persians were renowned for this kind of practice, and if our arguments hold true, the histories circulating about the fate of the Barcaeans could have been of great momentum in shaping a shared (Greek) narrative concerning the destiny of a displaced community in the *Far East*.

THE PERSIANS, THE ΑΝΔΡΑΠΟΔΙΣΜΟΣ, AND WAR TRAUMA

In the official Persian discourse, violence, including mass killing and displacement, has to be considered in a broader context.²⁵ This does not imply, of course, any kind of justification; on the contrary, it is necessary in order to understand why violence was displayed. The King's duty, as Bruce Lincoln puts it, was to restore 'happiness for mankind' (LINCOLN 2007; 2012): that is to say, the condition closer to Ahura Mazda's perfect creation. If that involved the use of violence, the King was nonetheless not culpable of the collateral damages that this implied. To use Aeschylus' words, 'if my son [Xerxes, Atossa is speaking] should succeed, || he would prove to be remarkable indeed, || but if he fails, he does not have to answer to the state; || if he returns safely, he will hold sway in this land as he did before' (Aeschylus *Pers.* II. 211–214). In fact, for the violence and the evil of war were held accountable those who, under the spell of the Lie (*draûga*) threatened the balance of the cosmos, forcing the King, on behalf of Ahura Mazda, to enter the field of war. Such a powerful narrative leaves little space for inquiring the way war and its aftermaths were perceived among the empire's population. We gain a different picture when we turn to the Greek discourse as it was performed on the stage. This does not mean that the Greeks were any better than the Persians: it only acknowledges the fact that it is simply easier to look at the Greek public discourse about war and its casualties. In doing so, we may see what kind of stories could circulate in relation to a community that was ἀνδραποδιζομένη as a consequence of a siege. In what follows I will try to show what kind of consequences such a cultural perception bears when speaking of individual and group identity. If it is true that we know nothing more about the Barcaeans' descendants, perhaps we can nonetheless take a closer look at one case in which the above-mentioned stories could have been directly related with the havoc that took place in furthest Central Asia. I am referring to the Branchidae, whose history will be discussed later on.

'When the city is captured, an evil operates, || takes human form, spreads like smoke || down every street, || sickens with the kill frenzy of Ares' pieties'. So did Aeschylus summarize,

25 On the topic see MENDOZA 2016; 2017.

in his *Seven Against Thebes* staged in 467 BC, the forces at play during a city siege (Aeschylus *Sept. II. 336–344*). The issue here, as Kurt Raaflaub noted, is not only a political, religious, or ideological one but, first and foremost, ‘the human and the social dimension of war’ (RAAFLAUB 2014, 18). Although it has been suggested that the scale and the cruelty of Greek warfare changed dramatically only with the Peloponnesian war and that, at least in Archaic Greece, a kind of code of honour existed in warfare with the aim to prevent large-scale destruction, there is considerable evidence that appears to prove the opposite.²⁶ The overwhelming majority of the servile population in Greece was in fact composed of ‘war booty’ (VAN WEES 2003, 34, 66) and during a siege the slaughter or enslavement of the defenders was commonplace (see e.g. VAN WEES 2011). As van Wees put it, ‘Neither archaic nor classical Greece knew a law, rule or convention which categorically prohibited the killing of a defeated enemy [...]. In combat, no special justification was needed for aiming to kill as many men as possible, including those who tried to surrender, whose overtures one was under no obligation to accept’ (VAN WEES 2011, 104–105). When confronted with such statements, the cultural importance given by the Greeks to a particular casualty of ancient war, the process of the ἀνδραποδισμός, is even more remarkable.²⁷ In Aeschylus’ *Seven*, the chorus gives us a clear insight of its meaning for a Greek audience: in Meineck’s words, it represents ‘nothing less than death for their family members, rape, assault, separation, abduction and enslavement. What they fear is the practice of *andrapodismos* – the process of sorting, killing, and enslaving a civilian population – not only a mythological trope but a very real facet of classical Greek warfare’ (MEINECK 2017, 50).²⁸ It may be argued that ἀνδραποδισμός was perceived as the war trauma *par excellence* because of its impact on the πόλις self-identity (MENDOZA 2016, 100). To quote an example: in his *Agesilaus*, Xenophon describes the pivotal importance of burying the dead (Xenophon *Ages. 2.15–16*. See also Thucydides II, 34). The ἀνδραποδισμός deprived a community of its mourning rituals and, in doing so, of its *lieux de mémoires*, thus severely endangering its self-awareness. Here lies the force of Euripides’ chorus in the *Trojan Women* (RAAFLAUB 2014, 20–21). Theatre was indeed a very powerful tool in linking ἀνδραποδισμός and (endangered) civic identity. Two episodes, one following, and one preceding the Persian wars, provide a strong evidence in this sense. The former, once again, involves Aeschylus: ‘in 467 BC the audience for the Aeschylean trilogy that included *Seven against Thebes* were invited into the sanctuary of Dionysus Eleuthereus on the south eastern slope of the Acropolis, directly under the scene of the Persian destruction. This impious scar on what Aeschylus described as “the eye of the land of Theseus” (Aeschylus *Eum. 1.102*) has to be considered both a physical and psychological backdrop to the play itself. It was a vivid and constant reminder to the Athenians that they narrowly escaped *andrapodismos* at the hands of a barbarian invader’ (MEINECK 2017, 53). The latter is related to Phrynichus’ *The Sack of Miletus* as reported by Herodotus (Herodotus VI, 21). It constitutes another example of the impact of the stories circulating in the Greek communities, which involved the defeat and the enslavement by a barbarian foe: it should not go unnoticed that, in the case of Phrynichus, we are only 16 years after the fall of Barce.²⁹

26 On the concept of ‘large scale destruction’ cf. HANSON ed. 1999.

27 On ἀνδραποδισμός see also FRANCHI 2016, 65–97, and now, from an Ancient Near Eastern perspective, MATARESE 2021, 201–228.

28 In Diodorus XII, 82.2 we are told of the complete destruction (pursued by Greeks) of a Bithynian city, including children and old men. Cf. Thucydides, III, 36–49 on the fate of the Mytileneans (but many more episodes could be mentioned: II, 75–78, III, 52–68, VI, 62.3–4). Before him, cf. Herodotus VI, 21 (Miletus) and, after Thucydides, Xenophon *Hell. II, 2.3*. My thanks to Mark Marsh-Hunn for his advice in Xenophontic matters.

29 The play was staged in 494–492 BC. The Libyan city fell in ca. 510 BC.

A second reason why ἀνδραποδισμός was so feared and became so strongly linked with a barbarian ἤθος involves the ethnic consequences of such practice, at least as it was perceived and displayed in Greek sources. Perhaps the best summary of this point comes from the 5th century and has been discussed by Meineck. His argument deserves full quotation: ‘in Andocides’ speech against Alcibiades we hear that Alcibiades personally purchased a Melian woman from among the captives after he had participated in the vote to *andrapodizein* the former allied state. He then brought her back to Athens and had a son with her. This is described as an unnatural act on a par with Aegisthus, who was the offspring of the incest between Thyestes and his daughter. Alcibiades’ child was born to parents who were the deadliest of enemies: his father having committed a terrible atrocity and his mother having suffered one [...] (Andocides 4.22–23).³⁰ The accusation goes on by asking how could this son become anything but a foe to Athens when his own father had enslaved his mother, killed her father and destroyed her home? Furthermore, the accuser then asks his audience how they are horrified by such things when they watch a tragedy, but indifferent when they perceive them happening in real life. This accusation, though made at the very end of the 5th century (Andocides came back to Athens around 403 BC), does provide a fascinating glimpse into contemporary attitudes to ἀνδραποδισμός: that it was a brutal, even shameful act, and that it would not have been normal for Athenians to keep slave women from cities they themselves had sacked, let alone father a child with them. [...] If we have established that it was abnormal for Athenians to keep captive slave women from their own campaigns, we have also shown that many of them did house women and children as slaves that had been captured in foreign wars and traded elsewhere. But we are still no closer to knowing what happened to the Greek women and children who were enslaved. Rosivach argues that once these people lost their status as wives, mothers, sons and daughters they became “displaced persons” and simply disappeared as part of any kind of legal, economic or social record, diminishing their “Greekness”, thereby making it easier for other Greeks to enslave them’ (quoted with further references in MEINECK 2017, 57–58).

That ἀνδραποδισμός always implied a loss of the displaced people’s Greekness is disproved by what we know about Eretria, on the eve of Marathon (and thus, again, no more than twenty years after Barce): ‘The Persians, judging by Greek accounts, did deport entire communities – where possible, as on islands, soldiers marched in a linked chain across the territory to ensure that not a single person avoided capture – but again kept them intact. The people of Eretria, deported a few days before the battle of Marathon and put to work scooping petroleum from a well, still formed a distinct, Greek-speaking community deep in Persian imperial territory two generations later’ (VAN WEES 2010, 249).³¹ However, this is not the point. What really matters is the difference between the two perspectives here at play relating to the ἀνδραποδισμός: if the Persians, in enacting what has been called a ‘conspicuous destruction’ (VAN WEES 2010, 240)³² pursued, or purported to pursue, a kind of theologically determined goal (restoring ‘happiness for mankind’), the Greeks viewed it as a threat to a community’s self-identity.³³

30 Cf. also Plutarch *Alex.* 16.4–5. I owe the reference to Mark Marsh-Hunn.

31 The episode referred to by van Wees occurs in Herodotus VI, 31, see also MATARESE 2021, 75–92.

32 Van Wees explains the concept as ‘a display of force designed to assert the power and status of the perpetrator in the face of a perceived challenge’. See also VAN WEES 2010, 250–252. In p. 252, van Wees writes: ‘In some cases, then, the annihilation of communities was not a goal in itself, but merely an incidental consequence of a ruthless pursuit of profit. The question of intent, however, is academic: slave-raiding states could not fail to realize that the ultimate result of their actions would be genocide’.

33 Pers. *šiyāti martiyahyā*, as Darius says in one of his inscriptions (DNa § 1).

There are mainly two reasons for this. On the one hand, to be resettled in an entirely new land – not on behalf of Delphi or due to a community decision, but by the use of sheer force – meant, as Herodotus powerfully summarized, the uprooting of everything that constituted Greek self-perception.³⁴ On the other hand, if the description of a defeat by the Argives' hand in the *Seven* – that is, the consequence of a siege – implies, as Meineck suggested (MEINECK 2017, 51), that 'those not considered profitable such as the elderly, infirm and the very young were killed or just left to die',³⁵ we may be tempted to posit a hypothesis about the demography of the Barcean-Bactrian diaspora and its perception in the Greek-speaking world at the dawn of the Persian Wars. If many of the displaced citizens were really women and children, the fact bears important consequences concerning the (Greek view of the) nature of the new-born settlement. Thucydides says that 'men make the city and not walls or ships without men in them' (Thucydides VII, 77.7):³⁶ it follows that the fate of the Barcaeans was already sealed when the city fell; in Bactria, they were destined to cease to be Greeks.³⁷ As we said, we know nothing more about the Barcaeans and about how their ethnic status was perceived either by Herodotus' sources, or by his audience, or by the historian himself. However, we have at least one piece of evidence, which could cast some light on what we could name 'the social life of a stereotype', that is, Bactria as a 'sort of Siberia', as famously stated by Rowlinson, and the ethnic belonging of the displaced people as inevitably doomed to fade away. In Polybius' words: to 'be completely barbarized' (Polybius XI, 34.5).³⁸ I am referring to the descendants of the 5th century Milesians known as Branchidae, whose story is recorded in the most detailed way in Curtius Rufus (Curtius VII, 5.28–35).

The case of the *Βραγχίδαι*-Branchidae

The story is well known: while pursuing Bessus, Alexander reached a small settlement somewhere in Sogdiana. Its dwellers, called the *Branchidae* by the historian, were the descendants of those Milesians who had allegedly been displaced to Central Asia by order of Xerxes as a reward for the policy of appeasement chosen by them as the king was campaigning against Greece. After some 150 years, Curtius remarks, the settlers 'had not ceased to follow the customs of their native land', but – he points out – were already bilingual ('having gradually degenerated': cf. Curtius VII, 5.29). Despite the joyful welcome of the Macedonians, they were however slaughtered by the soldiers, for the Graeco-Macedonians, according to Curtius, considered the inhabitants of the Central Asian settlement as traitors. As a consequence, the Branchidae were killed 'to a man' (Curtius VII, 5.33: *ad unum caedere*), and – interestingly, in perfect Achaemenid fashion, or at least according to the fashion that our sources have of the

34 Herodotus VIII, 144.2: 'the adornments and temples of our gods [...], the kinship of all Greeks' ('τῶν θεῶν τὰ ἀγάλματα, τὸ Ἑλληνικόν'), that is 'the kinship in blood and speech [...] and the shrines of gods and the sacrifices that we have in common' ('ἔδν δμαιομόν τε καὶ ὁμόγλωσσον [...] θεῶν ἰδρύματα τε κοινὰ καὶ θυσίαι ἡθεὰ τε ὁμότροπα').

35 According to VAN WEES 2011, 77, this was typical of siege warfare.

36 ἄνδρες γὰρ πόλις, καὶ οὐ τεῖχη οὐδὲ νῆες ἀνδρῶν κεναί'.

37 We have pointed out that in fact Bactria was not really 'at world's end', but it was perceived that way, and that is more than enough when it comes to building a cultural shared myth. The Alps too were not thousands of miles away from Rome, but in the eyes of a Roman army official the mountains really seem to embody the antonym of civilization: see for example *CIL* XII, 00104, as well as the commentary in BARONI 2005.

38 Polybius XI, 34.5: 'it would certainly be utterly barbarised' ('ἐκβαρβαρωθήσεσθαι ὁμολογουμένως').

Persians' *modus operandi* – their town razed to the ground, so that no vestige of the city might survive.³⁹

The account provided by Curtius⁴⁰ poses questions which cannot be easily answered: although several scholars have raised doubts that an *en masse* slaughter really took place, our sources often mention gruesome retaliations, not rarely for reasons far less compelling than the motives adduced by Curtius (see the discussion in VAN WEES 2009; 2016). For us it is important to note here that, if on the one hand what happened to the Branchidae helps illuminate the long-lasting effects of Greek discourses relating to the vengeance of the Persian invasion of the peninsula (and the sack of Athens) in 480 BC,⁴¹ on the other hand it could be suggested that, in a context such as that of Alexander's campaign in Central Asia, which was perceived as threatening the army's collective identity, the *pogrom* against someone that was not merely regarded as 'the Other', but as someone who 'had gone native' (ἐκβαρβαρωθήσεσθαι), worked to cement and strengthen the Graeco-Macedonians' self-perception.⁴²

In order to better understand this point, we need to reconsider the episode in full. It shows, in the clearest way possible, how the self-perception of a Greek community in Central Asia (as the Branchidae were) could dramatically differ from the image that the other Greeks had of it. An image, as I am attempting to show, that could have been deeply exasperated by the Greek reshaping of a Persian rhetorical move concerning the ἀνδραποδισμός. In other words, if the Branchidae still thought of themselves as part of the ἑλληνικόν, in the eyes of the other Greeks they were worse than βάρβαροι, and thus they could easily become the target of a genocide.⁴³ As shown both by Curtius' remarks and by the – no less shortcutting – one of Polybius concerning the Alexandrians of his own days (Polybius XXXIV, 14.4–6), a crucial role was played by language. Although being a *patrio sermone degeneres* does not imply, *per se*, the complete giving up of the mother tongue, what struck the Greek soldiers was the fact that the Branchidae decided to actively adopt it, just in the same way as their forebears had chosen to surrender Didyma: the old stereotype that we find in Herodotus, albeit fragmentarily, was replicating itself straight in front of Alexander's soldiers' eyes. In this episode, they are acting also on the base of a cultural bias, which was constructed in the former centuries by Greek ethnography.⁴⁴

The fatal error of the Branchidae, thus, could be seen not in the presumption – that proved to be wrong – of sharing the same ideological and cultural (not to say *ethnic*) background of Alexander's army, but in the persuasion that the Graeco-Macedonians would have recognized them as part of the system itself (the ἑλληνικόν) altogether. The consequences of

39 Although some scholars have doubted the authenticity of the episode, the material collected in VAN WEES 2011 shows clearly that such massacres were common since the very beginning of the literary record (the *Iliad*).

40 Another account is to be found in Plutarch *De sera* (= *Mor.* 557b).

41 The Branchidae not only had surrendered Miletus to the Persians, but they also desecrated the temple at Didyma *in gratias Xerxis* (Curtius VII, 5.28).

42 On the Branchidae see the recent articles, KUBICA 2016; MENDOZA 2016, 113–115, and the thorough discussion in MATARESE 2021, 127–138.

43 For a discussion of this concept in the ancient world see VAN WEES 2009; 2016.

44 But see Xenophon *Hell.* II, 1.15. The inhabitants of Cedreai were enslaved *en masse* by Lysander in 405 BC, and Xenophon seems to justify it on the account that they were 'half-barbarians' (μιξοβάρβαροι), just like the Branchidae. According to VAN WEES (2016, 33) the passage in Xenophon 'is evidently an attempt to excuse Lysander's action by contrast to previous Athenian acts of genocide against Greeks that Xenophon was about to denounce (II, 2.3), rather than an attempt to explain why Lysander destroyed Cedreai in the first place'.

that misunderstanding show the stark contrast which may exist between an individual or a community's concept of their own identity, and the outsider's one (MAIRS 2013, 368–371, with further bibliography on this topic). This may be called the 'ethnic explanation' of the Branchidae's fate, but it is not the only possible one. A second one – although strictly related to the first – may involve the role played by the ἀνδραποδισμός in Greek cultural discourse. The fate of the Barcaeans is a case in point. As anyone who had been displaced in Bactria (or beyond: Hyrcania, Arachosia, Sogdiana; that is, at world's end), the Branchidae were no longer Greeks. Since they had become 'barbarians', it was much easier to slaughter them. In addition, it comes as vengeance: 'the destruction of a formerly friendly or allied city which was deemed to have committed a particularly heinous act of treachery, which seriously endangered the city betrayed' (VAN WEES 2009, 254).⁴⁵ In the case of the Branchidae, it should be noted that their deeds affected not just a single πόλις, but an entire ἔθνος: τὸ Ἑλληνικόν. Be that as it may, it is possible to suggest that we are here confronted with a textbook example of what has been termed 'intentional history' (GEHRKE 1994; 2000; 2004; GEHRKE – LURAGHI – FOXHALL eds. 2010). 6th and 5th century Greeks (as reflected in Herodotus) knew something about the Upper Satrapies and the (once?) Greek speaking communities settled there, that their successors in the 4th century 'decided' to forget (or to shape anew) because it better fitted the needs of their own time and, in the particular case of the Branchidae, of Alexander's army's very peculiar situation. This is how social memory works (see e. g. FENTRESS – WICKHAM 1992, 130–136).

One last point needs our attention. In the light of what has been said so far, one may ask how the first veterans left in Bactria by Alexander (ironically enough, a very special King of Kings, as Briant famously called him: see the remarks in BRIANT 2017, 26–29) perceived *their own* social (and cultural) status – or positionality, if you like. We know from our sources that, at least from a Greek perspective, the satrapy was not a coveted prize. As soon as the king died, the new colonists revolted (Diodorus XVIII, 7.2–9).⁴⁶ In exploring the features of the first Graeco-Bactrian community, we will investigate some other discourses (FOUCAULT 1971) involving the cultural status of Bactria and its inhabitants within the cultural framework of Classical sources. The aim of this final section is to explore the range of stories like the one behind the passage concerning the Barcaeans and their efficacy in shaping the cultural landscape of an entire tradition in relationship to a land that was known to be radically different from how it was pictured in the historiographic tradition that has reached us.

THE FIRST GRAECO-BACTRIAN COMMUNITY

The history of the discovery of America and of the following conquest entails some aspects that at first sight can seem surprising, but these paradoxes can be scaled down if they are confronted with another discovery, which took place at the same time of the conquest; that is, the discovery of the Persian Far East. Just as with Columbian 'Indies', our ancient sources confront the reader with a remarkable discrepancy: on the one hand, a lush landscape, a virgin nature, provided with all manner of goods: a sort of *El Dorado* ready to be exploited, a reper-

45 The scholar also envisaged (VAN WEES 2009, 254) 'a final scenario' in his catalogue of genocide's reasons, that is 'the annihilation of a community as punishment for a religious offence. This principle is widely attested but seems to have been more often an additional justification for genocide than a major motivation in its own right'. In the case of the Branchidae, however, treason and religious offence seems to have been caught up together in the eyes of Alexander and his men.

46 According to Curtius (VII, 1.35), Cleitus perceived his new role as satrap in the east no better than a death sentence: '*mittor ad feras bestias*'.

toire of *mirabilia* to be carried to Europe and discussed in learned circles; a land of economic, social and political experiments too, to which civilization could – and indeed should – be grafted. On the other hand, there was a different landscape (the human one, if and when it was possible to speak of ‘humanity’)⁴⁷ that was ferine, violent, in which loathsome customs were in practice. There was no way to come to terms with all of this, no dialogue was possible; eradicating the barbarian⁴⁸ or the wiping out of the enemy were the only possibilities at hand in order to overcome the surrounding bestiality.⁴⁹

However, if the history more familiar to us is that of Théodore de Bry’s etchings or that of Pedro de Alvarado’s endeavours, the ‘Columbian prehistory’ of the encounter between the New and the Old Worlds, analyzed in a ground-breaking book by Tzvetan Todorov, is far less known (TODOROV 1982, 41–65).⁵⁰ It is possible to maintain that the first of the two myths that informs Columbus’ and Cortés’ histories, that of the noble savage, should be seen in the context of the first phase of the relationships between the natives and the newcomers; a phase in which, also thanks to countless misunderstandings on both sides, the *indios* proved themselves hospitable and collaborative (TODOROV 1982, 77–120; cf. also HARARI 2011, 237–261). It is possible to explain in this way Columbus’ and even Cortés’ initial commendation of the natives, whose embassies brought to the Spaniards all sorts of gifts. When the tide turned, and local resistance became as violent as it was desperate, then the representation of the natives changed, and we gain the picture described above. Something similar seems to have happened with the ethnography of Bactria’s population available in Classical sources (Cf., on this point, DUMKE 2015, 36). It is

47 After his first contact with the inhabitants of would-be San Salvador, a dismayed Columbus wrote in his diary not of the oddity of the native mother tongue compared to his own, but of the very absence, among the natives, of any kind of spoken language. They do not speak a different language; they ‘are not capable of speaking’. It has been stated countless times that the Greek word βάρβαρος derives from an onomatopoeia that mocks the muttering typical of non-Greek populations. To name but a few examples, in Sophocles (*Trach.* I. 060) only the Greeks had been gifted with the use of language: the rest of the world is ‘wordless’, ἄγλωσσος. In Aeschylus (*Pers.* I. 406), in describing the apical moment at Salamis, the ‘divine paean’ sung by the Greek fleet (Aeschylus *Pers.*, I. 390: ‘παιῶν ἐφύμνου σερμνόν’) is echoed in the words of the Persian (!) messenger by a ‘Περσίδος γλώσσης ῥόθος’: not words, but a whimpering. Herodotus tells us (II, 57) that the inhabitants of Dodona, in Epirus, called the priestesses ‘doves’ and that this was because their way of speaking sounded like birds’ chirping. At IV.183 the Thibestians, in North Africa, are said to speak a language that Herodotus compares with the bats’ call.

48 This appears also in poetry: cf. Virgil *Aen.* VIII, 688, when *ultima Bactra* is sung of. The city’s name is placed in *enjambement*.

49 Speaking of the native Americans, human sacrifices and cannibalism are, in the eyes of the *conquistadores*, the equivalent of Sophocles’ ἀγλωσσία, that is the core proof of the sub-human dimension that characterizes the Other. How instrumental this picture was is demonstrated, in the case of pre-Columbian America, by the existence of men and in some cases women, such as the famous Malinche (cf. PORRÚA 2001, 180; and MAIRS 2006, 50). She was a native woman who learned Spanish so well that she became Cortés’ interpreter even when it came to the meetings with emperor Motecuhzoma. In the ancient Greek world, the examples of the transcending of linguistic and cultural frontiers are countless. Here it is possible to recall the Spartan king Pausanias, who was said to have mastered Persian in order to speak with the oriental élite (Thucydides, I, 130). Next comes Themistocles (Plutarch *Them.*, 31), to whom was given an οἶκος at Magnesia on the Maeander, that is in Persian territory; and finally, Demaratus (Herodotus VII, 102). The Spartan king was dethroned by Cleomenes and fled to Persia, where he became Xerxes’ advisor.

50 As argued by Todorov (see e.g. TODOROV 1982, 44–50), Columbus discovered the Americas, not the natives. Something similar could be said about the relationship between the Alexander’s historians and, on the one hand, the physical geography of Central Asia and, on the other, the human one.

tempting to see in this phenomenon an example of ‘intentional history’ at work: the Persian discourse related to the empire’s borders becomes, in the Greek sources, a ‘landscape of fear’, and its inhabitants ‘the most savage of all’ (AIME 2005).

In the first attempt to provide an overall history of the *Greeks in Bactria and India*, William Tarn (1938, 116) devoted some pages to the discussion of a local (that is Bactrian) custom that Alexander and his successors,⁵¹ busily civilizing those remote places,⁵² finally succeeded in uprooting. In Bactria, according to Strabo (XI, 11.3),⁵³ old or ill people were thrown to dogs that were raised precisely for that purpose. The very streets of Bactra were plastered with human bones: it is the sheer antithesis of what every classical author could have labelled as *civilis*, a concept that, as already Aristotle noted (Aristotle *Pol.* 1253a), went hand in hand with humankind. Strabo’s source is, with all probability, Onesicritus (*FGrH* 134 F 5, quoted by Strabo *ad locum*), and his description became a τόπος: five hundred years later, Plutarch (*De Alex.; Mor.* 328C) praises Alexander’s παιδεία. The Macedonian, after having brought to the Hyrcanians the practices of marriage, agriculture in Arachosia and filial piety in Sogdiana, taught ‘the Scythians’ to bury their dead instead of feeding them to the dogs or, even worse, directly eating them themselves’ (Plutarch *Mor.*, 328E). We hear of such atrocities even in Late Antiquity: in fact, during a harangue against anthropophagy, Porphyry (*Abst.* IV, 21.4) is able to quote Scythians and Bactrians (notably: in the very same breath, as if they were one and the same population in their savagery) sharing the practice of cannibalism. When they do not eat their loved ones, they ‘throw the old ones, still alive, to the dogs’ (κυσὶ παραβάλλουσι ζῶντας τοὺς γεγηρακότας).

One should handle evidence such as that provided by Strabo very carefully. We are indeed confronted with a multi-layered source which is as difficult to evaluate as it is interesting. It has been maintained that Onesicritus (Strabo’s source) – most likely elaborating on some ethnographic report – was in fact sowing his own discourse, aimed at representing Alexander as an enlightened king, struggling to bring civilization ‘at world’s end’.⁵⁴ As far as Strabo is concerned, who on other occasions does not hesitate to blame his sources for being mendacious, here he is only too happy to have found evidence that the people living at the border of the οἰκουμένη were ‘completely barbarian’, extraneous to every norm of community life.

However, labelling the evidence provided by Strabo-Onesicritus as ‘invention’ seems unwise and does not pay enough attention to the structure of cultural stereotypes. In a passage of the *Videvdād* (3. 14–21) there seems to be evidence of a local custom which prescribed isolation for elders or ill men in places devoted to that aim,⁵⁵ and in which they were finally left

51 Diodorus (XVIII, 39.6) mentions Stasanor, satrap in Bactria after Alexander’s death. Cf. also Arrian *Anab.* VI, 29.

52 For a dramatized picture of Bactria as the new Tomi see Chariton 5. 1.

53 Strabo XI, 11.3: ‘those who have become helpless because of old age or sickness are thrown out alive as prey to dogs kept expressly for this purpose, which in their native tongue are called “undertakers,” and that while the land outside the walls of the metropolis of the Bactrians looks clean, yet most of the land inside the walls is full of human bones’ (‘τοὺς γὰρ ἀπειρηκότας διὰ γῆρας ἢ νόσον ζῶντας παραβάλλεσθαι τρεφομένοις κυσὶν ἐπίτηδες πρὸς τοῦτο, οὓς ἐνταφιαστάς καλεῖσθαι τῇ πατρῴᾳ γλώττῃ, καὶ ὀρᾶσθαι τὰ μὲν ἔξω τείχους τῆς μητροπόλεως τῶν Βάκτρων καθαρὰ, τῶν δ’ ἐντὸς τὸ πλεον ὀστέων πλήρες ἀνθρωπίνων’).

54 See ROLLINGER 2017b, 577, about how this *modus operandi* works in classical sources. When it comes to the picture of Bactria ‘at world’s end’ and the consequence of it for the local population, be it native or a displaced one, we should remember the underbrush that informs the Herodotean account in IV, 204 discussed above.

55 In the Avestān source the word used is ‘garden’: cf. pers. *pardēz* (LINCOLN, 2012, 59–80). I owe the information relating to the *Videvdād* to Dott. Marc Mendoza, from Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, and to prof. Alberto Cantera from Freie Universität Berlin. See also *Yašt*, 2. 57.

to die. It should be said that, in contrast to what Strabo tells us, it is extremely improbable that, as Grenet puts it, ‘Greeks were stumbling over human bones all the time while walking through the streets of Bactra’.⁵⁶ From the passage in the *Videvdād*, it seems to be clear that the dead – or dying – people were rigorously separated from the rest of the society. When Strabo, quoting Onesicritus, states that ‘while the land outside the walls of the metropolis of the Bactrians looks clean, yet most of the land inside the walls is full of human bones’ (τὰ μὲν ἔξω τείχους τῆς μητροπόλεως τῶν Βάκτρων καθαρὰ, τῶν δ’ ἐντὸς τὸ πλεον ὀστέων πλήρες ἀνθρωπίνων’, Strabo XI, 11.3), it is to be assumed that ‘the land inside’ (τῶν δ’ ἐντὸς’) has not to be taken literally and interpreted as ‘inside the city wall’, but should instead be seen as referring to tombs such as those discovered by Julio Bendezu-Sarmiento and Johanna Lhuillier at Tepe Zargarân, two kilometres from the Bactra’s city centre (Cf. LHUILLIER – MASHKOUR 2016, 657–659; BENDEZU-SARMIENTO *et al.*, 27–35).

At the very least since Jacoby scepticism has been raised when it comes to evaluating the meaning of any ‘such measures taken by Alexander’ (JACOBY 1930, 471). This kind of puzzlement seems all the more understandable if one considers the impressive funeral the Macedonian bestowed to Darius III (Arrian *Anab.* III, 29). One should not forget that, at Naqš-ī Rostam (LINCOLN 2012, 437–446), the Achaemenid kings underwent a very peculiar inhumation ritual, aimed at preventing contact of the body with the soil, which was thought to be polluting.⁵⁷ All of this was not in the slightest way ‘Greek’, but it seems that Alexander did not even attempt to abolish it. Assuming that events transpired in the way the Greek sources described them (though the picture seems to be too clear-cut from a sociological and anthropological perspective), the reason behind Alexander’s varying behaviour could be found in the context in which the Macedonian’s decisions were taken. In 330 BC Alexander was in need of legitimization in order to gain the locals’ support against Bessus: this explains the respect for the Achaemenid ceremonial shown by the Macedonian, whose aim appears to have been that of entering the Persian dynastic line (Cf. WIESEHÖFER 1994). On the contrary, during the years 329–327 BC the new Great King who, in the best Persian tradition possible, had already defeated and (crudely) punished a seditious traitor, was snared in fighting an uprising that threatened the stability of the entire region and, to some extent, the empire as a whole. More than once the king was wounded,⁵⁸ the higher ranks of the army became doubtful regarding the entire expedition and, a fact not to be underestimated, the troops became increasingly discouraged (Arrian *Anab.* IV, 16.6).⁵⁹ As an outcome, the way of sheer violence was chosen. Such an outcome would have been all the easier since, according to the Greek cultural discourse (that is, within the framework of their ‘intentional history’) the soldiers were moving in a world turned upside-down. Otherwise stated, they might have perceived to have entered a world that, as was a shared view from the 6th century onwards and as the Branchidae unquestionably proved, was able to transform (for the worse) those who had the venture to settle there; a world, moreover, which was inhabited by *something* that, whatever it was, was radically different from them (the Greeks), and thus was easier to deal with by means of unbounded violence.⁶⁰

56 Pers. comm. Nov. 3rd, 2017.

57 For further discussion related to this topic cf. for example ABDULLAEV 2017, 34.

58 Curtius VIII, 10.4; Arrian *Anab.* IV, 23; Justin XII, 7.4; Plutarch *Alex.* 58.6–9.

59 Sardelić (2017, e.g. 496.) has underlined the relationship between an internal crisis and an ‘apocalyptic’ representation of an external foe, with whom the same community (a city, an army, any kind of social group) suddenly comes into contact.

60 Such a way of reasoning is very much typical of *ex post* justification of (violent) conquest. See most recently SCHLIEPHAKE 2019 for a very sophisticated study of the British discursive creation of the ‘Asian other’ within the very same space in which Alexander’s army moved some two millennia before.

The history of the upcoming centuries shows that Alexander's successors turned out to be much more sophisticated in dealing with their subjects as their rhetoric of Otherness would lead one to believe, and indeed the Macedonian himself (eventually) proved to be an excellent mediator, a fact which accounts for his victory over Spitamenes.⁶¹ It would be very difficult to explain otherwise the three-century-long lasting vitality of the Hellenistic world in the Far East and, in the case of the two-hundred-year-old Bactrian history, the expansive vigour of the youngest among the Hellenistic kingdoms beyond the Hindūkūš. But discourse, as we have tried to show in this paper, penetrates deep into a group's cultural memory; moreover, it is capable of structuring the pattern of representations regarding the Other in a remarkably lasting way. And so it was that, also thanks to an apocalyptic vision concerning the end of Greek power in Central Asia (COLORU 2009, 231-241), Bactria and its inhabitants remained those portrayed by Onesicritus, Strabo, and Plutarch until some recent, very important, cultural turns in the field of (Hellenistic) Bactrian studies.⁶² In the 2nd century BC, the *Yuèzhī* came and – so the narrative goes – Greek civilization disappeared: as Holt puts it, it was as if the Greeks had never come, and 'the Devourer dogs were growling again over the bones of the Bactrians' (HOLT 2004, 164).⁶³

If the picture drawn so far can serve to reconstruct the genesis of a long-lasting stereotype within the Mediterranean cultural landscape, it must nevertheless be acknowledged that this is only one side of the coin. What about the (self)perception of that same world by those Greeks who – grudgingly – had remained in Bactria?

THE OFFSPRING ISSUE

According to Arrian, Alexander urged everyone who had fathered sons with Asian women to leave these children with him, as not to spark conflicts between foreign sons, born from Persian women and the ones – and their mothers – who were left in Greece (Arrian *Anab.* VII, 12.2). This passage of the *Anabasis*, and another one, in book One (Arrian *Anab.* I, 24.1), implies that no women had accompanied the soldiers who conquered Persia. But this is not without consequences. How then can we explain the existence of a Graeco-Macedonian community living in Bactria, once the new established power in Babylon had dealt with the first colonists' uprising?⁶⁴ According to Tarn, who probably had the business of British India in mind, the solution was quite simple: the mothers of the first Graeco-Bactrian generation were local women (TARN 1938, 35). As he saw it, no other solution was possible since, on the one hand, Arrian's passage is an argument against the hypothesis of a policy of familiar rejoining in Asia⁶⁵

61 For a discussion of the episode, its background and its interpretations cf. recently KUBICA 2016 with further literature.

62 Who, in their turn, were likely relying on a very long history, whose hints are to be found as early as the *Histories* of Herodotus, as we tried to show in the previous pages.

63 Holt's 'as if the Greeks had never come' is the last epigone in a line that was pursued by Tarn, by Droysen before him and, before both, as we have seen, by Plutarch, for example in *De Alex. = Mor.* 328D. Here we learn that, allegedly, 'when Alexander was civilizing Asia, Homer was commonly read, and the children of the Persians, of the Susianians, and of the Gedrosians learned to chant the tragedies of Sophocles and Euripides' (ἀλλ' Ἀλεξάνδρου τὴν Ἀσίαν ἐξημεροῦντος Ὅμηρος ἦν ἀνάγνωσα, καὶ Περσῶν καὶ Σουσιανῶν καὶ Γεδρωσίων παῖδες τὰς Εὐριπίδου καὶ Σοφοκλέους τραγωδίας ᾗδον'). Cf., *contra*, ABDULLAEV 2017, 39, with plates.

64 Cf. Justin XII, 5.13 and, among modern historians, COLORU 2009, 130-134; HOLT 1988, 87-91.

65 But cf. PATTERSON 1975, 322-330.

and, on the other hand, refusal of any kind of relationship, be it marriage or concubinage, would have led to the extinction of the would-be community.⁶⁶

As it has been noted, Tarn's view was based on two passages in Arrian's *Anabasis* (IV, 4.1, 22.2–3), from which it seems possible to argue in favour of a diffused policy of Bactrian born settlers in the new colonies pursued by Alexander. According to some scholars, such strategy aimed at ploughing fertile ground for 'fraternization' (and hence mixed marriages) between the conquerors and the natives; two typical aspects, as someone said, of any military occupation, in antiquity as well as in our days (BURSTEIN 2012, 99). However, as Holt underlines (HOLT 1999, 49), archaeological data from Āi Xānum point towards some degree of separation between the Greeks and the local population, at least in the initial years; this should come as no surprise, since the years 329–327 BC were not the best starting point for any process of community building.⁶⁷

If this scenario holds for the first generation of colonists, it must be assumed that within twenty years at most (more or less one generation) the picture became more complex. Otherwise, it is difficult to explain the sudden, strong need to (re)create a cultural tradition that one is confronted with in reading the so-called 'Clearchos' inscription' (ROBERT 1968; MAIRS 2014b). Furthermore, it should be remembered that the Greek community of the diaspora in the east from its very outset was, probably, socially much more complex as has been thought until quite recently. Sonja Plischke, for instance, stressed this point a few years ago (PLISCHKE 2014, 31): in what follows I shall try to add but a few footnotes to Plischke's evidence with the aim to emphasize what is hidden behind the displacement described in Classical sources. In doing so, we may be able to cast a glance – albeit an oblique one – at the social *milieu* of communities such as those that flourished as a consequence of acts of genocide as the one described in Herodotus IV, 204 and thus to the stories possibly circulating in those contexts.⁶⁸ Investigating the demography of such settlements may also help understand the cultural landscape of the following centuries such as the one we find, most famously, at Āi Xānum.

Pilgrim mothers

A radically different solution from the one provided by Tarn to the issue of the women left in Bactria with the Greeks cannot avoid an inquiry into the sociology of ancient warfare. According to Aristotle, for example, war constitutes 'a way of acquisition' (Aristotle *Pol.* I, 8.12 = 1256a),⁶⁹ and the philosopher's view shares many similarities with those of his mentor, Plato (*Leg.* VII, 823d). As for Thucydides (I, 5.1–2), he saw warfare in the context of a process of ἀὐξήσις, that is 'expansion', 'growth' of Greek communities. In this typology, acts of piracy are also included, which answered to ethical and cultural norms not so far removed from those of the context of warfare (Homer, *Od.* III, 73, IX, 52).⁷⁰ As might be expected, in all the cases we have thus far examined the entire focus is on a very specific section of an ancient city's population: the male citizen(s). One remarkable exception, however, is provided by the *Iliad* through the story of Chryseis' and Briseis' (Homer *Il.* I, 29–31, XIX, 291–298 destinies), a powerful picture of the meaning of the experience of war for both women and children in

66 This, incidentally, in fact happened to the first Chinese community in Jamaica. Cf. PATTERSON 1975, 324.

67 See however DUMKE 2015, 41. With the – indeed remarkable – exception of the 23.000 insurgents mentioned by Diodorus (XVIII, 7.2–9), those who stayed were ultimately forced to 'go native'.

68 VAN WEES 2016 provides a justification for the use of the term in precisely the context we are discussing in this paper.

69 Aristotle *Pol.* I, 8.12 (= 1256a): 'κτητική πως ἔσται'.

70 Cf. later in the 5th century Euripides *Tro.* 634–670.

the ancient world. In light of this, it may be no coincidence that Herodotus (I, 1–5) puts a chain of women’s kidnappings at the origins of the biggest, most important and cruellest conflict of the entire history, at least until his own days.

Switching from mythos to history, it should be remembered that Alexander’s ἀνάβασις had an antecedent, not only regarding the strategic and military aspect, but also the relationships between natives and newcomers: the Ten Thousand’s expedition guided by Xenophon. Judging from his firsthand account, it is not only possible to infer the presence, along with the mercenaries, of a not insignificant number of women (ἑταῖραι), but it is also possible to deduce that, during the journey back to Greece, they changed their status from war booty (ἀνδράποδα), to consorts of their masters (Xenophon *Anab.* IV, 3.19). Both were in fact united by their extraneousness to the surrounding places, which they were nonetheless forced to pass through (cf. LEE 2004, 154–165; BURSTEIN 2012, 101). Both expeditions, that of Xenophon and that of Alexander, lasted ten years, and the similarities between the two, at least concerning this topic, are striking. At Tyre, the Macedonian king – in distinctively Persian style – enslaved (ἐξηνδραποδίστατο) women and children (Diodorus XVII, 46.4),⁷¹ and the same happened at Gaza (Arrian *Anab.* II, 27.7: ἐξηνδραπόδισεν). After the fall of Persepolis, so writes Diodorus, Greek troops went on, ‘converting their [‘the inhabitants’] captivity into slavery’ (‘τὴν αἰχμαλωσίαν δουλαγωγοῦντες’; Diodorus XVII, 70.6). Deep in the heart of Asia, the script remains unchanged: according to Arrian, the Macedonians ‘seized as plunder the women, children and other spoils’ (*Anab.* IV, 2.4: ‘γυναῖκας δὲ καὶ παῖδας καὶ τὴν ἄλλην λείαν διήρπασαν’, but see also *Anab.* IV, 3.1.) and Ptolemy (*FGrH* 138 F 15 = *It. Alex.* 37) states that, once he reached and conquered Cyropolis, Alexander ‘distributed the men [the booty seized at Cyropolis] among his army (‘κατανεῖμαι [αὐτὸν Ἀλέξανδρον] τοὺς ἀνθρώπους τῇ στρατιᾷ’): in all probability, women were part of that allotment.

Cities, of course, were not the only source of war loot: from Herodotus (Herodotus VII, 187), Thucydides (Thucydides II, 78; cf. *Ath.* 12.572–573; LEE 2004, 147), and of course from several passages of Xenophon’s *Anabasis* (see again LEE 2004), we know that, during the 5th and the 4th century, women usually followed armies, Greek as well as the Persian ones: we are particularly well informed about the *comitatus* of Darius III at Issos and Gaugamela (which included many of the Persian royal women; Diodorus XVII, 35.3;⁷² Curtius III, 12.12–13; Arrian *Anab.* II, 12.9; Justin XI, 9). In the aftermath of the battle, the king left behind on the field a huge quantity of booty, including the famous war chariots that were prerogative of the women of the court (Diodorus XVII, 17.35.2–4; Arrian. *Anab.* II, 11.9).⁷³

Women among the Macedonians seem to be a constant also after Alexander left Bactria: Arrian (*Anab.* VI, 25.5; *Peripl.* 6.4–5) lists them among the casualties of the calamities that ravaged Alexander’s army during the hellish march through Gedrosia,⁷⁴ an account which helps explain the remarkable presence of Persian princesses at the Susan weddings.⁷⁵ The

71 In Arrian (*Anab.* II, 24.5) we find ‘ἠνδραπόδισε’.

72 Diodorus mentions even an ‘υἱὸς παῖς τὴν ἡλικίαν’.

73 For the war chariots see Herodotus VII, 83, IX, 76; Xenophon *Cyr.* VI, 4.41; Diodorus XV, 56.7; Plutarch *Alex.* 43.1; *Them.* 26; *Artax.* 5; Chariton. 6.9; Arrian *Anab.* III, 19.2; Curtius III, 13.11, IV, 4.11.

74 Cf. Strabo XV, 2.6, who quotes Aristobulos and Nearchus (*FGrH* 139 F 35 and *FGrH* 133 F 18 = Arrian *Peripl.* 6.4–7).

75 See moreover Arrian *Anab.* VII, 4.8, the *Index* to Diodorus’ book 2 (‘How it was that king Ninus married Semiramis because of her virtue’, in the Greek original ‘Ὡς Νῖνος ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐγγημε τὴν Σεμίραμιν διὰ τὴν ἀρετὴν αὐτῆς’) and the *Epit. R. Gest. Alex.* 31 for previous episodes of that kind. See also (BURSTEIN 2012, 102 and BOSWORTH 1980, 12) for an insightful interpretation of the episode. See also Plutarch *Alex.* 48.

passage in the *Anabasis*⁷⁶ quoted at the opening of this section provides explicit evidence of the ambiguous status of those women, who were soldiers' property sanctioned by military law (Justin XXXVIII, 10.2; Polyenus VI, 6.13);⁷⁷ however, along with their children, they constituted a potentially explosive social issue. That is why, one may argue, Alexander avoided their repatriation. If some of our sources deserve credit (Diodorus XXVII, 110.3; Justin XII, 4.2–10), the new King of Asia thought of turning the stateless condition of his soldiers' illegitimate children to his advantage, binding them to him thanks to a new unit of ἐπίγονοι.⁷⁸ In such accounts there is, naturally, no room for sentimentalism or romantic idealization, but it is a matter of fact that a relationship between a soldier and his war booty (ἀποσκευή) existed. In at least two cases, furthermore, we have evidence that the sheer physical presence of those women in the army ranks was able to heavily influence the soldiers' behaviour. During the battle of Paraetacene, for example, instead of reinforcing the positions they had gained after their victory,⁷⁹ the soldiers run after their possessions (ἐπί τὴν ἰδίαν ἀποσκευὴν ἀναχωρεῖν). Judging from the context, it is possible to infer that women were part of the loot (ἀποσκευή). Eumenes' fate was even worse. Although he had defeated Antigonos at Gabiene (316 BC), he was sold to him by his own soldiers, because they aimed at regaining their women, who had been captured by the One-Eyed.⁸⁰

After a detailed analysis of the literary sources, Stanley Burstein (2012, 103) concludes that the ancient historiography we know of does not explicitly say where the mistresses (or already wives) of the soldiers that Alexander settled in (or, according to Cleitus, exiled to?) the Bactrian forts came from. However, the comparative evidence discussed so far makes it very difficult to assume a shortage of women born in many different regions of the Achaemenid Empire in the ranks of the 'colonial expedition' (Diodorus XX, 41.1) that reached Bactria in 330–329 BC (Cf. Justin XII, 4.2–3). According to Burstein, modern interpreters have paid too much attention to episodes such as the Susan marriages, stressing the 'melting-pot-policy' with the women of the Persian (and local) *élite* pursued by the higher ranks of the Macedonians on behalf of Alexander. In doing so, Burstein goes on, informal relations that were at play among the lower ranks of the army have been overlooked. However, the evidence points to a picture characterized 'by the imposition of an occupying army on populations with whom they had few if any close ties. Not surprisingly, the result was that the first years of Macedonian rule in Bactria saw some of the most brutal and sustained fighting of Alexander's entire reign' (BURSTEIN 2012, 103).⁸¹

76 Arrian *Anab.* VII, 12.2.

77 ἀποσκευή and γῆρας here have to be understood as *termini technici*.

78 Another translation for the word ἀπολις is the English displaced: it is exactly the situation of the Barcaeans (see also VAN WEES 2010; 2016). In the Persian heyday it was the Greeks who could assume the status of a displaced community, and, in light of the evidence we are providing here, one should think about the consequences in terms of ethnicity, self-identity and social memory of such communities as the Barcaeans in Herodotus.

79 Other evidence of this kind can be found in Xenophon *Hell.* VII, 5.26.

80 Diodorus XIX, 43.7–9, who speaks of 'τῆς ἀποσκευῆς αὐτῶν ἠλωκυίας καὶ παρὰ τοῖς πολεμίοις ὄντων τέκνων καὶ γυναικῶν καὶ πολλῶν ἄλλων ἀναγκαιῶν σωματίων'. Cf. also Plutarch *Eum.* 17; COLORU 2009, 127–128.

81 One could even speculate why the same 'social bomb' that caused Alexander not to repatriate the Persian-borne children to Greece did not come to his mind when he settled the colonists in Bactria. The spectacular failure of such (re)settlement policy could have been one of the reasons behind the uprising of the natives as well as of the would-(not-)be colonists.

CONCLUSION: THE STORIES BEYOND (AND BEFORE) THE *HISTORIES*

One is left to wonder whether something similar to what we have described concerning the history of Alexander's campaign and its aftermath might have happened at the time of the displacement of the Barcaeans (510 BC). As van Wees has repeatedly pointed out (VAN WEES 2010; 2016), causes, ways, and consequences of displacements in Mediterranean (and Eastern) antiquity are strikingly similar: so was also, most probably, the ethnic component of the affected communities. After all, the ancient world has always been far more connected than we are sometimes ready to admit. Globalization, and the related problems, are in no way a modern phenomenon. This is true also from a socio-anthropological point of view, although on a markedly different scale. Histories about the birth and destruction of communities, about traditions that were forgotten, or about threatened identities could have been circulating then as they are today. Thus, one should not be surprised if some diaspora stories flourishing in one cultural context (the Persian one, for example) were translated into a different *milieu* (the Greek one). This is what Irad Malkin has described as 'creative misunderstanding' (MALKIN 2002, 151–181). In changing the context of circulation, those stories acquired a very different meaning, thus radically changing the etic perception⁸² of an entire region and of its inhabitants: Herodotus' account might well have been the starting point of one of these creative misunderstandings.

To summarize the main results of the above inquiry: on the one hand, if properly framed within its own socio-cultural – and discursive – context, the history of the Barcaeans' displacement turns out to be a significant piece of evidence for the reconstruction of the genesis of an inveterate prejudice nurtured by the intellectual tradition of Classical Antiquity against Central Asia and its inhabitants. On the other hand, a sociologically informed analysis of Alexander's expedition throws a rather interesting light on the socio-cultural complexity of the first Graeco-Macedonian communities in Bactria (of which the Libyan diaspora known to Herodotus could constitute a significant precedent), which in turn would help to explain many of the inconsistencies (from an architectural as well as from a figurative point of view, to name but few examples) characteristic of Āi Xānum's civic landscape as it is known from the post-Seleucid era. This having been said, what the history of Herodotus' Libyan-Bactrian community surely accounts for is the stunning richness of the 'labyrinth', as the *Histories* have been called: it reminds us, among other things, of how much there is yet in it, waiting to be discovered (NENCI 1994, XXIII).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My warmest thanks are due to four invaluable mentors, Sitta von Reden, Maurizio Giangliulo, Elena Franchi, and Giorgia Proietti (who happen to be also very cherished friends) for having taught me to look at – and to try to speak of – 'small and great cities of men alike'. Mark Marsh-Hunn succeeded in the not trivial effort of turning these notes into an academically acceptable piece of writing. As if this were not enough, he was a more than helpful and supportive friend during an exciting but very difficult Herodotean semester. Many thanks also to Angela Alaimo, who showed me how to travel. This contribution is dedicated to Beate Häberle, in sincere gratitude, to Tommaso, for having walked with me a long stretch through the intricate – and sometimes unbelievable – paths of history, to Iroda and Miraziz, for having hosted me in Sog-

82 In these situations, it is very often that of the conqueror, that is, in too many cases the only one that really matters.

diana in warmth and friendship, to Carlota, Giulia, Chiara and Anna, for being the wonderful friends they are, to Yılan, for a lovely journey in the paths of Tīmūr, to Negar Mohammadi, the best elder sister one could think of, to Lara Fabian, in unabated admiration, and finally to Эльвира and Лада (*снова, всегда*), because they are two beautiful and very much-loved voices from worlds far from the eyes, but not (indeed never) from the heart.

SOURCES

- Aeschylus *Pers.* = Aeschylus, *The Persians*. Oxford Classical Texts. Editor: D. Page. Oxford 1972.
- Andocides = Andocides, *Speeches*. Oxford Classical Texts. Editors: M.R. Dils – D.J. Murphy. Oxford 2018.
- Aristotle *Pol.* = Aristotle, *Politics*. Oxford Classical Texts. Editor: D. Ross. Oxford 1963.
- Arrian *Anab.* = Arrian of Nicomedia, *Anabasis of Alexander*. Bibliotheca Teubneriana. Editor: A.G. Roos. Leipzig 1907.
- Arrian *Peripl.* = Arrian of Nicomedia, *Periplus Ponti Euxini*. Bibliotheca Teubneriana. Editors: R. Hercher – A. Eberhard. Leipzig 1885.
- Chariton = Chariton of Aphrodisias, *Cherea and Chaliroë*. Antike Texte. Editor: M. Sanz Morales. Heidelberg 2020.
- Ctesias = Ctesias of Cnidus, *Persian History*. Reihe Geschichte. Editor: J.P. Stronk. Duisburg 2010.
- Curtius = Curtius Rufus, *Vita Alexandri*. Bibliotheca Teubneriana. Editor: C.M. Luciani. Leipzig 2009.
- Diodorus = Diodorus Siculus, *Bibliotheca Historica*. Collection des Universités de France. Paris 1972–2018.
- Epit. R. Gest. Alex.* = *Incerti auctoris Epitome rerum gestarum Alexandri Magni*. Bibliotheca Teubneriana. Editor: O. Wagner. Leipzig 1876.
- Euripides *Tro.* = Euripides, *Trojan Women*. Oxford Classical Texts 2. Editor: J. Diggle. Oxford 1981.
- FGrH* = *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*. Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker. Editor: F. Jacoby. Leiden 1923–1958.
- Herodotus = Herodotus, *Histories*. Oxford Classical Texts 1. Editor: N.G. Wilson. Oxford 2015.
- Justin = Justin, *Epitome historiarum Trogi Pompeii*. Collection des Universités de France. Editors: B. Mineo – G. Zecchini. Paris 2016–2020.
- Plato *Leg.* = Plato, *Laws*. Oxford Classical Texts 5. Editor: J. Burnet. Oxford 1963.
- Pliny = C. Plinius Secundus: *Naturalis Historia*. Bibliotheca Teubneriana. Editor: Karl Mayhoff. Leipzig 1875–1906.
- Plutarch *Alex.* = Plutarch, *Life of Alexander*. Bibliotheca Teubneriana. Editor: K. Ziegler. Leipzig 1994.
- Plutarch *Art.* = Plutarch, *Life of Artaxerxes*. Bibliotheca Teubneriana. Editor: K. Ziegler. Leipzig 1971.
- Plutarch *Eum.* = Plutarch, *Life of Eumenes*. Bibliotheca Teubneriana. Editors: K. Ziegler – H. Gärtner. Leipzig 1993.
- Plutarch *Them.* = Plutarch, *Life of Themistocles*. Bibliotheca Teubneriana. Editor: K. Ziegler. Leipzig 1969.
- Plutarch *De Alex.* = Plutarch, *De Fortuna Alexandri*. Bibliotheca Teubneriana. Editors: W. Nachstädt – W. Sieveking – J.B. Titchener. Leipzig 1971.
- Plutarch *De sera* = Plutarch, *De sera numinis vindicta*. Bibliotheca Teubneriana. Editors: W.R. Paton – M. Pohlenz – W. Sieveking. Leipzig 1972.
- Polybius = Polybius, *Histories*. Bibliotheca Teubneriana. Editors: L. Dindorf – T. Büttner-Wobst. Leipzig 1993–2001.
- Pomponius = Pomponius Mela, *Libri de situ orbis tres*. Editor: G. Paithey. Berlin 1867.
- Propertius = Propertius, *The Elegies*. Editor: G. Giardina. Roma 2005.
- Silius = Silius Italicus, *Punica*. Corpus Poetarum Latinorum. Editor: W.C. Summers. London 1905.
- Thucydides = Thucydides *Histories*. Oxford Classical Texts. Editor: H. Stuart-Jones – E. Powell. Oxford 1963.

- Tzetzes = Ioannes Tzetzes: *Historiae*. Libreria Scientifica Editrice. Editor: P.A.M. Leone, Napoli 1968.
- Virgil *Aen.* = Virgil, *Aeneid*. Oxford Classical Texts. Editor: Roger Mynors. Oxford 1969.
- Virgil *Georg.* = *Georgics of Vergil*. Editor: Roger Mynors. Oxford 1969.
- Xenophon *Ages.* = Xenophon, *Agesilaus*. Opera omnia. Editor: E.C. Marchant. Volume V, Oxford 1985.
- Xenophon *Anab.* = Xenophon of Athens, *Anabasis*. Oxford Classical Texts. Volume III. Editor: E.C. Marchant. Oxford 1963.
- Xenophon *Cyr.* = Xenophon of Athens, *Cyropaedia*. Oxford Classical Texts. Volume V. Editor: E.C. Marchant. Oxford 1963.
- Xenophon *Hell.* = Xenophon of Athens, *Hellenica*. Oxford Classical Texts. Volume I. Editor: E.C. Marchant. Oxford 1963.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ABDULLAEV, K. 2017: Funerary Tradition of the Ancient East in Examples from Anatolia and Bactria – Margiana. Origins or Parallels? *Türkiye Bilimler Akademisi Arkeoloji Dergisi* [Turkish Academy of Sciences Journal of Archaeology] 20, 27–51.
- AIME, M. 2005: *L'incontro mancato. Turisti, nativi, immigrini*. Torino.
- ASHERI, D. – LLOYD, A. – CORCELLA, A. 2007: *A Commentary on Herodotus. Books I–IV*. Oxford.
- ARMAYOR, O.K. 1978a: Did Herodotus Ever go to Egypt? *Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt* 15, 59–71.
- ARMAYOR, O.K. 1978b: Did Herodotus Ever go to the Black Sea? *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 82, 45–62.
- BARONI, A. 2005: Strade, dogane e province nei territori alpini in età imperiale romana. In: L. Gamberale (ed.): *Itinerari e Itineranti attraverso le Alpi dall'Antichità al Medioevo*. Convegno di Studio e Assemblea Nazionale, Trento, 15–16 ottobre 2005. Trento, 827–840.
- BENDEZU-SARMIENTO *et al.* 2015 = Bendezu-Sarmiento, J. – Lhuillier, J. – Mustafakulov, S. – Rakimov, S.K.: The Mortuary Practices of the Early Iron Age Populations. Recent Discoveries at Dzharkutan in Northern Bactria. *Bulletin of the International Institute for Central Asian Studies* 22, 26–46.
- BRIANT, P. 2002: *From Cyrus to Alexander. A History of the Persian Empire*. Winona Lake.
- BRIANT, P. 2017: *Kings, Countries, Peoples. Selected Studies on the Achaemenid Empire*. Stuttgart.
- BURSTEIN, S. 2012: Whence the Women? The Origin of the Bactrian Greeks. *Ancient West & East* 11, 97–104.
- CATALDI, S. 2005: Tradizioni e attualità nel dialogo dei messaggeri greci con Gelone (Erodoto VII 157–162). In: M. Giangiulio (ed.): *Erodoto e il «modello erodoteo». Formazione e trasmissione delle tradizioni storiche in Grecia*. Trento, 123–173.
- COLORU, O. 2009. *Da Alessandro a Menandro. Il regno greco di Battriana*. Pisa.
- CORCELLA, A. – MEDAGLIA, M.S. – FRASCHETTI, A. (eds.): 1993: *Erodoto, Le Storie. La Scizia e la Libia*. Milano.
- DUMKE, G.R. 2015: «Weil sie sich nach griechischer Erziehung und Lebensweise zurücksehnten...». Probleme und Auswirkungen der Ansiedlung griechischer Soldaten im hellenistischen Baktrien. In: C. Rass (ed.): *Militärische Migration vom Altertum bis zur Gegenwart*. Studien zur historischen Migrationsforschung 30. Paderborn, 31–40.
- FEHLING, D. 1971: *Die Quellenangaben bei Herodot. Studien zur Erzählkunst Herodots*. Berlin.
- FENTRESS, J. – WICKHAM, C. 1992: *Social Memory*. Oxford – Cambridge, Mass.
- FOUCAULT, M. 1971: *L'ordre du discours : leçon inaugurale au Collège de France prononcée le 2 décembre 1970*. Paris.
- FRANCHI, E. 2016: *Die Konflikte zwischen Thessalern und Phokern. Krieg und Identität in der griechischen Erinnerungskultur des 4. Jahrhunderts*. München.
- GEHRKE, J.H. 1994: Mythos, Geschichte, Politik – Antik und Modern. *Saeculum* 45, 239–264.
- GEHRKE, J.H. 2000: Mythos, Geschichte und kollektive Identität. Antike exempla und ihr Nachleben. In: D. Dahmann – W. Posthof (eds.): *Mythen, Symbole und Rituale. Die Geschichtsmächtigkeit der Zeichen in Südosteuropa im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*. Bonn, 1–24.

- GEHRKE, J.H. 2004: Was heißt und zu welchem Ende studiert man internationale Geschichte? Marathon und Troja als fundierende Mythen. In: G. Melville – S.K. Rehberg (eds.): *Gründungsmythen, Genealogien, Memorialzeichen. Beiträge zur institutionellen Konstruktion von Kontinuität*. Köln, 21–36.
- GEHRKE, H.-J. – LURAGHI, N. – FOXHALL, L. 2010 eds.: *Intentional History. Spinning Time in Ancient Greece*. Stuttgart.
- GIANGIULIO, M. 1981: Deformità eroiche e tradizioni di fondazione. Batto, Miscillo e l'oracolo delfico. *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa* 11, 1–24.
- GIANGIULIO, M. 2005: Tradizione storica e strategie narrative nelle Storie di Erodoto. Il caso del discorso di Socle Corinzio. In: M. Giangiulio (ed.): *Erodoto e il «modello erodoteo». Formazione e trasmissione delle tradizioni storiche in Grecia*. Trento, 91–123.
- GIANGIULIO, M. 2006: Bricolage coloniale. Fondazioni greche in Cirenaica. In: M. Lombardo – F. Frisone (eds.): *Colonie di colonie. Le fondazioni sub-coloniali greche tra colonizzazione e colonialismo*. Atti del convegno internazionale, Lecce, 22–24 giugno 2006. Lecce, 87–98.
- GIANGIULIO, M. 2010: *Memorie coloniali*. Roma.
- HANSON, D.V. ed. 1999: *Hoplites. The classical Greek battle experience*. London – New York.
- HARARI, N.Y. 2011: *Sapiens. A Brief History of Humankind*. New York.
- HARARI, N.Y. 2016: *Homo Deus. A Brief History of Tomorrow*. New York.
- HARTOG, F. 1991: *Le miroir d'Hérodote: essai sur la représentation de l'autre*. Paris.
- HENKELMAN, M.F.W. 2018: Bactrians in Persepolis – Persians in Bactria. In: J. Lhuillier – N. Boroffka (eds.): *A Millennium of History. The Iron Age in southern Central Asia (2nd and 1st Millennia BC)*. Proceedings of the conference held in Berlin, June 23–25, 2014. Dedicated to the memory of Viktor Ivanovich Sarianidi. Berlin, 223–257.
- HERZFELD, E. 1968: *The Persian Empire. Studies in Geography and Ethnography of the Ancient Near East. Edited from the Posthumous Papers by Gerold Walser*. Stuttgart.
- HOLT, F.L. 1988: *Alexander the Great and Bactria*. Leiden.
- HOLT, F.L. 1999: *Thundering Zeus. The Making of Hellenistic Bactria*. Austin.
- HOLT, F.L. 2004: *Into the Land of Bones. Alexander the Great in Afghanistan*. Berkeley.
- JACOBS, B. 2017: Kontinuität oder kontinuierlicher Wandel in der achämenidischen Reichsverwaltung? Eine Synopse von PF, *dahyāva* – Listen und den Satrapienlisten der Alexanderhistoriographen. In: B. Jacobs, – M.F.W. Henkelman – W.M. Stolper (eds.): *The Administration in the Achaemenid Empire / Die Verwaltung im Achämenidenreich. Imperiale Muster und Strukturen*. Wiesbaden, 3–45.
- JACOBY, F. 1930: *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker. Zweiter Teil B, Kommentar zu nrr. 106–261*. Berlin – Leiden.
- KING, R. 2021: *The House of the Satrap and the Making of the Achaemenid Persian Empire, 522–330 BCE*. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Chicago.
- KUBICA, O. 2016: The Massacre of the Branchidae: A Reassessment. The post-mortem Case in Defence of the Branchidae. In: K. Nawotka – A. Wojciechowska (eds.): *Alexander the Great and the East. History, Art, Tradition*. Wiesbaden, 143–150.
- LANDO, F. 1993: *Fatto e finzione. Geografia e letteratura*. Milano.
- LEE, J.W.I. 2004: “For there were many hetairai in the army”. Women in Xenophon's *Anabasis*. *The Ancient World* 34, 154–165.
- LENFANT, D. 2005: *Ctésias de Cnide. La Perse, L'Inte, Autres Fragments*. Paris.
- LINCOLN, B. 2007: *Religion, Empire, and Torture. The Case of Achaemenid Persia With a Postscript on Abu Grahīb*. Chicago.
- LINCOLN, B. 2012: *Happiness for Mankind. Achaemenian Religion and the Imperial Project*. Leuven.
- LHUILLIER, J. – MASHKOUR, M. 2017: Animal exploitation in the oases. An archaeozoological review of Iron Age sites in southern Central Asia. *Antiquity* 91, 655–673.

- LURAGHI, N. 2001: Local Knowledge in Herodotus' «Histories». In: N. Luraghi (ed.): *The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus*. Oxford, 138–160.
- MAIRS, R. 2006: *Ethnic Identity in the Hellenistic Far East*. Unpublished dissertation. University of Cambridge.
- MAIRS, R. 2013: The Hellenistic Far East. From the Oikoumene to the Community. In: E. Stavrianoupolou (ed.): *Shifting social Imagineries in the Hellenistic Period. Narrations, Practices and Images*. Leiden, 365–388.
- MAIRS, R. 2014a: Achaemenid Ai Khānoum. *Archäologische Mitteilungen aus Iran und Turan* 46, 1–19.
- MAIRS, R. 2014b: *The Hellenistic Far East. Archaeology, Language and Identity in Greek Central Asia*. Berkeley.
- MALKIN, I. 2002: A Colonial Middle Ground. Greek, Etruscan, and Local Elites in the Bay of Naples. In: L.C. Lyons – K.J. Papadopoulos (eds.): *The Archaeology of Colonialism. Issues and Debates*. Los Angeles, 15–181.
- MATARESE, C. 2021: *Deportationen im Perserreich in teispidisch-achaimenidischer Zeit*. Wiesbaden.
- MAZZARINO, S. 1966: *Il pensiero storico classico*. Roma – Bari.
- MEINECK, P. 2017: Thebes as high-collateral-damage Target. Moral Accountability for Killing in Aeschylus' *Seven against Thebes*. In: I. Torrance (ed.): *Aeschylus and War. Comparative Perspectives on Seven against Thebes*. Abingdon, 49–69.
- MENDOZA, M. 2016: La Anábasis forzada. Deportaciones en el imperio Aqueménida. *Polis* 28, 69–130.
- MENDOZA, M. 2017: Las deportaciones Aqeménidas. Paralelismos y diferencias con neo-asirios y neo-babilonios. In: A. Huerta Barrera – A.M. Cervera Obregón (eds.): *Los efectos de la guerra. Desplazamientos de población a lo largo de la historia*. Madrid, 27–50.
- MOGGI, M. 2005: Artabano in Erodoto. In: M. Giangiulio (ed.): *Erodoto e il «modello erodoteo». Formazione e trasmissione delle tradizioni storiche in Grecia*. Trento, 193–214.
- MURRAY, O. 2001: Herodotus and Oral History. In: N. Luraghi (ed.): *The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus*. Oxford, 16–44.
- NENCI, G. 1994 ed.: *Erodoto. Le Storie. La rivolta della Ionia*. Milano.
- PATTERSON, O. 1975: Context and Choice in Ethnic Allegiance. A Theoretical Framework and Caribbean Case Study. In: N. Glazer – D. Moynihan (eds.): *Ethnicity. Theory and Practice*. Cambridge, Mass., 305–350.
- PLISCHKE, S. 2014: *Die Seleukiden und Iran. Die seleukidische Herrschaftspolitik in den östlichen Satrapien*. Wiesbaden.
- PORRÚA, Á.M. 2001: Bernal Díaz. *Historia verdadera de la conquista de la Nueva España, México*. Ciudad Real.
- RAAFLAUB, K. 2014: War and the City. The Brutality of War and its Impact on the Community. In: P. Meineck – D. Konstan (eds.): *Combat Trauma and the Ancient Greeks*. New York, 15–46.
- RAPIN, C. 1996: *Indian Art from Afghanistan. The Legend of Sakuntala and the Indian Treasure of Eucratides at Ai Khānoum*. New Delhi.
- RAPIN, C. 2018: Aux origines de la cartographie. L'empire achéménide sous Darius I et Xerxès. *Ancient Civilizations from Scythia to Siberia* 24, 1–67.
- RAWLINSON, H.G. 1909: *Bactria. The History of a Forgotten Empire*. Bombay.
- ROBERT, L. 1968: De Delphes à l'Oxus, inscriptions grecques nouvelles de la Bactriane. *Comptes Rendus des séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* 112, 416–457.
- ROLLINGER, R. 2017a: Altorientalisches bei Herodot. Das wiehernde Pferd des Dareios I. In: H. Klinkott – N. Kramer (eds.): *Zwischen Azur und Athen. Altorientalisches in den Historien Herodots*. Stuttgart, 13–45.
- ROLLINGER, R. 2017b: Assyria in Classical Sources. In: E. Frahm (ed.): *A companion to Assyria*. London, 570–583.
- ROLLINGER, R. 2017c: Monarchische Herrschaft am Beispiel des teispidisch – Achimenidischen Großreichs. In: S. Rebenich (ed.): *Monarchische Herrschaft im Altertum*. Berlin, 189–215.
- ROLLINGER, R. – BICHLER, R. 2017: Universale Weltherrschaft und die Monumente an ihren Grenzen. Die Idee unbegrenzter Herrschaft und deren Brechung im diskursiven Wechselspiel. (Vom Alten Orient bis zum Imperium Romanum). In: R. Rollinger (ed.): *Die Sicht auf die Welt zwischen Ost und West (750 v. Chr. – 550 n. Chr) / Looking at the World from the East and the West (750 BCE–550 CE)*. Wiesbaden, 1–31.
- SARDELIĆ, M. 2017: John of Plano Carpini vs Simon of Saint – Quentin. 13th-Century Emotions in the Eurasian Steppe. *Golden Horde Review* 5, 494–508.

- SCHLIEHPAKE, C. 2019: *On Alexander's Tracks. Exploring Geographies, Memories, and Cultural Identities along the North-West Frontier of British India in the Nineteenth Century*. Stuttgart.
- SKINNER, E.J. 2012: *The Invention of Greek Ethnography. From Homer to Herodotus*. Oxford.
- SKINNER, E.J. 2018: Herodotus and his World. In: T. Harrison – E. Erwin (eds.): *Interpreting Herodotus*. Oxford, 187–222.
- TARN, W.W. 1938: *The Greeks of Bactria and India*. Cambridge.
- THOMAS, R. 2001: Herodotus' Histories and the Floating Gap. In: N. Luraghi (ed.): *The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus*. Oxford, 198–211.
- TODOROV, T. 1982: *La Conquête de l'Amérique. La question de l'autre*. Paris.
- VAN WEES, H. 2002: Herodotus and the Past. Herodotus in the Past. In: E. Bakker – I. de Jong – H. van Wees (eds.): *Brill's Companion to Herodotus*. Leiden – Boston – Köln, 321–349.
- VAN WEES, J.G.B. 2003: Conquerors and Serfs. Wars of Conquest and Forced Labour in Archaic Greece. In: N. Luraghi – S.E. Alcock (eds.): *Helots and their Masters in Laconia and Messenia. Histories, ideologies, structures*. Washington, DC – Cambridge, Mass., 33–81.
- VAN WEES, J.G.B. 2010: Genocide in the ancient world. In: D. Bloxham – D. Moses (eds.): *The Oxford Handbook of Genocide Studies*. New York, 239–258.
- VAN WEES, J.G.B. 2011: Defeat and destruction. The ethics of ancient Greek warfare. In: M. Linder – S. Tausend (eds.): *Boser Krieg. Exzessive Gewalt in der Antiken Kriegsführung und Strategien zu deren Vermeidung*. Graz, 69–110.
- VAN WEES, J.G.B. 2016: Genocide in archaic and classical Greece. In: V. Caston – S.-M. Weineck, 2016 (eds.): *Our ancient wars. Rethinking war through the classics*. Ann Arbor, 19–37.
- WIESEHÖFER, J. 1994: *Die "dunklen Jahrhunderte" der Persis. Untersuchungen zu Geschichte und Kultur von Färs in frühellenistischer Zeit (330–140 v. Chr.)*. München.

Marco Ferrario

Università degli Studi di Trento
 Via Tommaso Gar 14
 38122 Trento, Italia
 marco.ferrario@unitn.it