

‘THE MOST IGNORANT PEOPLES OF ALL’: ANCIENT ETHNIC HIERARCHIES AND PONTIC PEOPLES

Philip A. Harland

I. INTRODUCTION

The area of the Euxine Sea to which Darius was leading his army is, except for the Scythians, inhabited by the *most ignorant peoples of all* (ἔθνεα ἀμαθέστατα). For we cannot cite the wisdom (σοφίης) of any people there, other than the Scythian people, nor do we know of any man noted for wisdom in the Pontic region other than Anacharsis. The Scythian kinship group (γένει) is *most clever* (σοφώτατα) of all in making the most important discovery we know of concerning human affairs, though I do not admire them in other respects. They have discovered how to prevent any attacker from escaping them and how to make it impossible for anyone to overtake them against their will (*Histories* 4.46.1f.).¹

Herodotos is notorious for his description of northern peoples around what is now the Black Sea. Among his most extensive characterizations is that concerning those labelled ‘Scythians’ specifically. Herodotos’ comparative approach to Pontic and other peoples, with his superlative comments, would be echoed in subsequent ethnographic writing throughout the Hellenistic and Roman eras. There is a widespread proclivity to rank peoples in relation to one another. Attention to these more specific categorizations may help us to move beyond the frequently reiterated idea that the Greek literary elites tend to construct an ethnic self-understanding primarily in juxtaposition to a generalized inferior ‘other’, the ‘barbarians’, as the works of François Hartog, Edith Hall, and Jonathan M. Hall emphasize.² An approach to ancient ethnic rivalries and interactions that moves beyond ‘the other’ may also help us to follow both ancient historians who emphasize nuances in Greek perceptions of other peoples and postcolonial scholars, such as Robert J.C. Young, who call us to abandon the category of ‘the other’ altogether.³

Instead, Herodotos’ comment instantiates the concern for more particularity in grading other non-Greek peoples in relation to one another, in this case placing those identified generally as ‘Scythians’ above all other Pontic peoples with respect to their intelligence as manifest in military skill. More scholarly work remains to be done on how Greeks like Herodotos position supposedly ‘lesser’ peoples in relation to one another (rather than merely on a somewhat simplistic Greek-barbarian dichotomy) and on what shared legitimizing ideologies often accompanied such categorizations.

Rather than studying Greek ethnography in isolation, this paper places these ancient phenomena within the framework of social scientific theories and findings regarding intergroup conflict and prejudice within societies generally, particularly with respect to the concept of ‘ethnic hierarchies’. What may at first glance seem peculiar to ancient ethnographic traditions could in some important respects be another example of commonly attested intergroup phenomena, I would argue. Although considerable scholarly work has been done on Greek or Roman perceptions of other peoples, seldom have the results been studied in terms of intergroup prejudice (affective, negative attitudes or evaluations), stereotypes (external categorizations based, in part, on prejudice), and discrimination (behaviours following from

¹ Translation Strassler & Purvis 2009, with adaptations.

² Hartog 1988 [1980]; E. Hall 1989 (on tragedians of the 5th century); J.M. Hall 2002, 172-188 (on a shift from aggregative to oppositional constructions of Hellenicity in the 5th century). On this see also Thomas 2000, 43-45 and Vlassopoulos 2013.

³ Keim 2018 (on this shift among ancient historians); Young 2012, 36-39.

prejudice and stereotypes), on the one hand, and in terms of the ideologies that justify such hierarchies, on the other.⁴ While the present contribution aims at understanding some attitudes and stereotypes that accompanied a low position for Pontic peoples in Greek representations of ethnic hierarchies, in another study I explore Greek inscriptional evidence for peoples from the Black Sea area settled in Greek city-states.⁵ Such evidence for Pontic diasporas provides an opportunity to consider implications of hierarchies (that are our concern in this chapter) for social interactions between Greeks and Pontic peoples in local settings. Social identity theory and social dominance theory may help to further understand both ideological and social dimensions of the ancient situation.

II. INSIGHTS FROM THE SOCIAL SCIENCES

It is important to begin by briefly clarifying that most social scientific theories that help to frame the present study of ethnic groups and hierarchies owe something to the important theories of Frederick Barth on ethnicity (since 1969) and Henri Tajfel and John C. Turner on social identity and intergroup conflict (since 1979). Barth's seminal anthropological study on ethnic groups replaces primordial notions of ethnicity with a more fluid and situational understanding of how members of such groups – with beliefs that they have distinctive cultural customs and a shared common ancestry – formulate boundaries and define themselves in relation to other peoples on a situational basis.⁶

Within the discipline of social psychology, Turner and Tajfel's social identity theory is concerned with the value members of social groups (including ethnic groups) attach to membership in a given group.⁷ Specifically, the theory is focussed on how members seek a positive self-image for the group. They do this by, in part, favouring members of the ingroup and, most importantly here, by representing outgroups in a negative or ambivalent manner.

Drawing on both Barth and Tajfel, Richard Jenkins' study (1994) of how ethnic groups (as social groups) formulate and maintain a sense of belonging together emphasizes two interrelated factors: internal identifications by members of the group and external categorizations or stereotypes formulated by outsiders. It is the interplay between the self-categorizations of members in the group and reactions to the viewpoints of those who belong to outgroups that make the process of identification and the development of self-understanding so dynamic, as Jenkins shows.⁸

It is the latter of the two factors explained by Jenkins – external categorizations or stereotypes – that are so instrumental in understanding socially shared representations within a particular society or community that result in rankings of specific ethnic groups. These representations are what Louk and Roeland Hagendoorn and their colleagues (since 1989) call an 'ethnic hierarchy', or what we might also express using the image of an ethnic ladder.⁹ As Louk Hagendoorn explains:

⁴ See Snellman & Ekehammar 2005; Snellman 2007.

⁵ Harland 2020.

⁶ Barth 1969. Also see Jenkins 1994.

⁷ Tajfel & Turner 1979 = Tajfel & Turner 1986; Tajfel 1981 and 1982. Also see the research review by Howard 2000.

⁸ Jenkins 1994. Cf. Harland 2009. Brubaker helpfully problematizes categories which reify 'identity', proposing a more fruitful set of concepts relating to processes of 'identification', a terminological approach that I also adopt here. See Brubaker 2004, 28-63 = Brubaker and Cooper 2000.

⁹ Hraba, Hagendoorn & Hagendoorn 1989; Hagendoorn 1993 and 1995; Hagendoorn et al. 1998. Also see Snellman & Ekehammar 2005.

In a multi-ethnic context, each group will have stereotypes about several outgroups accentuating negative differences from the ingroup. Outgroups will be placed further away from or further below the ingroup, the larger and more important these differences are. This means that the process of differentiation unavoidably entails a rank-ordering. In this way stereotypes generate an ethnic hierarchy.¹⁰

Replicated studies of ethnic hierarchies in Holland have found that (within various subgroups, including minorities) a consensual stratification had North Europeans at the top, East and South Europeans below that, and Africans and Middle Eastern groups at the bottom.¹¹ Alexandra Snellman and Bo Ekehammar's study of hierarchies among various groups in Sweden found a relative consistency: subjects ranked Swedes first, Italians second, and Latin Americans third, with Somalians, Iranians, and Syrians most often ranked (in that order) further below.¹²

In some respects, the rankings reflect the degree to which members of one people choose to maintain social distance from members of another. Social distance here pertains to the acceptance or rejection of members of outgroups as marriage partners, neighbours, friends, classmates, or workmates.¹³ Contact with members of ethnic groups that are placed lower on hegemonic hierarchies than one's own group would be considered undesirable in this way and contact with those higher would be desirable for status implications.¹⁴ So, such representations and ideologies have a direct impact on social relations and discrimination.

A particular ethnic ladder may reflect priorities of the upper echelons of a culturally hegemonic or politically powerful group. Yet studies by Hagendoorn, Snellman, and others show that the process of intergroup interactions sometimes results in a similar or common hierarchy being taken on by subordinated ethnic groups, even though such minorities would be placed low in the hegemonic ranking. A result is that 'ethnic groups at the bottom of the ethnic hierarchy are rejected by dominant ethnic groups as well as by other ethnic minorities'.¹⁵ In some cases, both hegemonic and subordinated groups in a particular society may thus have highly similar if not consensual rankings of specific ethnic groups or peoples. Simultaneously, certain ethnic groups still struggle with one another for a more favourable position on lower rungs of the ladder. This tendency to adopt and justify current hierarchies (i.e. the status quo) even by members of disadvantaged groups is also a central proposition in system justification theory, as I discuss below.

However, in other cases, minorities may construct their own alternative hierarchies of peoples in a way that benefits their own people's status (i.e. favouring the ingroup). This phenomenon is more in line with social identity theory and social dominance theory in their original expressions. In a study of Judaeans specifically, I have explored how ethnic minorities in the Roman era reflect both approaches.¹⁶ Sometimes cultural minorities in the ancient context adopt or adapt hegemonic hierarchies, on the one hand, and sometimes they formulate alternative hierarchies that challenge those in a socially or culturally dominant position, on the other. Furthermore, a certain member of an ethnic minority group, like Philo or Josephus, may also reflect both approaches, depending on the social or rhetorical situation.

Roughly contemporary with the work of Hagendoorn and his colleagues and focussing on the United States, Jim Sidanius and Felicia Pratto (since 1999) developed a more wide-ranging theory which they designate 'social dominance theory'. This theory draws on social identity theory, realistic group conflict theory, Marxist theory, and other approaches in order to examine

¹⁰ Hagendoorn 1993, 36.

¹¹ Hraba, Hagendoorn, and Hagendoorn 1989; Hagendoorn 1993; Hagendoorn et al. 1998.

¹² Snellman & Ekehammar 2005.

¹³ Hagendoorn 1995.

¹⁴ Hagendoorn 1995, 205.

¹⁵ Hagendoorn 1995, 222.

¹⁶ Harland 2019.

processes (at institutional, group, and individual levels) that lead to and maintain societal group-based inequalities, namely what they label ‘social hierarchies’, a broader concept which envelops racial or ethnic hierarchies.¹⁷ Particularly important for understanding ancient Greek or Roman elite perspectives on other peoples is social dominance theory’s attention to the role of commonly shared attitudes and ‘legitimizing myths’ or ideologies. These contribute to and justify processes of discrimination, thereby maintaining hierarchies that favour dominant groups.¹⁸ There are also attempts to consider the degree to which specific individuals have an investment in commonly shared hierarchies and in ideological justifications for such hierarchies. A high score in such a ‘social dominance orientation’ indicates a high degree of support for current stratification and, conversely, a low score an orientation that favours more equality and attenuates an existing hierarchy.

Recent contributions in social psychology that focus on some of the blind-spots of both social identity theory and social dominance theory may help to provide balance in theoretical perspectives. John T. Jost, Mahzarin R. Banaji, and colleagues (since around 1994) have developed ‘system justification theory’ to address other dimensions of intergroup interactions.¹⁹ These social psychologists focus attention on cases of outgroup (rather than ingroup) favouritism where members of subordinated groups show a motivation to justify a status quo or hierarchy that involves their own domination by more powerful groups.²⁰ Similarly, intergroup emotions theory as developed by Diane M. Mackie, Eliot R. Smith, and colleagues (since 1993) explores a range of possible attitudes from positive to negative and ambivalent responses in intergroup relations.²¹ So while social identity theory and social dominance theory shed light on how ingroup favouritism leads to stereotypes and intergroup conflict, system justification theory and intergroup emotions theory notice variations in responses to both the ingroup and outgroups. The latter also tend to observe cases where outgroup favouritism on the part of subordinated groups leads to the perpetuation of existing social arrangements or hierarchies. These are among the social dynamics that we will now witness in a case study of ancient ethnic hierarchies with a focus on the position of Pontic peoples.

III. ETHNIC HIERARCHIES AND LEGITIMIZING IDEOLOGIES

One very important factor in social dominance theory is the role of commonly shared legitimizing ideologies aimed at enhancing a particular hierarchical arrangement within a given society.²² On the other hand are attenuating ideologies that may work against existing hierarchies. While ideologies which serve to maintain current arrangements are usually held by the dominant group and those which work against the status quo are sometimes held by subordinated groups, Sidanius and Pratto emphasize the tendency for both hegemonic and subordinated groups to maintain largely consensual ideologies and attitudes that enhance rather than undermine established hierarchies.²³ System justification theory and Hagendoorn’s ethnic hierarchies research likewise posit that both dominant and subordinated groups may tend to the

¹⁷ Sidanius & Pratto 1999, with clarifications in Sidanius et al. 2004 and Pratto, Sidanius & Levin 2006. Cf. Snellman and Ekehammar 2005; Snellman 2007.

¹⁸ For a brief summary, see Pratto, Sidanius & Levin 2006, 275f. For a more extensive explanation, see Sidanius & Pratto 1999, 103-126. For possible weaknesses of the theory, see, e.g., Turner & Reynolds 2003. Cf. Jost, Banaji & Nosek 2004.

¹⁹ Jost & Banaji 1994; Jost, Banaji & Nosek 2004.

²⁰ See Harland 2019 for examples involving Philo and Josephus.

²¹ Smith 1993; Mackie & Smith 2002; Mackie, Smith & Ray 2008; Mackie & Smith 2015.

²² Sidanius & Pratto 1999, 103-126.

²³ Sidanius & Pratto 1999, 123-126.

former ideologies, those that maintain the status quo. When held by subordinated groups, these legitimating ideologies are akin to the Marxist concept of ‘false consciousness’, as Jost and Banaji clarify.²⁴

Here I argue that Greek ethnographic writings provide glimpses into both of these ideological tendencies but especially elite ideologies that enhance currently established hierarchies. This can be witnessed in cases where elite authors indicate theoretical justifications for rankings they presume. These became part of a tradition of explaining the inferiority of particular peoples in specific, largely-shared, though slightly varying, stratified representations. Ethnographic authors like Ephoros and Eratosthenes, however, seem to offer cases of elites attenuating certain aspects of common categorizations

Unfortunately, our evidence for the perspectives of subordinated groups themselves is quite limited, since we often lack literary or inscriptional evidence to assess these standpoints. Nonetheless, attenuating ideologies are also clearly evident among one of the few minorities whose perspectives have been preserved in a substantial corpus of ancient writings, namely Judaeans.²⁵ Such limitations notwithstanding, some indications of the perspectives of other peoples, including Pontic peoples, have survived within elite ethnographic writing by Greeks, as we will soon see.

There are two main sets of principles first evident in the latter half of the 5th century (and repeated thereafter) that sought to enhance or justify dominant hierarchies, explaining why certain peoples should be considered higher or lower in a ranking of peoples, with Greeks (and later Romans) at the top. The first is more in line with realities of ethnocentrism and the second ostensibly offers a ‘rational’ basis for such categorizations. Nonetheless, the second dovetails closely with the first and, it seems, primary factor. It is important to briefly set out these two inter-related ideologies before turning to a more in-depth look at sources concerning the position of northern peoples in the hierarchies these ideologies sought to bolster.

On the one hand, there is the *distance-from-centre justification* of ethnic rankings which is already clearly evident in and known to Herodotos, who composed his work in the second half of the 5th century BC (likely between 450 and 420).²⁶ This factor would, quite readily, give a low position to peoples at the reaches of the known world, including inhabitants north of the Black Sea. The further away an ethnic group was from a cultural centre (whether that be Persepolis, Athens, or Rome), the more likely such a group was to be placed lower on the scale in a particular ethnic hierarchy. Herodotos himself, who employs the language of honour, shows an awareness of this concept when outlining the customs of the Persians (1.131-140). However, he attributes such a stratifying approach to the Persians (who would therefore place Greeks and others low in their own ethnic hierarchies) without necessarily recognizing how this principle informed Greek assessments of non-Greek peoples, including his own assessments:

[The Persians] honour (τιμῶσι) most highly those who live closest to them, next those who are next closest, and so on, assigning honour by this reasoning. Those who live farthest away they consider least honorable of all. For they think that they are the best of all people in every respect and that others rightly cling to some virtue (ἀρετῆς) until those who live farthest away are the worst (κακίστους εἶναι). The Medes were under the influence of a similar principle ...²⁷

²⁴ Jost & Banaji 1994; Jost 1995.

²⁵ See Harland 2019.

²⁶ On this, also see Isaac 2004, although I do not subscribe to his particular view of the ancient origins of racism.

²⁷ Hdt. 1.134.2. Translation adapted from Godley 1920 (LCL).

Having noted this tendency to assume that the farther away peoples were, the more barbaric or inferior they would be, it is important to observe cases where this was challenged or inverted by Greek-speaking elites. As the cases of Ktesias of Knidos and Ephoros show, far-off peoples (e.g. Scythians, Egyptians, Ethiopians, Indians) might be considered particularly noble or wise, a reverse ethnocentrism of sorts.²⁸ This was, in part, a way of critiquing one's own society but it also served to attenuate existing consensually held hierarchies, I would suggest.

A second main factor is that, quite often, Greek ethnographic rankings of peoples came to be informed by ideologies first attested in the 5th century in philosophical and health-related discussions, theories regarding the four elements in nature and the four humours in humans.²⁹ The theory of the humours is first clearly outlined in the Hippocratic writings on *The Nature of Man* and *On Airs, Waters, and Places*, both likely from the final decades of the 5th century BC and roughly contemporary with Herodotos.³⁰ Because the attributes of hot, cold, dry, and moist were so fundamental to both the elements and the humours – with earth / black bile thought to be cold and dry, water / phlegm cold and moist, fire / yellow bile hot and dry, and air / blood hot and moist – there was also a close correspondence not only with climatic changes of the seasons but also with movements of the planets or stars.

So, in many respects, this was a thorough-going environmental theory that came to be applied as an explanatory device in a variety of contexts, in this case to bolster Greek categorizations of other ethnic groups. The Greek (or Roman) elites who constructed or modified such theories tended to imagine that their own location was relatively balanced in terms of temperatures and seasons and, therefore, balanced in a combination of the elements or humours. For this reason, humoral theory often dovetails quite closely with the distance-from-centre factor. For, as one went further north, south, east or west of a cultural centre such as Athens (or Rome), increasingly extreme or unchanging climates or environments were imagined to exist. These climates were thought to negatively shape the character of populations living in those conditions, creating inferior populations (cf. Diodoros of Sicily, *Library of History* 3.34). This situation means that, once again, there was a tendency to affirm a low place for peoples north of the Black Sea, as well as other northern peoples (e.g., Gauls, Germans or Britons) as they became known.

Although these propositions or ideologies are presented by ancient authors as explanations for the relative inferiority or superiority of particular peoples, I would argue that, in large part, these were justifications for a pre-existing, widely-shared categorization of peoples as inferior to Greeks. This said, the theorizing itself when adopted by subsequent authors could influence how a particular writer categorized specific peoples within such widely-held hierarchies. Like astrological reasoning, the theory itself left considerable room for variant or even opposite interpretations of the same ostensible data. This goes along with my point that these were often justifications for negative categorizations more so than the cause of negative categorizations.

IV. HIERARCHIES AND PONTIC PEOPLES IN ANCIENT ETHNOGRAPHY

1. Herodotos' Greek Perspective on Northern Barbarians

²⁸ Photios' summary of Ktesias' work on India frequently emphasizes that the various peoples of India, including the supposed pygmies and dog-heads, were 'very just'. For Ktesias, there were no humans settled beyond India. See Nichols 2008, 111-116. Cf. Wells 1999, 99-121; Romm 1992, 45-81.

²⁹ Also see Thomas 2000, 47-74 on the humours and ethnography. For a general discussion of the environmental theory, see Isaac 2004, 55-109.

³⁰ Jouanna 2012, 335-360.

Now that we have a general sense of these two ideological factors, we can move on to the relative positions of Pontic and other peoples in common ethnic hierarchies, as well as justifications of, or challenges to, such rankings. Before proceeding, it is important to note that Herodotos' conception of the inhabited world, much like his predecessors (e.g. Hekataios of Miletos) and authors who followed, is often divided in three: Europe, Asia, and Libya.³¹ Scythians and Pontic peoples would be the northern-most (non-legendary) peoples of Europe in this case. In his description of northern peoples, Herodotos sometimes reveals his own rankings of these peoples or, less often, the supposed rationale for his approach.

It is in the passage that opens this chapter (4.46) that Herodotos most directly reveals the position of Pontic peoples generally within the ethnic hierarchy he presumes, and it is a very low position. Herodotos' primary criterion for the low position of all Pontic peoples, presumably in relation to other Europeans at least, seems to be their relative lack of 'wisdom' (σοφίης) or intelligence (demonstrated by a dearth of wise men beyond one well-known Scythian, Anacharsis). As we will soon see, this is a criterion of evaluation that is echoed later in Aristotle's notion that a superior people would possess a balance of both 'intelligence' or 'skill' (διάνοια, τέχνη) and 'heart' / 'spirit' (θυμός). Furthermore, as Brent Shaw details, another important factor in Herodotos' ranking of peoples is whether or not they were considered settled agriculturalists, which for Herodotos suggests a less inferior level, or pastoral nomads, who were most inferior or barbaric in his view.³² It is noteworthy that this bears some resemblance to apparent grading of barbarians later on in the work of Strabo, the geographer of the Augustan age. Strabo's account is based, in part, on concepts about the progression of human societies Plato's *Laws*, where the development is from simple forms of life (e.g., nomadism and banditry) to agricultural forms to organized cities on the model of the Greek city-state (*polis*).³³

What is clear is that Herodotos ranks the Scythians above all other Pontic peoples based on their exceptional intelligence in one important area similarly valued by a Greek like Herodotos, namely military skill. As Sven Rausch's study of northern peoples explores in detail, this evaluation is often repeated in subsequent authors, with Thracians or Gauls or Celts often placed alongside Scythians as superior or persistent (if wild) fighters.³⁴ Yet, while the Scythians are placed above other northern Europeans, Herodotos places Persians (categorized as Asians for Herodotos) above Scythians, at least that seems to be the implication in his portrayal of Persia's effective (almost Greek-like) fighting against Scythians.³⁵ Herodotos' tendency to differentiate (rather than mix together) sub-groups of 'barbarian' peoples is also evident in his description of the peoples of India, where one people of India kills no living thing

³¹ Herodotos conceives of Europe and Asia on a north-south axis, with the Euxine (Black) Sea and Lake Maiotis above it as a boundary and with the Sauromatians (who are placed to the east of Maiotis) and Kolchians on the Phasis (Rioni) River being the most northerly Asians (Hdt. 4.36-42). Cf. Romm, p. 746-747 in Strassler 2009. For the author *On Airs, Waters, and Places*, Lake Maiotis (Azov) seems to be the boundary (*On Airs* 13) between Asia and Europe with the so-called Sauromatians placed just north of this boundary. So, the author has Sauromatians as Europeans (unlike Herodotos) and those settled on the Phasis River (southeast of Lake Maiotis and just south of the Greater Caucasus Mountains) are considered northern Asians (*On Airs* 15). Hekataios of Miletos had the boundary at the Tanais (Don) River (Priestley 2014, 141). Strabo has a similar three-fold division (*Geogr.* 2.5.26-33).

³² Shaw 1982.

³³ Plat. *Nom.* 3.676a-683a; cf. Almagor 2005, 51-55, citing L.A. Thompson.

³⁴ Scythians as dangerous warriors: Thuk. 2.96 (as archers); Isok. *Paneg.* 4.67 (with Thracians and Persians); Plat. *Laches* 191a; Arist. *Pol.* 7.1324b (with Thracians and Celts); *Rhet.* 1.9. See Rausch 2013.

³⁵ Hartog 1988, 44-50, 258f. points out that when the Persians attack Greeks, they are portrayed as people who do not know how to fight. Whereas when the Persians attack Scythians, they figure as well-organized fighters, as if they were Greek hoplites attacking inferior people. For Hartog, this becomes a further instance of dichotomous thinking on Herodotos' part. Instead, I am drawing attention to how this helps us see Herodotos' tendency to rank specific barbarians in relation to one another.

whatsoever (3.100) and another people (Padaians) kills anyone who is ill and feasts on his or her flesh (3.99).

This concern to grade distinguished peoples continues within subsequent ethnography both in the Hellenistic period and in the Roman era, as Diodoros' discussion of Libyan tribes (3.49) and Tacitus' discussion of Germanic peoples (*Germania* 28-46) illustrate well. Tacitus makes the broad generalization that Germans are better than 'worthless' (29.3) and 'spiritless' (28.4) Gauls (= Celts). But then he details that, among Germans, Batavians were most outstanding in valour (29.1) and Chattians in mental abilities (30.1).³⁶ Fosiens were inferior even in the best conditions (36.2).

The fact that Herodotos has an ongoing concern to rank other ethnic groups below Greeks but also to place sub-groups of supposedly inferior peoples within a hierarchy is also clear in his discussion of the Thracians, on the western coast of the Black Sea.³⁷ Overall, as Matthew Sears states, Herodotos' description of the Thracians 'leaves the reader with an impression of contempt mitigated by curiosity'.³⁸ In discussing Thracians succumbing to the advance of Darius, Herodotos claims that the Getians (*Getai*) were 'the most manly and just (ἀνδρηότατοι καὶ δικαιοτάτοι) of the Thracians' (4.93). Yet even they could be relatively foolish and become enslaved. That the 'just' quality of the Getians is relative to a very low view of all Thracians generally becomes clear when Herodotos chooses to zero in on the Getians' custom of sacrificing a human to their god Salmoxis (4.94). This leads Herodotos into stories concerning this god, and he chooses to relate the perspective of Greek settlers in the area (perhaps in a settlement such as Histria). These Greeks are said to regard Thracians as 'crude' (κακοβίων) and 'somewhat stupid' (ὕπαρρονεστέρων) for their belief in Salmoxis, with Greek settlers asserting that Salmoxis was merely a famous person, not a god at all (4.95).³⁹ Herodotos, however, is hesitant to take on fully the viewpoint of the colonists that he relates (4.96). Here, with a picture of Greek settlers' attitudes, we are gaining a glimpse into how ethnic rivalries and stereotypes might manifest themselves in actual social relations between Greeks and other peoples in and around the cities of the Black Sea region. While recognizing common negativity towards Thracians, it should also be noted that there were signs of attraction to Thrace and Thracian culture on the part of some among the Athenian elites, as Aristophanes' playful reference to 'Thrace-frequenters' suggests (Θρακοφοῖται).⁴⁰

There is not enough space to deal with the epigraphic evidence for Pontic diasporas here, evidence which I discuss at length in another study.⁴¹ Still, it is important to note that inscriptions from Athens, Rhodes, and other locales demonstrate the ongoing presence of Pontic peoples (Thracians, Scythians, Maiotians, Sindians, Sarmatians, Kolchians, and others), including but not limited to imported slaves, in Greek cities from the 5th century and on into the Hellenistic era.⁴² So, instances of Pontic peoples ranked within hierarchies pertain not only

³⁶ Even among the Suebian tribe, some sub-groups were more savage than others, so he claims (38.1-45.6). For an overview of ethnographic traditions regarding Germans, see Rives 1999, 11-41. Tan 2014 unfortunately says almost nothing concerning the environmental theory as it pertains to Tacitus' discussion of the geography of *Germania*; she seems to have a primordial definition of ethnicity (e.g., 'uncompromised Germanic ethnicity': p. 183 n. 15; cf. p. 191 n. 67).

³⁷ On Athenian or Greek perceptions of Thracians, see Sears 2015, 314-316; also Sears 2013.

³⁸ Sears 2015, 315.

³⁹ Braund 2008a, 357-359.

⁴⁰ Aristoph., cited by Ath. 12.75; cf. Sears 2015, 316-318.

⁴¹ Harland 2020.

⁴² Examples from Athens: *IG* I³ 421, lines 34-49 (six slaves: three Thracian women, one Thracian man, one Scythian man, and one Kolchian, ca. 415 BC); *IG* II² 1283 (free or freed Thracians, 240/39 BC and earlier); *SGDI* II 1992, 2163 (Maiotians, 2nd BC); *IG* II² 8430, 10243, 10244, 12061 (Sarmatians, 2nd BC); *IG* II² 9049f. (graves of Kolchians, 2nd-1st centuries BC). One inscription from the island of Rheneia (*SEG* XXIII

to distant populations. Rather, these rankings and stereotypes have real implications for social relations within Greek cities and for discrimination against such settlers. Greeks like Herodotos would encounter northern peoples in everyday interactions in places like Athens. In addition, there is also evidence in Herodotos' own narrative regarding interactions between Greek colonists and indigenous peoples north of the Black Sea, which is pertinent to the issue of alternative hierarchies that work against Greek ones.⁴³

2. Northern Perspectives on Greeks as Reflected in Herodotos' Work

Herodotos' work provides, first and foremost, a glimpse into his own categorizations of specific outgroups. Nonetheless there are hints of other peoples' perspectives and categorizations within Herodotos' narrative. Although the extent of Herodotos' own travels are debated, it is reasonable to suggest that he spent some time at Borysthenes (Olbia), where he would have opportunity to witness interactions between Greeks and indigenous peoples.⁴⁴ He goes into greater detail about this Ionian (Milesian) colony and refers to a conversation with Tymnes – a Greek-speaking official of the Scythian king Ariapeithes – which may have taken place there, for instance (4.76). Some of Herodotos' stories seem to reflect ethnic tensions between Greek settlers and Pontic peoples in places like Borysthenes, whether Herodotos went there or not. And, in some cases, Herodotos reports what he claims are Scythian perspectives on Greek peoples and their customs, including that Scythians 'avoid foreign customs at all costs, especially those of the Greeks' (4.76).

Herodotos relates two main incidents that serve to illustrate Scythian disdain for Greek cultural customs and, it seems, for Greeks generally, who are thereby cast as inferior to Scythians in alternative ethnic hierarchies.⁴⁵ Herodotos also mentions local informants in both cases. On the one hand, the story goes that when Anacharsis imported from Kyzikos rites for the Mother of the Gods, he was observed by another Scythian. That Scythian informant reported this to the king, who then shot Anacharsis dead with an arrow for engaging in Greek customs (4.76). Herodotos also reports that Scythians even rejected the existence of Anacharsis because Anacharsis had adopted such Greek practices.

A second story of Scythian negativity regarding inferior Greeks and their customs involves the Scythian king Skyles, son of Ariapeithes, which occurred 'many years later'. According to Herodotos (4.78-80), king Skyles' mother was a Greek from Histria and this king 'was not at all content to live as the Scythians did but, because of his education [by his mother], was much more inclined to practice Greek customs'. Beyond dressing in Greek attire when not visible to other Scythians, he also 'set up sanctuaries to the gods in accordance with Greek customs',

381 = *IG IX* 1².4.1778, 100 BC) attests to a master who owned 22 slaves, one third of which are identified as coming from the Black Sea area (four male Maiotians, three male Thracians). Graves from 2nd- or 1st-century-BC Rhodes attest to at least three Scythians; three Kolchians; five Maiotians; three Sarmatians; one Sindian and three Thracians (*IG XII* 1.526f.; *I.RhodM* 421; *SEG* LI 1015; Hatzfeld 1910, 243, no. 8; *IG XII* 1.514; Jacopi 1932, 232, no. 122; *I.Lindos* 683; *MDAI(A)* 23 (1898) 394, no. 64; *IG XII* 1.525; Jacopi 1932, no. 95; *SEG* XXXVIII 789; *IG XII* 1.1385; *I.RhodM* 217f.; *I.Lindos* 695). As Lewis 2018 shows, approximately one third of the 179 Delphic manumissions that identify ethnicity pertain to Pontic slaves (including Thracians). On the Pontic slave-trade, see Finley 1962; Braund & Tsetschladze 1989; Gavriljuk 2003; Avram 2007; Tsetschladze 2008; Braund 2008b.

⁴³ See Podossinov, chapter II in this volume on the Scythian police force; Oller Guzmán, chapter I in this volume on early interactions between Greeks and Scythians.

⁴⁴ See Braund 2008a. Cf. Skinner 2012, 164f. For a more pessimistic view regarding Herodotos' travels to the Pontic region, see Armayor 1978.

⁴⁵ On the interaction of Greeks and Pontic peoples in such narratives, see Podossinov 1996; Podossinov 2019; Braund 2008a; Vlassopoulos 2013.

particularly spending time at the Greek settlement of Borysthenes. The king's demise (by beheading) came when other leading Scythians witnessed him participating in the rites of Dionysos. Herodotos' expresses a local Greek's supposed taunt, which suggests that the Scythians were known to laugh at Greek settlers for, among other things, engaging in rites for a god that was reputed to induce madness.⁴⁶

Such ethnic rivalries manifested within social encounters like these could result in competing hierarchies. We have already cited Herodotos' outline of a Persian hierarchy which would place Greeks low on the scale of honour because of their distance from Persia, for instance (1.134.2). Furthermore, Herodotos' discussion of Persian alliances with Ionians (Ionian tyrants) against Scythians (ca. 513 BCE) attributes to the Scythians a disdain for Ionian Greeks such as those settled at Olbia, placing Ionians low down in a ranking of peoples.⁴⁷ Herodotos states: 'the Scythians judged the Ionians as free men to be the worst and most unmanly (κακίστους τε καὶ ἀνανδροτάτους) of all humanity; but as slaves, to be the most fond of servility and the least likely to flee from their masters. Such were the insults cast at the Ionians by the Scythians' (4.142). Even if this viewpoint is expressed in Herodotos' words,⁴⁸ this at least shows an awareness that Greek ethnic hierarchies could be actively challenged by other peoples, including northern peoples ('Scythians') who rejected Greek categorizations.⁴⁹

3. Medical Theories Contemporary with Herodotos

More accessible than these alternative rankings are the ideological justifications for the structures Herodotos and other Greek elites presume. Although not dealing with ethnic hierarchies, Deborah Thomas' work demonstrates Herodotos' awareness of medical theories at some length.⁵⁰ Herodotos, like other contemporaries, seems to believe the environment determines the character and relative quality of a people (e.g., 1.142; 9.122). He is aware of medical theories (e.g., 2.77) like the ones I discuss below in connection with Hippocratic literature. These commonalities may suggest widespread legitimizing ideologies among the Greek elites at least by the mid- to late-5th century. In Herodotos' case, for instance, Egyptians (who were viewed as southern Asians) are described as having paradoxical customs that are precisely the opposite of what Herodotos considers normal, and this is linked to 'the contrary nature of Egypt's climate and its unique river' (2.35). Egyptians are nonetheless regarded as the second healthiest people next to Libyans (2.77) and praised for being exceedingly pious (2.37), and some Greek customs regarding deities are then traced back to Egyptians (e.g., 2.49). This suggests ways in which Egyptians might be considered superior to at least some other peoples from Herodotos' perspective.

Such ambivalent attitudes – negative alongside positive evaluations – towards an outgroup are quite common, as Mackie and Smith's study of emotions in intergroup relations shows.⁵¹ However, Herodotos does not clearly express such environmental theories in his discussion of the northerners, even though the cold may explain how tough the Scythians were considered to be. This holds true especially in light of the fact that, elsewhere, Herodotos cites the view that 'soft places tend to produce soft men' (9.122). These ideological developments became more widespread, and eventually began to play a key role in justifying rankings within hierarchies.

⁴⁶ See Oller Guzmán and Podossinov, chapters I and II in this volume, for more on Anacharsis and Skyles.

⁴⁷ Cf. Braund 2008b, 4-6.

⁴⁸ Cf. Braund 2008b, 7.

⁴⁹ See Harland 2019 for an example involving Judaeian perspectives.

⁵⁰ Thomas 2000, 28-101.

⁵¹ Mackie & Smith 2002, 2f.

The Hippocratic work *On Airs, Waters and Places*, which is usually dated to the final decades of the 5th century BC, seems to be the earliest extensive explanation of these ideologies regarding the correspondence between climate (with its four elements), the four humours within humans, and the relative inferiority or superiority of peoples.⁵² *On Airs, Waters, and Places* (abbreviated as *On Airs* here) presents itself as a guide-book for travelling physicians. The author details what a successful physician must take into account regarding seasons, climate, environment, and the movement or position of the sun, moon, and stars. The author's emphasis on 'the contribution of astronomy' is echoed later in theories that accompany ethnic hierarchies of Vitruvius (*On Architecture* 6.1.3-12; late-1st century AD) and Claudius Ptolemy (*Tetrabiblos* 2.2.1-7; 2nd century AD), where the environmental theory is combined with astrological reasoning.⁵³ Although not expressly stated, the argument in *On Airs* presumes the theory of the four humours in human health, a theory that was first clearly expressed in the roughly contemporary Hippocratic work titled *The Nature of Man*.

Most importantly, *On Airs* offers a comparison of Asia and Europe (with the boundary being the Phasis or Maiotian Lake, it seems) regarding 'how the peoples of one differ entirely in form (μορφή) from those of the other' (*On Airs* 12). This is an issue that is mirrored in the roughly contemporary work on *Regimen*, where Pontic peoples are briefly contrasted to the southern Libyans (2.37), but *On Airs* goes deeper. What is most important in this case is the way in which *On Airs* justifies evaluations of inferior or superior characteristics of peoples in Europe and Asia, illustrating the *rhetoric* used to express and legitimate rankings of ethnic groups.

The Hippocratic author's views do not seem entirely consistent, but his main emphasis in discussing Asian peoples is that the climate in most parts of Asia are moderate and consistently hot, with very little variations from one season to the next (*On Airs* 12-16). This results in good agricultural production and healthy animals, especially in Egypt and Libya (the southernmost portions). At the same time, this also results in a homogeneously inferior population that is 'weak' (ἀναλκῆς), 'unmanly' (ἄνανδρος), 'lacking in heart' (ἄθυμος), and 'unwarlike' (ἀπόλεμος) (16). This is explained as going along with a tendency towards a lack of independence and susceptibility to rule by despots. A lack of variation in seasons in most of Asia is thought negative for the disposition of people. According to the author, there are 'no mental shocks nor extreme physical variation' that could have brought 'passion and arrogance' (τὴν ὀργὴν ἀγριοῦσθαι τε καὶ τοῦ ἀγνώμονος) or 'a share in a higher level of spirit' (θυμοειδέος μετέχειν μᾶλλον)' (16). This notion has affinities with Aristotle's emphasis on 'spirit' or 'heart', as I discuss below. Furthermore, passages such as this in *On Airs* continued to influence authors into the Roman era, as illustrated in Galen's discussion of *On Airs* centuries later.⁵⁴

Still, there is mention of other (especially northeastern) portions of Asia with more variations in seasons and temperatures. Moreover, the author anticipates a comparative internal ranking among Asian peoples when he states that you 'will find that Asians also differ from one another, some being superior (βελτίονας), others inferior (φαιλοτέρους)'. And variations in seasons are once again the basis of these supposed differentiations (16).

The Hippocratic author then turns to European peoples (17-24). The author begins in the extreme north, contrasting Egyptians of the south to Scythians of the north, each population relatively homogeneous due to a lack of variation in seasons, the one hot, the other cold (18). A consistently cold and moist climate is the factor that renders a people inferior (soft, impotent, fat, and lazy), presumably in comparison with other Europeans. The Scythians are so

⁵² Cf. Thomas 2000, 86-101 regarding the continents in *On Airs*.

⁵³ Cf. Galen, *The Soul's Dependence on the Body* 805. Cicero, who maintains the environmental theory, seems more hesitant in respect of combining it with astrology (*On Divination* 2.96).

⁵⁴ Galen, *Soul's Dependence on the Body* 8f. = 798-805; Strohmaier 2004; Cf. Isaac 2004, 85-87.

undifferentiated that even the distinction between men and women is blurred (22). It seems that the author is justifying a placement of Scythians at the bottom of a hierarchy of European peoples.

The author then argues that European peoples are far more varied than Asians because of the variability of seasons in different parts of Europe (23). The more varied European peoples will therefore be superior to the largely homogeneous Asians. This notion is encapsulated in the assertion that Europeans are ‘more courageous’ (εὐψυχότερους) than Asians because they live in colder conditions (23). The discussion of variations in European environments which concludes the work presumably facilitates a positive evaluation of other Europeans. Greeks, who would likely be placed at the pinnacle of all European peoples, are likely in mind, although this is not as expressly stated as it is by Aristotle. The implication is that, for this Hippocratic author, Scythians are at the bottom of the European hierarchy and Greeks are at the top, with most European peoples being superior to Asians. The fact that the author directly compares Egyptians and Scythians as the most extreme peoples in the most extreme environments suggests that both would be placed together at the bottom of an ethnic hierarchy.⁵⁵

4. Ethnic Hierarchies in the Works of Aristotle

I have given considerable space to a discussion of *On Airs* in part because it is among the earliest and most extensive works concerned with theorizing the relative position of peoples. But I have also done so because the concepts it expresses came to influence subsequent ethnographic works that are concerned with justifying rankings of northern and other peoples in certain hierarchies. It is notable that neither Herodotos nor the Hippocratic author clearly explains the position of the Greeks at length, although both seem to presume the superiority of Greek peoples in relation to others that are subordinated.

In *Politics* (about a century after the above works), Aristotle is less hesitant to express his stratifications and the ideological concepts that may, in some respects, inform the positions of both Herodotos and the Hippocratic author regarding northern and southern peoples. Aristotle reveals the overall ethnic hierarchy that underlies his discussion when he states that ‘barbarians’ generally are ‘more servile in character than Greeks, Asians more servile than Europeans’ (*Politics* 1285a; cf. *On Airs* 16). So Greeks are at the top, other Europeans below that, and then Asians at the bottom, at least with respect to slave-like characteristics that lead to domination by others. Peoples around the Black Sea specifically seem to be placed particularly low by Aristotle, despite the fact that, in theory, they might possess the ‘spirit’ that cold climates foster.

Elsewhere in *Politics* (1338b), Aristotle puts northern peoples forward as an instance of the ‘most savage’ (ἀγριώτατοι) people – though lacking in true courage (ἀνδρεία) – comparing them to animals and highlighting the case of cannibalism. The claim that these people of the north lack true courage seems to clash with Aristotle’s theory regarding conditions favourable to a high degree of ‘spirit’, which I discuss soon. Such theories and the categorizations they reflect are quite fluid and open to varying interpretations when used in connection with particular peoples. If we can assume some overlap between lower European peoples and higher Asian ones, then Aristotle’s ethnic hierarchy seems to match both Herodotos and *On Airs*, though neither of these makes a statement as clear as Aristotle’s on the position of Greeks.

Aristotle also combines what appears to be a theory of the humours and climate with the notion that Greece is the centre of the known world, reflecting both elements of widely shared legitimizing myths. Although Aristotle is certainly critical of contemporary Athenian societal arrangements in *Politics*, he nonetheless goes into more detail regarding the superiority of

⁵⁵ Cf. Diod. 3.33f.

Greece, with geography and climate central to the reasoning. Aristotle outlines the positions of northern Europeans and Asians within a hierarchy of peoples. Yet he also reveals his supposed criteria for determining the inferiority or superiority of different Greek peoples (without naming specific city-states), namely, a balance of both ‘heart’ / ‘spirit’ (θυμός) and ‘intelligence’ (διάνοια) or ‘skill’ (τέχνη) which leads to virtuous citizens:

The peoples inhabiting the cold places and those of Europe are full of *spirit* but inferior with regard to *intelligence* and *skill*, so that they continue to be comparatively free, but lack civic organization and the ability to rule their neighbours (θυμοῦ μὲν ἐστὶ πλήρη, διανοίας δὲ ἐνδεέστερα καὶ τέχνης, διόπερ ἐλεύθερα μὲν διατελεῖ μᾶλλον, ἀπολίτευτα δὲ καὶ τῶν πλησίων ἄρχειν οὐ δυνάμενα). The peoples of Asia, on the other hand, are intelligent and skillful in temperament, but lack spirit, with the result that they continue to be subjected and enslaved (τὰ δὲ περὶ τὴν Ἀσίαν διανοητικὰ μὲν καὶ τεχνικὰ τὴν ψυχὴν, ἄθυμα δέ, διόπερ ἀρχόμενα καὶ δουλεύοντα διατελεῖ). But the Greek kinship group (γένος) participates in both characters, just as it occupies the middle position geographically, for it is both spirited and intelligent. For this reason, it continues to be free, to have the best civic institutions, and – if it attains a united civic constitution – to have the ability to rule everyone. The same variety also exists among Greek peoples (ἔθνη) in comparison with one another: while some have a singular nature, others have a good combination of both these qualities [i.e. spirit and intelligence]. So it is clear that those who are likely to be guided to virtue by the lawgiver must be both intellectual and spirited in their nature.⁵⁶

Aristotle, like Herodotos and the Hippocratic author, leaves room for more specific rankings of Europeans and others, including the evaluation of which Greek peoples (or *poleis*) would be considered superior to other Greeks. The tradition of evaluating the degree to which a people possessed ‘spirit’ or ‘intelligence’ continues in subsequent ethnography and can be seen clearly, for instance, in Tacitus’ evaluation of Germanic tribes, where environmental theories also play a role.⁵⁷

5. Questioning Hegemonic Ethnic Hierarchies: The Approach of Ephoros

Justifying the subordination of other peoples with reference to theories of the humours and climate continues in subsequent ethnography into the Roman era.⁵⁸ Yet only certain dimensions of Herodotos’ account of the Scythians specifically seem to remain prominent in discussions in the Hellenistic and Roman periods.⁵⁹ While Herodotos speaks of the Scythians as superior to other northern peoples and makes further distinctions regarding other peoples, later authors were less attentive to Herodotos’ specifics. In particular, Herodotos claims that ‘beyond [the Scythian farmers] dwell the Man-eaters (ἄνδροφάγοι), who are in no way Scythian, but a completely distinct people’ (4.18; cf. 4.106). Yet subsequent mentions of the Scythians confuse the situation with the Scythians generally depicted as savage cannibals who engage in human sacrifice.⁶⁰ Herodotos’ report that Scythians drink the blood of the first man they slay in battle (4.64f.) may contribute to these later simplified characterizations. This confusion was also, in part, because the Taurians, who were said to engage in sacrificing Greek sailors to a goddess,

⁵⁶ Arist. *Pol.* 7.1327b. Translation adapted from Rackman 1932 (LCL). Cf. *Household Management* (*Oikonomika* 1.5.5 = 1344b), which reflects similar thinking in advice for choosing slaves.

⁵⁷ Tac. *Germ.* 28-46, esp. 28.4; 29.2; 30.2. Cf. *Agricola* 11, where he also reflects environmental theories (based on the humours) in stating that ‘shared climatic conditions produce the same physical appearance’ (translation Birley 1999, 10).

⁵⁸ E.g., Polyb. 4.21; Diod. 3.33f. (contrasting Ethiopian Troglodytes and Scythians as the extremes); Vitruvius, *On Architecture* 6.1; Strabo, *Geogr.* 2.5.26 (126f.C); Tac. *Agricola* 11; Galen, *Soul’s Dependence on the Body*, 798-805; Lucan, *Civil War* 8.294-308. See the summary discussion by Isaac 2004, 82-101.

⁵⁹ On the continuing influence of Herodotos in the Hellenistic era, see Priestley 2014, 109-156.

⁶⁰ E.g., Apollodoros as reported by Strabo in *Geogr.* 7.3.6 (298C); Plut. *On Superstition* 13; Apollod. *Library* E 6.26 and 2.8.

were sometimes subsumed under the general designation ‘Scythians’. They were thought to inhabit land within Scythian territory, whereas Herodotos located them just west of the Kimmerian Bosphoros on the Crimean peninsula.⁶¹ So, the supposed Man-eaters and Taurians readily stood in as representative of ‘Scythians’ after Herodotos. Some authors were concerned to reassert distinctions, including Ephoros. Cases such as this provide glimpses into elites who held ideologies that attenuated consensual rankings and worked against widely held justifications for such hierarchies.

Ephoros, whose work was likely composed around 350 BC, seems to have had a noteworthy discussion of Pontic peoples in his *Histories* (a work that only survives in citations by others, primarily Strabo and Diodoros of Sicily).⁶² More importantly here, Ephoros also seems to have known and sought to pull the rug out from under common ideologies that sought to support Greek hegemonic ethnic hierarchies, hierarchies that placed Scythians at or near the bottom. As Frances Pownall convincingly argues, cases where citations can be checked in parallel sources suggest that Strabo’s summaries faithfully reproduce Ephoros’ work.⁶³ According to geographer Strabo, who cites Ephoros in order to defend Homer against the works of Eratosthenes of Cyrene’s *Geography* (ca. 246-218 BC) and Apollodoros of Artemita (ca. 100 BC), the European section of Ephoros’ work stressed that the lifestyle of Sauromatians and other Scythians varied considerably.⁶⁴

There is reference to some engaging in cannibalism but others abstaining from killing any living thing, for instance. Strabo’s point is that Ephoros critiqued other ethnographic writers for focusing on the most savage (ὠμότητος) examples while ignoring contrary, positive evidence about distant peoples. Instead, these distant peoples, including Scythian nomads, could be put forward as positive moral examples of the ‘most just’ (δικαιοτάτοις) mode of life. In this case of positive attitudes towards outgroups, Ephoros proposed that the Scythians were ‘the most straightforward’, ‘frugal’ and ‘independent’ people.⁶⁵ Ephoros also argued that it was contact with inferior Greek customs that tainted what was originally superior. The phrasing in Strabo does not clearly indicate that Ephoros denied the existence of very particular northern peoples who engaged in cannibalism, but the direction of the argument does seem to indicate that Ephoros did reject this.

Strabo seems quite concerned to refute both Eratosthenes and Apollodoros who claimed that Scythians ‘sacrificed strangers, ate their flesh, and used their skulls as drinking-cups’, and that Homer was ignorant of these ‘facts’.⁶⁶ Over a century after Strabo, Aulus Gellius was far more direct in dismissing as ‘disgusting’ and ‘worthless’ writings that claimed that the most remote of the Scythians engaged in cannibalism (ἀνθρωποφάγοι). However, he may well have had Herodotos himself (i.e. the Man-eaters passage) in mind, along with others who followed or misconstrued Herodotos, perhaps Eratosthenes and Apollodoros (Gell. *Attic Nights* 9.4). Whatever the case may be regarding the charges of human sacrifice and cannibalism, what is important here is that Ephoros attenuates common ideologies and begins to construct alternative hierarchies that place superior Scythians above other peoples, including Greeks, it

⁶¹ E.g., Hdt. 4.103; Eur. *Iph. Taur.* 72, 276-278, 775f. (see E. Hall 1989, 110-112); Diod. 4.44.7; Paus. 1.43.1; *Orphic Argonautica* 1075; Ov. *Pont.* 3.2.45-58; Amm. Marc. 22.8.3. On stories of Taurian human sacrifice (which likely circulated as early as the 6th century BC), see Rives 1995.

⁶² Hudak 2009, 5-8.

⁶³ Pownall 2010, 116; Hudak 2009, 42.

⁶⁴ Strab. *Geogr.* 7.3.9 (302f.C). Strabo does not believe that Ephoros was consistently truthful in other respects, however; see Roller 2010, 118-122.

⁶⁵ Strab. *Geogr.* 7.3.8 (301C); cf. Pownall 2010, 127f. See also Diod. 1.9.5, where Ephoros is said to believe that barbarian peoples could claim greater antiquity than Greeks, which would imply superiority to Greeks (something that Diodoros dismisses).

⁶⁶ Strab. *Geogr.* 7.3.6 (298C); cf. 7.3.7 (300C); cf. Gardiner-Garden 1986, 222-224.

seems.⁶⁷ Ethnography is here used as a means of critiquing customs of the author's own ethnic group, something that is also clearly evident later on in Tacitus' *Germania*, for instance.⁶⁸

6. Attenuating Ideologies and Strabo's Response

Further signs of ideologies that attenuate widespread hierarchies are evident in sources cited or summarized by Strabo. In his citation of Ephoros and his refutation of Eratosthenes, he seeks to defend Homer. The principle concern seems to be that Eratosthenes did not value Homer as an accurate source, while Strabo did.⁶⁹ Eratosthenes may have accepted widespread, strongly negative categorizations of Scythians, although there are other signs that he himself worked against common elite representations and rankings in his own geographical work.⁷⁰ In particular, he seems to have challenged the normal Greek-barbarian dichotomy. Instead, he emphasized the measure of 'virtue' (ἀρετή) or 'vice' (κακία) independent of distance from a centre or independent of climate in describing the relative position of different peoples in the grand scheme of things, a viewpoint that Strabo is hesitant to adopt.⁷¹

Thukydides, who himself had Thracian ancestry, likewise tends to downplay the distinction between Greeks and 'barbarians' in his *Peloponnesian War*, emphasizing similarities between the lifestyles of those labelled 'barbarians' and of earlier Greeks.⁷² It should be clarified that even a challenger of the ethnocentric approach to Pontic peoples – like Eratosthenes or the author of the so-called letters of Anacharsis (*Cynic Epistles*) – was assuming an ethnic ladder, albeit one with different criteria for positioning peoples on the rungs. Eratosthenes' reconfiguration of ethnic hierarchies and rejection of the usual barbarian categorization happens to place Indians, Romans and Carthaginians on a high rung as 'refined' or 'urbane' peoples (ἄσπεῖοι), rather than 'bad' peoples (κάκοι). Eran Almagor convincingly argues that Strabo rejects Eratosthenes' alternative and is concerned to maintain the Greek-barbarian dichotomy, just as Daniela Dueck sees the Greek-barbarian dichotomy as central to Strabo's overall work.⁷³

Strabo himself does seem concerned with ranking peoples even while maintaining a Greek-barbarian dichotomy. First of all, it seems clear that he places most Europeans above both Egyptians and Libyans.⁷⁴ Notwithstanding its coldest limits (e.g., the Tanaïs River), Europe tends to create superior peoples in comparison with Egypt and Libya. This is because Europe is 'both varied and most naturally suited for excellence in men and civic organization (πολυσχίμων τε καὶ πρὸς ἀρετὴν ἀνδρῶν εὐφροεστάτη καὶ πολιτειῶν)' (2.5.26). Beyond its mountains, Europe's climate is varied and temperate and therefore conducive to peace and independence. This region has therefore been the source of leading nations, such as the Greeks,

⁶⁷ In the discussion of peoples in Asia Minor, Strabo does not agree with Ephoros' tendency to break down the usual Greek-barbarian dichotomy, at least when Ephoros speaks of some peoples (γέννη) as 'mixed' (μυγάδη), a category that does not exist for Strabo (*Geogr.* 14.5.23-25). See Almagor 2005, 43f.

⁶⁸ Gruen 2011. This function can also be seen, at times, in barbarian characters of comedy. See Long 1986, 165-167.

⁶⁹ Cf. Roller 2018, 9f.

⁷⁰ For a recent translation of Eratosthenes, see Roller 2010.

⁷¹ Strab. *Geogr.* 1.4.9 (66f.C). On Strabo's understanding of Greek and barbarian, see Almagor 2005; van der Vliet 2003; Dueck 2000, 58, 75-84. Closely related are traditions regarding the superiority of barbarian wisdom, which are also reflected in fictional narratives and writings. Cf. Philostr. *VA*; Letters of Anacharsis in the *Cynic Epistles*; cf. Harland 2011; also see Podossinov, chapter II in this volume.

⁷² Thuk. 1.5f.; cf. Sears 2015, 315.

⁷³ Strab. *Geogr.* 1.4.9 (66f.C) on Eratosthenes. See Almagor 2005, 49f.; Dueck 2000, 75-84.

⁷⁴ Strab. *Geogr.* 2.5.26-33 (126-131C).

Macedonians and Romans, who help to subdue any war-like inhabitants of mountainous or cold regions of Europe (2.5.26).

Dueck shows that Strabo sometimes adopts the Roman perspective, with Greeks and Romans grouped together as a civilized ‘us’ in contrast to barbarians, such as Britons and Germans.⁷⁵ However, in other respects, Strabo firmly places Greeks above Romans in his own hierarchy, with the Greeks being more ancient and both intellectually and culturally superior. So, Greeks are at the top of his ladder and Romans are near the top (similar to Eratosthenes’ notion of Romans as refined ‘barbarians’). Conversely, various barbarian peoples are placed on lower rungs, with Europeans generally above Egyptians (as southern Asians) and Libyans. Furthermore, both Patrick Thollard and Almagor demonstrate that Strabo assumes a ‘scale’ of barbarity, a scale that incorporates various ‘civilizing’ factors, including the distinction between primitive peoples (e.g., those engaged in a nomadic lifestyle or in banditry), more developed peoples (e.g., those engaged in a settled, agricultural lifestyle), and most developed peoples, namely Greeks with an organized civic constitution.⁷⁶

There are signs that Strabo, like Herodotos and the Hippocratic author, shares the notion that climate and environment explain both the lifestyles and the relative inferiority of specific barbarian peoples, as exemplified with the Ethiopians.⁷⁷ Further factors that differ from Greek customs pertain to food-manufacturing, eating, bathing, clothing, and trading: all of these serve as criteria that justify a relative grading of peoples as more or less inferior.⁷⁸ Thus while the people of Britain are ‘more simple and more barbaric’ than Celts, still other peoples are ‘completely barbarians (τελέως βάρβαροι)’ or ‘semi-barbarian’ (ἡμιβάρβαροι).⁷⁹ The latter is not dissimilar to ideas attributed to Eratosthenes, despite the fact that Strabo critiques that author precisely on the ‘barbarian’ issue.

As Almagor points out, there is a lack of uniformity in Strabo’s perspective on ‘barbarians’, and I would suggest that Strabo may not always adopt a strict Greek-barbarian dichotomy in his grading of peoples. Instead, he is using as his model some variation on commonly shared ethnic hierarchies, with different barbarian peoples being graded differently. The difficulty is that Strabo does not provide us with a consistent explanation of where exactly he places each specific barbarian people on the ethnic ladder. It is noteworthy that he also sees ways in which ‘softness’ or ‘luxury’ (τροπή) associated with Greek and Roman lifestyles comes to have a negative influence on barbarian peoples.⁸⁰ Overall, though, the degree to which Strabo himself attenuates largely consensual categorizations of other peoples (as did Ephoros and Eratosthenes in more emphatic ways) remains debatable. In many respects, Strabo’s approach, like others we have investigated here, serves to enhance and bolster widely held ethnic hierarchies.

V. CONCLUSION

While it seems that the majority of Greek intellectuals continued to legitimize hegemonic rankings of other peoples, placing Pontic peoples low on the ladder, there were a few others such as Ephoros who actively challenged such approaches and offered alternatives. These attempts to attenuate commonly held views would have affinities with certain subordinated or

⁷⁵ Dueck 2000, 75-84. For Strabo’s explanation of the category ‘barbarians’, see *Geogr.* 1.4.9 (the Eratosthenes debate) and 14.2.28 (on the origin and meaning of the term).

⁷⁶ Strab. *Geogr.* 17.3.24 (839C). See Thollard 1987 (dealing with *Geogr.* 3-4 only); Almagor 2005, 51-55. Cf. van der Vliet 2003.

⁷⁷ Strab. *Geogr.* 17.1.3 (786f.C); cf. Dueck 2000, 78f.

⁷⁸ Cf. Dueck 2000, 78; Shaw 1982, 29f.

⁷⁹ Strab. *Geogr.* 4.5.2 (786f.C); 2.5.32 (130C); 4.6.4 (203C).

⁸⁰ Strab. *Geogr.* 7.3.7 (300C). For more on this, see Podossinov, chapter II in this volume.

colonized peoples who actively sought to challenge their own low position within hegemonic hierarchies, assuming quite different arrangements on an ethnic ladder.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank Altay Coşkun and Maia Kotrosits who provided helpful feedback on the paper.

Bibliography – Ancient Sources

- Birley, A.R. 1999: *Agricola and Germany*. Oxford World's Classics, Oxford.
Godley, A.D. 1920: *Herodotus*. LCL, Cambridge, MA.
Rackman, H. 1932: *Politics*. LCL, Cambridge, MA.
Strassler, R.B. & Purvis, A.L. 2009: *The Landmark Herodotus: The Histories*, New York.

Bibliography – Modern Scholarship

- Almagor, E. 2005: 'Who is a Barbarian? The Barbarians in the Ethnological and Cultural Taxonomies of Strabo', in D. Dueck, H. Lindsay & S. Potheary (eds.), *Strabo's Cultural Geography: The Making of a Kolossourgia*, Cambridge, 42-55.
Armayer, O.K. 1978: 'Did Herodotus Ever Go to the Black Sea?', *HSCP* 82, 45-62.
Avram, A. 2007: 'Some Thoughts about the Black Sea and the Slave Trade before the Roman Domination (6th-1st Centuries BC)', in V. Gabrielsen & J. Lund (eds.), *The Black Sea in Antiquity: Regional and Interregional Economic Exchanges*, Aarhus, 239-251.
Barth, F. 1969: *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries*, Oslo.
Braund, D. 2008a: 'Scythian Laughter: Conversations in the Northern Black Sea Region in the 5th Century BC', in P.G. Bilde & J.H. Petersen (eds.), *Meetings of Cultures in the Black Sea Region: Between Conflict and Coexistence*, Aarhus, 347-367.
Braund, D. 2008b: 'Royal Scythians and the Slave-Trade in Herodotus' Scythia', *Antichthon* 42, 1-19.
Braund, D. & Tsetschladze, G.R. 1989: 'The Export of Slaves from Colchis', *CQ* 39, 114-125.
Brubaker, R. 2004: *Ethnicity without Groups*, Boston.
Brubaker, R. & Cooper, F. 2000: 'Beyond "Identity"', *Theory and Society* 29, 1-47.
Dueck, D. 2000: *Strabo of Amasia: A Greek Man of Letters in Augustan Rome*, London.
Finley, M. I. 1962: 'The Black Sea and Danubian Regions and the Slave Trade in Antiquity', *Klio* 40, 51-59.
Gavriljuk, N.A. 2003: 'The Graeco-Scythian Slave-Trade in the 6th and 5th Centuries BC', in P.G. Bilde, J.M. Hojte & V.F. Stolba (eds.), *The Cauldron of Ariantas: Studies Presented to A.N. Ščeglov on the Occasion of His 70th Birthday*. Black Sea Studies 1, Aarhus, 75-85.
Hagendoorn, L. 1993: 'Ethnic Categorization and Outgroup Exclusion: Cultural Values and Social Stereotypes in the Construction of Ethnic Hierarchies', *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 16, 26-51.
Hagendoorn, L. 1995: 'Intergroup Biases in Multiple Group Systems: The Perception of Ethnic Hierarchies', *European Review of Social Psychology* 6, 199-228.
Hagendoorn, L., Drogendijk, R., Tumanov, S. & Hraba, J. 1998: 'Inter-Ethnic Preferences and Ethnic Hierarchies in the Former Soviet Union', *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 22, 483-503.
Hall, E. 1989: *Inventing the Barbarian: Greek Self-Definition through Tragedy*, Oxford.
Hall, J.M. 2002: *Hellenicity: Between Ethnicity and Culture*, Chicago.
Harland, P.A. 2009: *Dynamics of Identity in the World of the Early Christians: Associations, Judeans, and Cultural Minorities*, New York.
Harland, P.A. 2019: 'Climbing the Ethnic Ladder: Ethnic Hierarchies and Judean Responses', *JBL* 138, 665-686.
Harland, P.A. 2020: 'Pontic Diasporas in the Classical and Hellenistic Eras', *ZPE* 214, 1-19.
Hartog, F. 1988: *The Mirror of Herodotus: The Representation of the Other in the Writing of History*, transl. by J. Lloyd, Berkeley.
Hatzfeld, J. 1910: 'Inscriptions de Rhodes', *BCH* 34, 242-248.
Howard, J.A. 2000: 'Social Psychology of Identities', *Annual Review of Sociology* 26, 367-393.
Hraba, J., Hagendoorn, L. & Hagendoorn, R. 1989: 'The Ethnic Hierarchy in the Netherlands: Social Distance and Social Representation', *British Journal of Social Psychology* 28, 57-69.
Isaac, B. 2004: *The Invention of Racism in Classical Antiquity*, Princeton.

- Jacopi, G. 1932: 'Nuove epigrafi dalle Sporadi meridionali', *Clara Rhodos* 2, 165-256.
- Jenkins, R. 1994: 'Rethinking Ethnicity: Identity, Categorization and Power', *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 17, 197-223.
- Jost, J.T. 1995: 'Negative Illusions: Conceptual Clarification and Psychological Evidence concerning False Consciousness', *Political Psychology* 16, 397-424.
- Jost, J. T., & Banaji, M. R. 1994: 'The Role of Stereotyping in System-justification and the Production of False Consciousness', *British Journal of Social Psychology* 33, 1-27.
- Jost, J.T., Banaji, M.R. & Nosek, B.A. 2004: 'A Decade of System Justification Theory: Accumulated Evidence of Conscious and Unconscious Bolstering of the Status Quo', *Political Psychology* 25, 881-919.
- Jouanna, J. 2012: *Greek Medicine from Hippocrates to Galen: Selected Papers*, ed. by P. van der Eijk, transl. by N. Allies, Leiden.
- Keim, B. 2018: 'Communities of Honor in Herodotus' *Histories*', *AHB* 32, 129-147.
- Lewis, D. 2017: 'Notes on Slave Names, Ethnicity, and Identity in Classical and Hellenistic Greece', *U Schyłku Starożytności: Studia Źródłoznawcze* 16, 183-213.
- Mackie, D.M., & Smith, E. R. 2002: *From Prejudice to Intergroup Emotions: Differentiated Reactions to Social Groups*, New York.
- Mackie, D.M. & Smith, E. R. 2015: 'Intergroup Emotions', in M. Mikulincer (ed.), *APA Handbook of Personality and Social Psychology*, vol. 2, Washington, DC, 263-293.
- Mackie, D.M., Smith, E.R. & Ray, D.G. 2008: 'Intergroup Emotions and Intergroup Relations', *Social and Personality Psychology Compass* 2, 1866-1880.
- Nichols, A. 2008: 'The Complete Fragments of Ctesias of Cnidus: Translation and Commentary with an Introduction', Ph.D., Gainesville, FL.
- Podossinov, A.V. 1996: 'Babarisierte Hellenen - hellenisierte Barbaren: Zur Dialektik ethno-kulterer Kontakte in der Region des Mare Ponticum', in B. Funck (ed.), *Hellenismus: Beiträge zur Erforschung von Akkulturation und politischer Ordnung in den Staaten des hellenistischen Zeitalters*, Tübingen, 415-425.
- Podossinov, A.V. 2019: 'Nomads of the Eurasian Steppe and Greeks of the Northern Black Sea Region: Encounter of Two Great Civilisations in Antiquity and Early Middle Ages', in C. Hao (ed.), *Competing Narratives between Nomadic People and Their Sedentary Neighbours*, Szeged, Hungary, 237-251.
- Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., & Levin, S. 2006: 'Social Dominance Theory and the Dynamics of Intergroup Relations: Taking Stock and Looking Forward', *European Review of Social Psychology* 17, 271-320.
- Priestley, J. 2014: *Herodotus and Hellenistic Culture: Literary Studies in the Reception of the Histories*, Oxford.
- Rausch, S. 2013: *Bilder des Nordens: Vorstellungen vom Norden in der griechischen Literatur von Homer bis zum Ende des Hellenismus*, Berlin.
- Rives, J.B. 1995: 'Human Sacrifice Among Pagans and Christians', *JRS* 85, 65-85.
- Rives, J.B. (ed.) 1999: *Tacitus: Germania*. Clarendon Ancient History, Oxford.
- Romm, J.S. 1992: *The Edges of the Earth in Ancient Thought*, Princeton.
- Sears, M.A. 2013: *Athens, Thrace, and the Shaping of Athenian Leadership*, Cambridge.
- Sears, M.A. 2015: 'Athens', in J. Valeva, E. Nankov & D. Graninger (eds.), *A Companion to Ancient Thrace*, London, 308-319.
- Shaw, B.D. 1982: "'Eaters of Flesh, Drinkers of Milk": The Ancient Mediterranean Ideology of the Pastoral Nomad', *AncSoc* 13/14, 5-31.
- Shaw, B.D. 2000: 'Rebels and Outsiders', in A.K. Bowman, P. Garnsey, & D. Rathbone (eds.), *The Cambridge Ancient History*, vol. 11, 2nd ed., Cambridge, 361-404.
- Sidanius, J. & Pratto, F. 1999: *Social Dominance: An Intergroup Theory of Social Hierarchy and Oppression*, Cambridge.
- Sidanius, J., Pratto, F., van Laar, C. & Levin, S. 2004: 'Social Dominance Theory: Its Agenda and Method', *Political Psychology* 25, 845-880.
- Skinner, J. 2012: *The Invention of Greek Ethnography: From Homer to Herodotus*, Oxford.
- Smith, E.R. 1993: 'Social Identity and Social Emotions: Toward New Conceptualizations of Prejudice', in D.M. Mackie & D.L. Hamilton (eds.), *Affect, Cognition and Stereotyping*, San Diego, CA, 297-315.
- Snellman, A. 2007: *Social Hierarchies, Prejudice, and Discrimination*, Uppsala.
- Snellman, A. & Ekehammar, B. 2005: 'Ethnic Hierarchies, Ethnic Prejudice, and Social Dominance Orientation', *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology* 15, 83-94.
- Strohmaier, G. 2004: 'Galen's Not Uncritical Commentary on Hippocrates' *Airs, Waters, Places*', in P. Adamson (ed.), *Philosophy, Science and Exegesis in Greek, Arabic and Latin Commentaries*, vol. 2, London, 1-9.
- Tajfel, H. 1981: *Human Groups and Social Categories: Studies in Social Psychology*, Cambridge.
- Tajfel, H. 1982: *Social Identity and Intergroup Relations*, Cambridge.

- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J.C. 1979: 'An Integrative Theory of Intergroup Conflict', in W.G. Austin & S. Worchel (eds.), *The Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations*, Monterey, CA, 33-47.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J.C. 1986: 'The Social Identity Theory of Intergroup Behaviour', in S. Worchel & W.G. Austin (eds.), *Psychology of Intergroup Relations*, Chicago, 7-24.
- Tan, Z.M. 2014: 'Subversive Geography in Tacitus' "Germania"', *JRS* 104, 181-204.
- Thollard, P. 1987: *Barbarie et civilisation chez Strabon. Étude critique des livres III et IV de la Géographie.*, Paris.
- Thomas, R. 2000: *Herodotus in Context: Ethnography, Science, and the Art of Persuasion*, Cambridge.
- Tsetschladze, G. 2008: 'Pontic Slaves in Athens: Orthodoxy and Reality', in P. Mauritsch (ed.), *Antike Lebenswelten: Konstanz, Wandel, Wirkungsmacht. Festschrift für Ingomar Weiler zum 70. Geburtstag*, Wiesbaden, 309-320.
- Turner, J.C., & Reynolds, K.J. 2003: 'Why Social Dominance Theory Has Been Falsified', *British Journal of Social Psychology* 42, 199-206.
- van der Vliet, E.Ch.L. 2003: 'The Romans and Us: Strabo's Geography and the Construction of Ethnicity', *Mnemosyne* 56, 257-272.
- Vlassopoulos, K. 2013: 'The Stories of the Others: Storytelling and Intercultural Communication in the Herodotean Mediterranean', in E. Almagor & J. Skinner (eds.), *Ancient Ethnography: New Approaches*, London, 49-75.
- Wells, P.S. 1999: *The Barbarians Speak: How The Conquered Peoples Shaped Roman Europe*, Princeton.
- Young, R.J.C. 2012: 'Postcolonial Remains', *New Literary History* 43, 19-42.

Abstract

Attention to ethnic hierarchies in the ancient context can clarify nuances in Greek approaches to other ethnic groups. Alongside ideologies that sought to justify hegemonic rankings of non-Greek peoples, including Scythians and other Pontic peoples, were some limited attempts to attenuate negative evaluations of certain ethnic groups. After providing some background on sociological theories regarding group hierarchies, the ancient mainstream views are outlined. They are best represented by the 'Father of History' Herodotus and the Hippocratic author in the 5th century BC: distance from the centre of the ingroup society is defined as the crucial factor, besides climatic features as hot versus cold and dry versus moist. A century later, the philosopher Aristotle seemed to be agreeing with these criteria on the one hand, but identified 'heart' / 'spirit' and 'intelligence' / 'skill' as the factors that decided on the virtue of citizens and their value as an ethnic. His contemporary, Ephoros put much more emphasis on individual virtue and intelligence rather than allowing geographical factors to determine characteristics. In the 3rd century BC, the geographer Eratosthenes vociferously echoed Ephoros in opposition to the prevailing view. In the largest extant work of ancient geography composed at the end of the 1st century BC, Strabo drew on both traditions generously. While leaning more towards the dichotomic model of Herodotus and the Hippocratic corpus, he failed to present a consistent synthesis.

Абстракт

«Самые невежественные люди из всех» – понтийские народы и древние этнические иерархии

В этой главе показано, как обращение внимания на этнические иерархии в древнем контексте может прояснить нюансы в отношении греков к другим этническим группам. Наряду с идеологиями, которые пытались обосновать преимущество негреческих народов, в том числе скифов и других понтийских народов, древними авторами были также предприняты ограниченные попытки смягчить негативные оценки определенных этнических групп. После представления научных основ социологических теорий, касающихся иерархии групп, автор текста изложил основные древние взгляды на эту тему. Наиболее верно они были описаны в трудах «отца истории» Геродота, а также в Гиппократовском трактате V века до н.э.: решающим фактором в определении иерархии, помимо климатических признаков, таких как жара – холод и засуха – влажность, является расстояние данной группы людей от центра. Спустя сто лет философ Аристотель с одной стороны согласился с этими критериями, но также идентифицировал «сердце» / «дух» и «ум» / «умение» как решающие факторы, говорящие о достоинстве граждан и их значении как этнической группы. Именно современный Эфор уделял гораздо больше внимания индивидуальному достоинству и интеллекту, не позволяя географическим факторам определять характер человека. За громким протестом против преобладающего мнения последовал географ Эратосфен в III веке до н.э. В крупнейшем из сохранившихся трудов древней географии, созданном в конце I-го века до н.э.,

Страбон в значительной степени опирался на обе традиции. Склоняясь больше к дихотомической модели Геродота и Гиппократовского корпуса, он не смог представить однозначного синтеза.