

THE KARIANS' PLACE IN DIODOROS' THALASSOCRACY LIST¹

In the much discussed list of thalassocrats excerpted by Eusebios from Diodoros the tenth entry remains the most puzzling.² Although the name is missing in Eusebios' *Chronographia* (and in the derivative Synkellos), both the Armenian version of the Canons and Jerome's Latin Canons give this place to the Karians, and the Armenian Canons are generally followed for the period of rule of sixty-one years:³ 'Zehntens führten die Seeherrschaft die Karier, 61 Jahre.' The years apparently covered by this Karian thalassocracy are c. 735–674 B.C.⁴

However sceptical one may be about the pedigree and worth of such an artificial list of sea-rulers,⁵ most of the lower half at least of the list does make reasonable sense when taken with other surviving evidence.⁶ There is something very peculiar about the Karians being given a period of rule for two generations at the height of Greek colonization when there are clearly much better candidates for a thalassocracy: both Megarians and Korinthians have been suggested as plausible substitutes.⁷ It is also worth re-emphasizing that there is very little evidence surviving in other sources which supports the possibility of a tradition of Karian sea-power at this time.

All that has usually been seized upon as a possible basis for such a tradition has been the story in Herodotos of 'bronze men from the sea' who helped Psammetichos I of Egypt against the Assyrians.⁸ But this looks like a case of arranged military assistance rather than casual piracy and so is part of the story of the Karians' well-known role as mercenaries.⁹ Even if the Karians did achieve

¹ I am grateful to W.G. Forrest and Dr. L.H. Jeffery for their comments on earlier drafts of this note.

² See the recent treatment by W.G. Forrest, 'The tenth thalassocracy in Eusebios', *CQ* N.S. 19 (1969), 95–106.

³ J. Karst, *Eusebios, die Chronik aus dem Armenischen* (Gr. Chr. Schr. 20), pp. 106–7, 182; R. Helm, *Die Chronik des Hieronymus* (Gr. Chr. Schr. 47), p. 90b; J.L. Myres, *JHS* 26 (1906), 107, 109; J.K. Fotheringham, *JHS* 27 (1907), 82–3; R. Helm, *Hermes*, 61 (1926), 252, 258. Two divergent opinions are to be found in F. Bork, *Klio*, 28 (1935), 16–20, who tried to reduce the Karians' sea-rule to only two years c. 587–585, and M. Miller, *The Thalassocracies* (New York, 1971), pp. 63 ff., where the 'thalassocracy-list of Eusebios-Jerome' includes a Karian thalassocracy of fifty-one years, although that ascribed by her to Diodoros and Kastor has sixty-one years. In the table in Forrest, loc. cit. 105, for '71' read '61' years.

⁴ The period of rule is put at 737–676 by Helm in his article and 730–669 by Fotheringham. The dates I give are those of

Fotheringham raised by five years which is a necessary procedure to have the list end with Xerxes' invasion correctly in 480 B.C. on his presuppositions. In any case the differences between the two reconstructions of Helm and Fotheringham are slight enough. Even if one reduces these dates on the supposition that some lengthening has occurred and a genuine tradition may be involved, we still have to keep this period of sixty-one years in the seventh century.

⁵ There are some brief judicious remarks by L.H. Jeffery in Appendix 3 to her *Archaic Greece* (London, 1976), pp. 252–4.

⁶ Myres, *JHS* 26 (1906), 84–130 and Forrest, loc. cit.

⁷ A.R. Burn, *JHS* 47 (1927), 165–77, esp. 167; Forrest, op. cit. 98–9.

⁸ Hdt. 2.152 etc.; Diod. 1.66.12.

⁹ Polyainos 7.3; John Boardman, *The Greeks Overseas*² (1973), p. 112; M.E. Austin, 'Greece and Egypt in the Archaic Age', *Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc. Suppl.* 2 (1970), 15–16, with notes for the Karians' other mercenary activities during this period.

a considerable reputation as mercenaries it is difficult to translate this into a tradition of an independent sea-power. Even less substantial is the evidence of place-names from which Schulten tried to infer Karian enterprise in the western Mediterranean.¹⁰ The name *Καρικὸν τεῖχος* (? Karian fort) is certainly striking and may be identified with Mogador in Morocco.¹¹ As well as Phoenician ware, some East Greek and Attic pottery has been found there from the seventh and early sixth centuries.¹² However such a find does not necessarily require direct contact by Greeks (? Phokaïans or Rhodians); the involvement of Phoenician intermediaries is perhaps more likely and there is certainly no basis for supposing that Karians were present at an early date.¹³ Various explanations, both Greek and Semitic, have been advanced for the name but perhaps the simplest is that suggested by our source—Hanno's *Periplus*—that Karian mercenaries were settled there by Hanno in the fifth century.¹⁴

The evidence for Karian piracy in the Archaic period is fairly slim,¹⁵ but it is likely that those Karians who lived near the coast would have depended on the sea for their livelihood in one way or another. We know that they could produce a moderate-sized fleet at the time of the Persian Wars,¹⁶ and before this the Persians seem to have appreciated the usefulness of the Karians in maritime enterprises. Skylax of Karyanda was involved in Darius' expedition to the Indus river,¹⁷ and we also hear of Karians and Ionians bringing cedars by boat from Babylon to Susa early in Darius' reign.¹⁸ It is interesting to find that in some playful elegiacs ascribed to Kritias, the fifth-century sophist, amongst a number of states credited with inventing various aids to civilization, the Karians are associated not with any piece of military equipment but with a particular kind of boat:¹⁹

Φοῖνικες δ' ἤνδρον γράμματ' ἀλεξίλογα.
Θήβη δ' ἄρματόνευτα δίφρον συνεπήξατο πρώτη·
φορτηγούς δ' ἀκάτους Κᾶρες ἀλὸς ταμίαι.

The *ἄκατος* or *ἀκάτιον* (= *actuaria*) was a very humble kind of boat, a small oared vessel used by pirates or envoys because of its swiftness at times, but more widely

¹⁰ A. Schulten, 'Die Griechen in Spanien', *RbM* 85 (1936), 289–346, esp. 293; A.M. Snodgrass, *JHS* 84 (1964), 117–18.

¹¹ Hanno, *Per.* 5 (Müller, *Geogr. Graec. Min.* i.3–4); Steph. Byz. s.v. *Καρικὸν τεῖχος* (= Ephoros *FGrHist* 70 F 53); Ptol. *Geogr.* 4.1.2 (*Μυσοκάρας λιμὴν*); Steph. Byz. s.v. *Μαύσωλοι*. For the identification, see D.B. Harden, *Antiquity* 20 (1948), 142–3, and his *The Phoenicians* (1971), p. 304 etc. However, A. Jodin, *Mogador, comptoir phénicien du Maroc atlantique* (Tanger, 1966), p. 191, is more cautious.

¹² F. Villard, 'Céramique grecque du Maroc', *Bull. d'archéol. marocaine* 4 (1960), 1–26 esp. 14–20; Jodin, op. cit., pp. 53–64.

¹³ Villard, loc. cit. 19, preferred Phoenician intermediaries; Jodin, op. cit., pp. 192–3, is open-minded; but a more recent summary of the evidence includes a preference for the possibility of Greeks

reaching Morocco: Mehdi Bekkari in *L'espansione fenicia nel Mediterraneo* (Pubblicazioni del Centro di studio per la civiltà fenicia e punica 8) (Rome, 1971), pp. 32–4.

¹⁴ Harden, op. cit., pp. 244–5 n. 240; J. Carcopino, *La Maroque antique* (1943), pp. 73 ff., 91 n. 3, 103–4. I find that M. Rousseau, 'Hannon au Maroc', *Revue africaine* 93 (1949), 161–232, esp. 167 and 211, suggested that Hanno could well have used Karian mercenaries.

¹⁵ Cf. H.A. Ormerod, *Piracy in the Ancient World* (1924), pp. 70 and 96–7, and Thuc. 1.13.5 after 1.7–8.

¹⁶ Hdt. 7.93 etc.

¹⁷ Hdt. 4.44.1.

¹⁸ E. Herzfeld, *Arch. Mitt. aus Iran*, iii.2 (1931), 39, 59–60.

¹⁹ Diels–Kranz 81 B 2, West B 2, 9–11 and in *Sofisti, testimonianze e frammenti* iv (1962), ed. A. Battezzatore, pp. 254–6.

for cargo, on rivers as well as on the sea.²⁰ The ascription has not apparently been disputed and there is the additional piece of evidence in a broken entry in Hesychios (Latte, ii.414): *Καρικῶι πλοίωι* . . . It may be difficult to decide how much to read into the description *ἄλδς ταμίαι*. Whether it alludes to piracy as well as an interest in trade is uncertain but the phrase surely involves something of the mock-heroic. There is also no indication of when the invention was supposed to have been made, and not much is known of the Karians' activities in the latter half of the fifth century.²¹

We may admit then that the Karians may have been useful sailors and perhaps fulfilled the role of traders or middlemen rather than pirates during the sixth century or even earlier. But even so, just as in the military sphere on land, we find the Karians in a subsidiary and dependent role and there is nothing here to suggest a stronger tradition of a Karian thalassocracy in the seventh century.

On the other hand there is a substantial tradition of a Karian thalassocracy at a very early period in which the Karians are linked with Minos and in some accounts this lasted after the Trojan War.²² Indeed Diodoros himself follows a source in Book Five which places the height of the Karians' thalassocracy just after the Trojan War:²³ *μετὰ δὲ τὴν Τροίας ἄλωσιν Κᾱρες αὐξηθέντες ἐπὶ πλεόν ἑθαλαπτοκράτησαν* . . . In this account Diodoros puts the thalassocracy between the rule of Minos, which preceded the Trojan War, and the settlement on the islands by the later Greeks, Ionians and Dorians, and this corresponds to Herodotos' statement that the Dorians and Ionians expelled the Karians from the islands, although Herodotos does not specify a Karian thalassocracy independent of Minos.²⁴ Such a period of independent Karian rule is nevertheless easily deduced from Herodotos' remarks, whatever other source may have contributed to Diodoros' account in Book Five.²⁵ Such a simple scheme is very different from the elaborate succession of sea-rulers we find in the thalassocracy list itself where neither Ionians nor Dorians are given a place at the time of the Ionian Migration when one might expect it, *c.* 1044 B.C. or 140 years after the Fall of Troy.²⁶ It is also puzzling that at the end of Book Five (5.84.4) Diodoros promises a fuller

²⁰ J.S. Morrison and R.T. Williams, *Greek Oared Ships* (1968), pp. 245–6; L. Casson, *Ships and Seamanship in the Ancient World* (1971), pp. 159–60. The *ἄκαρος* is first mentioned in Theogn. 458 and Pindar, *Pyth.* 11.40, *Nem.* 5.2 (on which see J. Péron, *Les Images maritimes de Pindare*, Études et commentaires, lxxvii (Paris, 1974), pp. 33–4); for the *ἀκάριον*, see Thuc. 1.29.3 and 4.67.3.

²¹ There are only brief remarks in A. Kleingünther, 'ΠΡΩΤΟΣ ΕΥΡΕΤΗΣ' *Pbil. Suppl.* 26 (1933), 145, and hardly any discussion elsewhere. For the Karians under the Athenian Empire, see *ATL* i.446, 498 and R. Meiggs, *The Athenian Empire* (1972), pp. 118 and 306–7.

²² Hdt. 1.171; Thuc. 1.4, 8.1; Isoc. *Panath.* 43; Konon (*FGrHist* 26) F 1 (XLVII) 4–5; Strabo 14.2.27 (661); Paus. 7.2.3 etc. Both Herodotos and Konon imply that a Karian thalassocracy lasted after the Trojan War.

²³ Diod. 5.84. This final section in Book Five sums up the ways in which the Karians took over the rule of the sea from the Cretans. See also Diod. 5.51, 53, 54, 60.

²⁴ Hdt. 1.171.5. In Konon's account the Dorians under Althaimenes drove the Karians from Rhodes at the time of the Ionian Migration.

²⁵ Diod. 5.55–9 comes from Zenon of Rhodes (*FGrHist* 523 F 1) and 5.64–80 from various Cretan authors (*FGrHist* 468 F 1), but all the references to Karian thalassocracy fall outside these sections. They may be drawn from some unnamed Cretan source, since there is a close relation to Minos' thalassocracy, or from some other background narrative source, perhaps even Ephoros, since he did include some account of the migrations (*FGrHist* 70 F 125–7).

²⁶ For the Alexandrian date (although other variants existed), see *FGrHist* 241 F 1, 244 F 61–3, and F. Jacoby, *Apollodoros Chronik*, pp. 76 ff.

account of the Karians' sea-rule and this must surely have come in Book Seven, perhaps closely preceding the thalassocracy list as is usually indicated in editions of Diodoros (= 7.10 Vogel). However, whatever further details Diodoros did give in Book Seven of the Karian thalassocracy, it does seem likely that the thalassocracy list came from a different source and gave a more elaborate account than was contained in the narrative.²⁷ We might, on the other hand, suggest that it would be unlikely for such a list not to include the Karians if it was given after, or in the middle of, a narrative in which the Karians were prominent as sea-rulers soon after the Trojan War.

At any rate Diodoros' account in Book Five clearly confirms the tradition of an early Karian thalassocracy and in no source does this extend later than the time of the migrations. We can safely conclude that either the thalassocracy list omitted the Karians altogether (as ruling before the Trojan War under Minos), or included them very early on in the list.

The problem over the place of the Karians may therefore be summed up quite simply: we have a period of Karian rule where there is no reason to have one and we do not have a Karian thalassocracy when we would expect to have one. This contradiction surely suggests that it is mistaken to be content with removing the Karians from the list by emendation. What we are dealing with appears to be some kind of displacement.

But how could the Karians disappear from a position early on in the list and be restored as the tenth entry? Such a move is difficult to imagine, for if a copyist had missed them out and later realized his mistake, or if the name had been restored at some later stage, would it not have been placed somewhere at least near the top of the list rather than half way down? Only a solution which satisfactorily accounted for such a jump could restore the Karians to a position at the beginning of the list, but I believe that the very oddity of this displacement can suggest a way of explaining it.

In the Armenian version of Eusebios' *Chronographia* we appear to have the thalassocracy list set out in a single table with one ruler below the other.²⁸ I see no compelling reason for supposing that this precise form was found in Eusebios' Greek text and taken over from Diodoros. What I would like to suggest is that both in Diodoros and in the excerpt in Eusebios the thalassocracy list was in fact set out in two adjacent columns, each more or less the same length, as follows:²⁹

²⁷ The only known author of a thalassocracy list is Kastor of Rhodes (*FGrHist* 252 T 1) and it is not impossible that he was Diodoros' source; but equally well he could have had some unknown predecessors.

²⁸ Karst, *op. cit.*, pp. 106–7. There is no indication that the manuscripts show anything different and I have not checked them on this point.

²⁹ It has been pointed out to me that prose manuscripts including those of historical authors were in any case often written in fairly narrow columns (c. 15–25 letters wide): E.G. Turner, *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World* (Oxford, 1971), p. 8 with no. 55 (c. 50 B.C.) and e.g. Sosylos, *Hannibal* iv preserved on a papyrus

of c. 100 B.C. and given as no. 10 in Bilabel, *Die kleineren Historikerfragmente auf Papyrus* (= *FGrHist* 176 F 1). I am not sure if this strengthens the likelihood of a list such as we are dealing with here being spread over two columns rather than being run on down a single column. It certainly might have been done to mark a differentiation in the subject-matter. There is an interesting case of variation in form dictated by content in a rather different literary genre in *P. Oxy.* 3010 (narrative about Iolaus) where twenty lines of a speech in verse are preceded and followed by two narrow prose columns of narrative. I also think that chronographic writing (or historical writing with a strong chrono-

- | | |
|------------------------|--------------------|
| 1. Lydians (Maionians) | 10. Karians |
| 2. Pelasgians | 11. Lesbians |
| 3. Thracians | 12. Phokaians |
| 4. Rhodians | 13. Samians |
| 5. Phrygians | 14. Lakedaimonians |
| 6. Cypriots | 15. Naxians |
| 7. Phoenicians | 16. Eretrians |
| 8. Egyptians | 17. Aiginetans |
| 9. Milesians | |

If one sets out the list in this way (and for this purpose I ignore the periods of rule), it seems quite plausible to suppose that the Karians as tenth sea-rulers came at the top of the second column, and the chances of explaining their move from the top of the first column to the top of the second column look quite reasonable. I see further confirmation of such a layout of the list in the corruption of the last thalassocrat in the Armenian Canons. Instead of the Aiginetans we find 'Egypter'.³⁰ In the two columns as I have set them out, the Egyptians are the eighth thalassocrats and lie opposite the Aiginetans at the same level in the list. Perhaps a corruption of ΑΙΓΙΝΗΤΑΙ into ΑΙΓΥΠΤΙΟΙ is not impossible, though it is certainly a strange one, but if there were such a two-column arrangement as I have imagined, we could easily suppose that the copyist's eye has slipped momentarily back from the second column to the first so that the Egyptians appear as the last sea-rulers instead of the Aiginetans.³¹

Such a simple transposition of entries will not, however, satisfactorily solve the problem of the Karian entry. Such a solution would require that the Karians replace the Lydians (Maionians) and that they in turn become the tenth sea-rulers. But the Maionians were held to be the early inhabitants of Lydia as they are mentioned in Homer (and the Lydians are not), and there is just as much difficulty in having a Maionian thalassocracy in the seventh century as there is in having a Karian one at that time.³² Nor does it seem likely that we have a genuine double entry here with the Lydians being separable from the Maionians. The Greek entry in Synkellos, which could well preserve what was found in Eusebios' *Chronographia*, suggests that Μαίονες is given as an alternative or explanatory name for Λυδοί:³³ Λυδοὶ οἱ καὶ Μαίονες. We might have expected Μαίονες to come

graphic content) was expressed in a variable style including the use of parallel lists and this would perhaps encourage a layout of the Thalassocracy List in Diodoros such as I have suggested.

³⁰ Karst, op. cit., p. 191 and p. XLVI where the corruption is explained as arising through the Syriac transcription. On my supposition the error would have occurred at some stage while the two-column arrangement of the list was still preserved in the *Chronographia*, whether in the Greek or Syrian antecedents of our Armenian manuscripts.

³¹ It would be comforting to find further traces of this conjectured form of the list in the omissions and errors in the entries in the Armenian and Latin Canons, but it is difficult to find anything very suggestive of something more than a general carelessness

or corruption. We do find that the sixth and the fifteenth entries, which are on the same level in the two-column version of the list given above, that is the Cypriots and Naxians, are missing in the Armenian Canons, but the Naxians are also missing from Jerome's Canons while the Cypriots are not.

³² Hdt. 1.7; 7.74; Apollodoros (*FGrHist* 244) F 170–1; Diod. 4.31; Strabo 13.1.8, 3.2, 4.5; 14.5.23, 24, 27; scholiasts on *Iliad* 3.401, 10.431, 17.291; and *RE* XIV.1, 582–3.

³³ Synkellos, p. 324 l.16 (Dindorf). For the exegetic ὁ καὶ construction, imitating Latin *qui et* in late Greek, see A.N. Jannaris, *Historical Greek Grammar* (1897), pp. 404–5, and E. Schwyzler, *Griechische Grammatik*² i.638 n.7.

first with *Λυδοί* added as an explanation, but in any case the presence of the name *Μαίονες* makes it impossible to place this Lydian thalassocracy in the seventh century. Even if there were grounds to suppose that *οἱ καὶ Μαίονες* was a gloss which was not originally found in Diodoros or his source, a Lydian thalassocracy in the seventh century is very unlikely. There does not appear to be any tradition of Lydian sea-power. As Herodotos emphasizes in a story relating to Kroisos (1.27), the Lydians were famous for their cavalry but not for their prowess at sea, even if they may have been concerned to gain control of the Ionian commercial outlets for trade.³⁴

If it is unconvincing to move the Lydians (Maionians), what other solutions are left to us? It is not possible to insert an additional entry at the beginning of the list as J. L. Myres tried to do;³⁵ many of the thalassocrats are numbered and there is no reason to doubt that the numbering was found in the list of Diodoros himself.³⁶ To intrude the Karians at the beginning of the list as an additional entry would upset this numbering and does not seem at all likely. The only remaining possibility that I can see is to suppose that the Karians were originally joined to the Lydians (Maionians) as the first entry which read something like *Λυδοὶ οἱ καὶ Μαίονες, καὶ Κᾶρες*. This may seem cumbersome and it would remain the only genuine double entry, but how else can the evidence be reconciled? If there were such a long first entry it would certainly help to explain this notorious corruption. The names at the top of the first column, as I have envisaged it, could have given the impression that they included the name for the first entry at the top of the second column with the result that the name of the real tenth thalassocrat was then omitted—as indeed we find in the Armenian *Chronographia*. One could still suppose that the name of the original tenth thalassocrat was indeed similar to *Κᾶρες* which would encourage such a slip.

In favour of such a multiple first entry is the linking of the Maionians and Karians such as one finds in Homer,³⁷ and the need that has been felt in any case for the Maionians at this place in the list to include the Karians.³⁸ But since we do have the name of the Karians occurring in the list, is it not preferable to retain them and join them to the Maionians?

The explanation I offer for the presence of the Karians as tenth thalassocrats may not take us any closer as to who the real tenth thalassocrats were, but I hope I have shown that although the possibilities of manoeuvring are limited, it is conceivable that the Karians have been displaced and should be kept in the list.

University of Ibadan, Nigeria

R. BALL

³⁴ Hdt. 1.14.4 ff. and see J.G. Pedley, *JHS* 94 (1974), 97, for the suggestion that some co-operation with Karians was also involved.

³⁵ *JHS* 26 (1906), 88, 129–30.

³⁶ See Burn, loc. cit. 167; Forrest, loc.

cit. 98.

³⁷ *Il.* 4.141 ff. for the staining of ivory by women of Karia and Maionia.

³⁸ Burn, loc. cit. 167 and *Minoans, Philistines, and Greeks* (1930), pp. 60–1.