

## BLACK GYPSIES, WHITE GYPSIES

### THE GYPSIES WITHIN THE PERSPECTIVE OF INDO-EUROPEAN MIGRATIONS

Our predecessors Pott, Miklosich, Woolner, Grierson, Jules Bloch, Barannikov, Ralph Turner and others, have established from diachronic facts (comparison of the Romany with the old Indian) the Indian origin of the Tsiganes, or Gypsies. Their divergencies originate from the exact place of the primitive homeland of the Gypsies, the majority inclining to the north-west of India.

On the other hand, given the poor state in which the Gypsies live at the present, due to long centuries of persecution, opinion is unanimous in affirming that their original caste was that of the pariah. We note an even greater divergence among the specialists in this field when we reach the question of the date and causes of their exodus. Ralph Turner, one of the greatest of our contemporary Indilogists, advances the date of approximately 250 B.C. as the date of their departure from their original land (the Central Provinces, according to him). Our own inter-disciplinary studies have shown that the Gypsies are Rajputs who left Northern

Translated by Lisa Pasternak Slater.

*Black Gypsies, White Gypsies*

India (the present state of Delhi, and its environs, particularly Rajasthan), after the battle of Teraïm, in 1192 A.D.

However, at the nagging of conscience, in June 1966, we collected at Jammu-Kashmir after four years of research, to compare our suppositions with those of our predecessors. In actual fact, the Kashmiris are as white as the Gypsies, belonging, like they, to the Mediterranean race. But if it were only a matter of this, it would not be indispensable to go all the way to Himalaya: Europe abounds in Mediterranean races. The Kashmiris have no more in common, in all respects, with the *Chavé* Romanies than they have with the inhabitants of Uttar-Pradesh, Delhi and Rajasthan. Their language differs as much from Romany as from Hindi-Rajasthani. Their music has some points in common with gypsy music, but no more than it has in common with Indian music in general. Their dances are limited to several popular steps, unlike the dances of the Romanies and the Kathak. Their costumes are very different from those of the Rajasthans and of the Romanies...

The people of Jammu are already closer to the Romany, but they are closer too to the Hindu Panjabis and to the population of Delhi. In short, we can state with certainty:

1. The more a people resemble the high castes of Delhi, the Hindu Panjabis and Rajputs in general, the more they resemble the *Chavé* Romanies (the European Gypsies).

2. The closer the similarity of a language to Hindi-Rajasthani, the closer it is to Romany (the language of the European Gypsies).

3. The same applies to the music, dances and other cultural traits.

The distribution of blood-groups among the *Chavé* Romanies corresponds to that of the high military castes in India, and is characterised not by the high percentage of group B, as many believe, but by *the most stable distribution of the percentages of AOB that may be found in India and Europe*. Here is the distribution of groups AOB among the Kshatriyas and the Roma on one hand, among the Kashmiris on the other:

	A	O	B	AB
Kshatriya	26.7	30.8	32.7	9.63
Rom	26.2	31	33.9	8.9
Kashmiri	24	47	32	6

Our scientific investigations were confirmed by the oral history of the Banjaras, "Gypsies" of India whom we discovered in the "jungle", an area rather of a desert than jungle kind in Rajasthan. It consists of various Rajput clans, slightly bastardized.

Nevertheless, they have a fairer complexion, are taller and finer in build than the peasants in the neighbouring villages, even those belonging to the Brahman and other high castes. It is important to stress that they all consider the Banjaras as Rajputs. So everything tallies with the establishment of the parallel between the Rajputs and the Gypsies.

Having reached this results, we realized that we were no further than before: no-one can say exactly what a Rajput is, nor what is his origin. An enquiry carried out among the Indian historians, anthropologists and ethnologists discouraged us from forming a precise idea of the high military castes in India. Gradually we came to understand that the problem of the origin of the Rajputs, and consequently that of the Gypsies, was linked to the problem of the origin of the Indo-European migrations and that it would be necessary to organize interdisciplinary research in order to resolve it. Furthermore, during the Tenth International Congress of Linguists, (August to September, 1967), we had occasion to demonstrate that no domain of human science can serve, on its own, as decisive criteria for the clarification of the origin of a people. Only a synthesis of the various contributions of the Human Sciences can allow us to unveil the history of a people or a tribe.

Thus, for the identification of the Gypsy-Rajput, we had studied these two human groups, applying modern methods acquired in anthropology, ethnology, and linguistics.

And, for the clarification of the origin of the military caste in India, we would have recourse to history proper and to archeology.

Let us consider first of all the problem of Indo-European migrations as a whole.

#### a) *Linguistic*

A common Indo-European? Simplifying all the hypotheses to the extreme, we finally come down to the following schemes:

## *Black Gypsies, White Gypsies*

1) The theory of divergence: a common language presupposes a nation, and vice versa. Meillet thinks that since we have lost trace of the primitive Indo-European, the localization of the Indo-European people is of no interest. Furthermore, solely from a linguistic point of view, it seems to us that this localization is impossible to establish. 2) The theory of convergence: there is no known Empire in which the fusion of all the Indo-European languages and peoples existed. Nevertheless, one might postulate a larger or smaller Indo-European area in which numerous Indo-European dialects were spoken, whose differentiation grew in proportion to the increasingly considerable distances between them, and in accordance with the ever-swelling size of the peoples. Furthermore, this differentiation would become accentuated if communications encountered natural barriers, such as mountains and unnavigable rivers. Add to this different substrata of the languages spoken by the conquered peoples to the Indo-European tongues, and you will have had a glimpse of the evolution of the Indo-European languages.

### b) *Anthropology*

Race is not a dream, but a reality. Even in Paris, at first sight, we can distinguish the representatives of the “pure” races that have formed the French nation: the Nordic—the Franks; the north-eastern and Dinaric—the Celts; and the Mediterranean type—the Romans. But we are far from the identification of race to language to people. Indeed, since the unification of large human groupings on a racial basis is nowhere realised, *no people known today can pretend to the monopoly of such and such a race.*

Thus neither Kossina nor any other anthropologists have succeeded in demonstrating the Nordic origin of the Indo-European people. Hirt himself criticizes Penka and other anthropologists who try to demonstrate the racial unity of the Indo-European peoples.

G. Sergi and Patroni, for instance, stress the Mediterranean origin of the Italian civilization, and Patroni insists on the persistence of *racial characteristics* in Italy from the neolithic epoch until recent times. We will add another fact: the Gypsies have

preserved their meso- or dolicephalism even among brachycephalic peoples like the Rumanians, Slavs and Celts. The majority of Scandinavians are dolicephalic in spite of their environment, or at least, in spite of very prolonged contact with the Finno-Hungarians. How then are we to explain the cranial “rounding” of the Celts who had no such direct contact with the Altaic peoples, if, originally, they belonged to the “Nordische Rasse” of the Germans?<sup>1</sup>

According to the majority of experts, the Indo-Europeans “appeared” in about the second millennium B.C., but we should go right back to the beginning of the neolithic age, about the fifth millennium B.C., at the epoch when the Finno-Hungarian, Uralo-Altaic, Mediterranean, Chamitic and Semitic races were already formed. According to Bosch-Gimpera’s synthesis, there would have been two regions where the first Indo-European nuclei would be formed: 1) Czechoslovakia and the Danubian regions; 2) Poland and the Pontic regions. The Balto-Slavs and the Germans would have as their substratum the Finno-Hungarian, and those of the Danube, the Aegeian. (cf. *Les Indo-Européens*, Payot, 1961). Towards the third millennium begins the crystallization of the Indo-European culture. According to Bosch-Gimpera, towards the 2000-1800, a “great event” came to pass:<sup>2</sup> the displacement of a warrior race whose culture is characterized by *cordée ceramics and battle-axes*, whose point of departure seems to be fixed in the South-East of Europe. This warrior race provoked the dislodgement of most of the cultures of East, North, and Central Europe, and the triggering of movements at the periphery. A part of the regions lying between the Dnieper and the Volga, in the valleys of the Donetz and the lower Don, this people crossed the plains of Rumania, went back up the Dnieper, crossed the Kiev region, White Russia, Poland, the Oder, Saxony and Thuringen, then Central Russia, Moscow, the Vistula and the Baltic. Finally,

<sup>1</sup> It would be interesting to draw attention to the celebrated thesis of S. Fist (1913-14) in which he advances a hypothesis that is totally opposed to his German compatriots, according to which the Germans, given the impoverishment of their verbal system and several phonological traits (consonant mutations), would have a non Indo-European origin and would have been gradually Indo-Europeanised.

<sup>2</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 159.

## *Black Gypsies, White Gypsies*

via the Baltic coastline, battle-axes of a naval pattern arrived in Finland, and, from there, in Eastern Sweden.

From Thuringen, their direction was towards Saxony, Bohemia, Silesia, Moravia, the Plain of Galicia, the Carpathians, the lower Danube, the Hellespont, Asia Minor. We do not believe that the displacement of the Indo-European tribes could be due simply to a "great event." The clans of the Tripolean culture<sup>3</sup> (including Moravia, the Ukraine, the middle Dniester and the Bug, and the northern Rumanian regions), after a thousand years' efforts, in the third millennium, had arrived at a fairly elevated level of culture. Agriculture and stock-breeding reached considerable proportions, particularly on the left banks of the middle reaches of the Dniester, and in the meridional and northern areas of the Bug basin. The immediate result of this flourishing agriculture was a rapid *increase in the population*. And the intensive stock-breeding always demanded new pastures. The same evolution is followed by the culture of the Catacombs<sup>4</sup>—the various clans who lived on the steppes of the Black Sea. It is preeminently here that all kinds of battle-axes and *cordée* ornamentation (*cordée* ceramics) originated. All these tribes maintained commercial relations with the Caucasus and the Middle East, and their infiltration proceeded in all directions: in Europe, archeology shows us the spreading of these battle-axes and of *cordée* ceramics during the third and second millennia from the middle Volga as far as the Rhine, and from the middle reaches of the Dnieper as far as the Baltic countries and Southern Scandinavia.

Let us now follow more closely the migration of peoples who are related to the high Indian military castes:

### A. THE INDIANS<sup>5</sup>

Towards the middle of the seventeenth century B.C. the Indians were already living on the plateau of what is now Azerbaijan. The "Uman-Manda," the first nomad horsemen, were checked by the

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *Istorija SSSR*, tom I, "P'evobyt noobscinniy stroy," Institut Archeologii, "Nauka," Moskva 1966, p. 87-96.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid*, pp. 128-134.

<sup>5</sup> That is to say, the people who gave rise to the Indians: the Rajputs, or "black" Gypsies.

Babylonians, but from that time no military victory could interrupt their infiltration, which was slow but irresistible. The Aryans were associated with the Hurites, and during the sixteenth century accompanied them in their expansion as far as the Nouzi region in the East of Assyria, as far as the Euphrates in the West, and as far as Palestine in the South.<sup>6</sup> In Mesopotamia, Northern Syria and the borders of Palestine, they succeeded in creating a kind of military aristocracy which spread the use of the horse, long known in the northern mountains, and used chariots in warfare, and made up a kind of chivalry.<sup>7</sup> Thus the Mittanians quite quickly seized power, exploiting the anarchy of the Hittite state. The "Great King" (Maharajah) Barattarna annexed Aleppo. Their empire contained, besides, a nucleus spread around Washukanni, the kingdoms situated at the mouth of the Orontes, in Arapha and Syria. The Mittanians built a dazzling civilization: they saw a symbiosis of Hurite, Amorite and Aryan elements. "The Hurite divinities Teshub, the god of thunder, and his wife Hepa, dominate the Pantheon; Teshub contains in himself the Aryan gods Mitra, Indra, Varuna..." Artistic life prospers: there is the resurrection of painted ceramics, the appearance of the portico in architecture, a predilection for hybrid figures in the decorative repertoire, the invention of enamel."<sup>8</sup> In Babylon the Kassite dominion was consolidated; the kings reestablished their temples and built new palaces. But the Mittanians must adjust all their efforts to the protection of Syria and Aleppo against the Pharaoh Tuthmosis III. His own attacks, and, later on, those of his son Amenophis II shattered against the Mittanian resistance organized by Shaushtar. The same checks were encountered by the Hittite attacks. Meanwhile troubles broke out in Anatolia; Hattusas was burnt down. Tuthalya III, the Hittite king, got over the crisis and entrusted the government of Syria to his son Supilulyuma. Dushrata, taking advantage of the situation, reaffirmed his power in Syria, spread his rule over Cilicia and the upper reaches of the Tigris, so encroaching on the Hittite empire. Then equilibrium was established. The four "Great Kings"—those of Egypt, Mit-

<sup>6</sup> Cf. *Histoire Universelle*, N.R.F., Paris, 1956, p. 354 f.

<sup>7</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 374.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*

tany, Babylon and of the Hittites—exchanged gifts, princesses in marriage, and, of course, trade, particularly of metals, united them: Egypt exported gold in exchange for copper from Cyprus, lapis-lazuli passed in transit by Babylon, etc.

There followed an epoch of confusion: different nomads invaded Anatolia and destroyed the Hittite empire. The “Mushki” also invaded the Mittanian empire and sacked it. Towards 1163 Ashur-dan, the son of Ramses III, took advantage of the situation and went on a pillaging raid of Babylon, only to find the Mushki (probably the Cimmerians, J.K.) installed on the upper Tigris. In the same year the king of Elam brought back from Babylon to Susa, among other trophies, the victory stele of Naram-Sin and the stele on which the laws of Hammurabi were inscribed. After a few years’ resistance, the last representative of the Kassite dynasty was deposed round about 1160.<sup>9</sup>

In the seventh century the Assyrians, campaigning against the Iranians in Media, discovered in the Hammadin region, at Ecbatan, the Bit-Ramatej principality, governed by the Indian prince Ramatej. Were these the Kassites who had taken refuge there, after the collapse of their empire, which used to spread from Zagros to the Mediterranean, or were they simply the rear-guard of the Vedic Indians who had penetrated into India via the North-West of the Iranian Plateau? We are sooner inclined to think that they are Mittanians.

But the mainstream of the Indians dispersed in the direction of the Sind province and the Punjab. Leaving their original site, which was situated between the Caucasus and the Zagros, they crossed the north of the Kewir Desert, then Iran, from there to the south-east of the Caspian, continuing their route over the territories situated at the north of the Hindu-Rush, reaching Herat (Ariana) via the Heri-Rud basin, from there passing to Eastern Afghanistan (Drangiania and Arachosia), climbed up the Hilmend and reached the Punjab through the valleys of Kabul and Kurran, tributaries of the Indus: such is the reconstruction of their great journey, made by Bosch-Gimpera on the basis of archeological facts.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>9</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 374.

<sup>10</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 227-228.



In the excavations at Mohenjo-Daro the adze-hatchet (Axt-pic-kel) in bronze has been found, with sleeve-jointed tabulature, dating from approximately 1200-1000 B.C.; now this hatchet is the parent of a series amply represented in Rumania, the Ukraine, the Northern Caucasus, Assyria and Iran, similar to a type originating in Transylvania during the first half of the second millennium, and widely spread in the Middle East. Moreover, bronze club-heads have been found in the excavations at Chandhu-Daro, in the last strata of Harappa and Jhukar, identical to the ones at Louristan and in Hissar III C (in the treasures of Asterabad), which are contemporary with the adze-hatchets mentioned already. The seals of the Jhukar stratum of Chandhu-Daro are distinct from those of the earlier culture of Harappa and show close similarities to the examples discovered in Anatolia during the Hittite epoch, and particularly with these last during the fall of the Hittite empire after 1200 B.C. All this evidence agrees in the fixing of the dates of the introduction of these objects in India, and in the directions of the itinerary of its carriers.

Once they had arrived in India, the Aryans found the population proto-Mediterranean; it seemed to them to be very "dusky." Among the principal clans, the Kauravas and the Pandavas, the members of the first were more race-conscious, and in their struggle for supremacy the Pandavas had competition from the aboriginal races who had as their prince the "god" Krishna. The fusion of the Aryans and the aboriginal nobility has produced the upper castes in India, that is, the Brahmans and the Kshattriyas. The latter would be the ancestors of the Rajputs and the "black" Gypsies. Of course, during the last 3,500 years or so, there have been many other admixtures and what we say here is only very approximate. But our assertions have some verisimilitude, if one takes into account the rigidity of castes in India.

## B. THE IRANIANS

Clearly we do not consider here any of the Iranian peoples except those that are Kushan and Hephtalite in origin.

The history of the Rajputs "white" *Chavé* Romanies is closely linked with the history of the Kusha and *Hephtalite* ("white Huns") dynasties in India and Central Asia. From lack of space,

there is no opportunity to discuss the different theories concerning this fascinating subject in which experts like Konow, Otto Maenchen-Helfen, Marquart, Bachhofer and others have come to grips, without coming to any definitive conclusion accepted by the majority of them. In any case few historians occupy themselves with the origin of the Kushans and the "Svetah Hunas;" they are satisfied with analysing the historical period in question.

For this part of our discussion, we have freely drawn from the works of Bosch-Gimpera, already mentioned, from the *History of the USSR* of the Academy of Sciences, 1960, vol. I, and particularly from R. Ghirshman's book: *Les Chionites-Hephtalites*, Memoires of the French Institute of Oriental Archeology at Cairo, vol. LXXX, and from *A Comprehensive History of India*, vol. II, The Indian History Congress and the Bharatiya Itihas Parishad, Bombay, 1957.

There are two theories about the origin of the Kushans:

One: Scythians-Sakas or Sarmatians, or another northern Scythian tribe. The arguments advanced by Sten Konow are: the money minted by Kanishka, Huvishka and Vasudeva being in pure Khotani, which is a Saka dialect. Ludvig Bachhofer, after a minute examination of the costumes and arms of the Kushans and of the Sakas, reaches the conclusion that they dressed in identical clothes and fought with exactly the same arms. Ghirshman connect them with the Sarmatians, both Kushans and Hephtalites: they have in common costume, arms, (especially the long sword carried by Kanishka, which is so typical of Sarmatian warriors), and the polychrome ceramics brought by the Sarmatians from Southern Russia.

Two: Tokharians. A.J. Van Vindikens in his *Etymological Lexicon of Tokharian Dialects* analyses the theories concerning this subject and interprets them: p. xxvi: "One fact is incontestable: at the beginning of the second century B.C. people with fair skins, fair hair and blue eyes lived in the North-East and South-East of the Tarim Basin. Perhaps they were divided into many branches (Tokhares, Jue-chi, U-sum) even in that epoch..." He hyphenates U-sum -Yue-chi -Asioi-Asiani, while they all belonged to one people and spoke Tokharian. He links Tokharian with the *centum* tongues, that is to say, the Eastern group of the European languages. Nevertheless, we have noted, for instan-

ce, a large number of Latvian and Lithuanian words less advanced along the road of palatalisation than Tokharian, although the latter is represented by documents dating from the sixth and seventh centuries. In general, his analysis of Chinese documents on which he bases his hypothesis does not seem very convincing. Moreover, he thinks that the Hephtalites belonged to the same ethnic stock as the Tokharians, without being able to demonstrate it.

The Indian History Congress (*op. cit.*) accepts Maenchen-Helfen's point of view: "Since Kutsi, Ku-shih and Kao-ch'ang (K. chan) were known to the Chinese already in the early Han period, Kushans must have settled in the northern Tarim long before the Kushan empire was founded."<sup>11</sup> Then, basing himself on the classical documents, he seems to want to demonstrate that the Tokharian is another transcription of *Kusha*! "Since the fourth century B.C. at the latest the Chinese knew barbarians in the northwest under the name Kusha-Yue-chi. The Kushans were the dominant group. The tribal name was Togar (or the like). At an undetermined time the Kusha-Yue-chi came under Saka rule. The usage of two names, Kusha and Arçi, for designating the rulers can best be explained by assuming that *Kusha* was the Tokharian term for "nobles," while the Saka called themselves Arçi."<sup>12</sup> Further on, Maenchen-Helfen says that the Kusha tribe "gained ascendancy over the whole horde."

Bosch-Gimpera,<sup>13</sup> basing himself on Heine-Geldern, thinks that the Yue-chi would be Tokharians. The vestiges of their language would have been preserved in the Tarim Basin. To the west of Hoang-nu, since the time of the Chansi and the Kansu, they would have been attacked by the Huns (Hiong-nu, J.K.) at about 210-209 B.C., during the Chinese Tsin dynasty, to which the Tokharians were vassals, 175-174. From Kansu they withdrew to the Tibetans, but the great mass of the people emigrated to the East, penetrating the Tarim Basin, into the region of Ili and the Issi-Kul lake, where they engaged in a struggle against

<sup>11</sup> "The Yue-chi problem reexamined," *JAOS*. 65, 1945, pp. 71-81.

<sup>12</sup> According to the Van Vindemens *Lexicon*, the word *Arçi* means "white" in Tokharian.

<sup>13</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 233 f.

*Black Gypsies, White Gypsies*

the Wu-sum,<sup>14</sup> who would be Alans, a Sarmatian Iranian group occupying the Lake Balkhash region. From there, they turned their steps to Ferghana, and arrived in the Syr-Darya and Amu-Darya (Oxus) Basin, from which they drove the Iranian Sacae.

The Sacae (Sakas) infiltrated into the kingdom of Bactria, and, continuing their march to the South, arrived in India.

The Tokharians, Yue-chi, established themselves in Sogdiana (on the Upper Amu-Darya) in about 165, the date of their adopting a sedentary way of life. Their rear-guard came to rest on the Tarim (Chinese Turkestan), where they settled for a long time.

Bosch-Gimpera (quoting G. Halun) compares the people, mentioned by the Chinese (771 B.C.), *Hsien-Yun* to the *Kim-mior* i.e. Cimmerians. A large amount of objects unknown in the Extreme East, above all a diversity of arms found in the Mongolian interior and in China would be a proof of their presence in this country. And Heine-Geldern believes that he can place their parting-point between the lower Volga and the Caspian steppes. From there, they turned to the Balkhash Lake, then to the Asiatic steppes, the passes of Dzungaria, the Gobi, China to the west of Hoang-hu, and to Kansu, from which penetration was made via the Weiho towards Hao. Another possible route, according to this author, would be from the Aral through Syr-Darya, north of the Altai through the Terek pass to the Tarim Basin and the upper Hoang-ho to the south of the Nan chain, onto the pasture lands of Kuku-Nor. From there, via Sseu-Tchuan and Yunnan, they would land up in Burma. Indeed, one can find here objects of "Pontic" and Caucasian origin: a bronze dagger, adze-hatchets (*Axt-Pickel*), buckles of swordbelts with bell-flower or spiral "S" patterns, stag-hunts, curving patterns, etc... bronze cauldrons, swordbelts of perforated bronze plate, hunting scenes, then a series of northern bronze (period IV and V), swords "*à languettes*," daggers and knives with anthropomorphous handles, etc.

Only, other discoveries in the same provinces of Kansu show us the installation of the Indo-Europeans at a far earlier period, when this province was still a stranger to Chinese rule: "On the

<sup>14</sup> Cf. the U-sum of Van Vindekens, *op cit.*

site of the Yang-chao, in the North of Ho-nan, in a collection of burial-places about to be inhumed, there were found stores of earthenware vases with painted, polychrome decorations of bands, triangles, spots and crossed lines, together with bone knives with a silix cutting edge, rings and hatchets of jade. We are concerned here with magnificent geometric polychrome designe, formed of spiralling schrolls, waves or festoons, of lozenges and of "serpents' skins." According to some archeologists, this fine pottery dates from about 1700, while according to others, it is later.<sup>15</sup> This ceramic is comparable to that of Ukraine and of prehistoric Rumania, which leads one to suppose an immigration from the "Pontic" regions, after the same reasoning, but which would be about a thousand years older than those of *Hsien-Yun*, i.e. Kim-mior, i.e. Cimmerians. This observation does not aim at contradicting the departure of the Cimmerians at the date suggested by G. Halun and Bosch-Gimpera, but is intended to show that the immigrations of these Cimmerians occurred on several occasions.

According to R. Ghirshman, the Kushans would be the Ta-Yuechi, the "Great Yue-chi" of the Chinese annals. The "Little Yue-chi" would represent a fraction of the Ta-Yuechi and of the Sakas who "since the time of their great exodus from Chinese Turkestan, in the second century B.C., stayed in the territory controlled by Wou-souen." In short, he believes that the Kushans and the Hephthalites belong to the northern Iranians, particularly the Sarmatians. In evidence, here are some extracts from his book *Begram, Archeological and Historical Researches into the Kushans*:

p. XII. The Sarmatians are recognised by "a lance and a long sword... and who, by new military tactics, similar to the 'squares of war,' put bow and arrow in the second place." Sarmatians and Kushans are characterised by the same clothes and by a "polychromatic jewelry." The Kanishka of Mathura have "the same long sword so characteristic of Sarmatian warriors."

p. XIII. The northern Iranians are divided into two branches: one made its way towards Europe, the other towards Yaxartes and the Oxus. The second branch blocked the way to the spread-

<sup>15</sup> Grousset, "Extrême-Orient," in the *Histoire Universelle*, La Pléiade, p. 1537.

ing of the Parthians towards the East and made the Indian empire a reality. In the second century, the Sarmatians were stopped by the Romans on the Danube, and driven back into the Ukrainian steppes. The Alans formed the powerful *Kuban* empire and tried once again to drive the Roman Empire from their province of the Caucasus, and suffered another check..."

Here, in addition, are some extracts from his second book *Les Chionites-Hephtalites*, p. xi: "For about two thousand years, this people (the people of Outer Iran) evolved between the Greco-Roman Occident and the Chinese Far East, stirring and shifting in the vast area of immense Eurasian steppes, from the plains of Southern Russia to the mouth of the Indus, and from the mountains of Zagros to the Great Wall.

In an irregular cadence, sporadically, in successive waves dependent on the awakening of other human groups, the solitudes of Central Asia (where we will probably, one day, succeed in identifying the *home* of the Iranians) scattered them in the direction of the West."

The author continues, saying that the first wave established itself firmly on the Iranian plateau, and "for 1000 years Central Asia did not seem to have felt any disturbances, having rejected the Iranians in the same direction."

We believe that the second wave, in the third century, coincided with the general awakening of the Mongols, who organised themselves into a powerful military democracy. Their expanding rule reached its apogee during the rule of Modé. For all that concerns their organisation, armament, etc., see the book published by the Academy of Sciences in Moscow, in 1967: *The History of the Mongol People's Republic*, p. 79 ff. At the beginning of the second century they began their general drive towards the West, and jostled the Indo-European peoples settled in the south of the Balkhash Lake. These were the Kushans and the Sakas. The first formed an enormous equestrian empire in Central Asia and in India, and the second settled in the north-west of India. On the glitter of culture during the Kushan dynasties, particularly that of Kanishka, see *The Indian Civilisation*, v. I by J. Filliozat and Louis Renou, and the book already quoted: *A Comprehensive History of India*, v. II.

Five centuries later, after the disintegration of the Kushan

Empire, another, third and last wave arose, building a new empire on the wrecks of its predecessor: these were the Kedarites, a tribe related to the Kushans whose dynasties, anyhow, will be called "Little Kushans" and the ancient allies of the Kushans, the Chionite-Hephtalites, the "White Huns." Ghirshman's book *Les Chionites-Hephtalites* describes the extraordinary epopee of this people, which is so little known in history, but which shook Central Asia and India, and alternately aided and overthrew the Sassanides, again and again, only to be crushed in its turn, two centuries later, by the Perso-Turkish coalition, between 563 and 567. Soon the Iranian Empire, with all the possessions seized from the Hephtalites (1. Sind; 2. Bost; 3. Ar-Bokhady or Arachosia; 4. Zabulistan; 5. Tokharestan; 6. Dardistan; 7. Kabulistan) fell into the hands of the Arabs, but the irrepressible spirit of liberty inspiring the Hephtalites gave the new Musulman conquerors much to cope with, and the struggles continued right up to the second half of the ninth century. The last campaign against the Hephtalites was led by the brave general Yaqub, in 1860-71.

We are going to survey the two points of view of the origin of the Kushans and of the Hephtalites—the White Huns who, we believe, are the ancestors of the Romanies, the "White" Rajputs.

We would like to add that if two languages have been left by these Indo-European tribes established in Central Asia, Khotanian and Tokharian, there have also been two people who used to speak these languages. The comparison *Hsien-yun* with *Kim-mior*, *Cimmerian*, seems to us to be far-fetched. All the more so, when the mention of *Hsien-yun* by the Chinese date from 771 B.C. and the Cimmerians continued their pillaging on the Ionian coast till 670 B.C., this being the date when they burnt down the temple to Artemis, at Ephesus. In 650 B.C. they seized Sardis, and in 637 they were conquered by Assurbanipal at the gates of Cilicia. Nevertheless, in spite of these two facts, appellation (*Hsien-Yun*) and chronology, it is quite possible that after their defeat by Assurbanipal, with the Scythians on their heels, they were forced to start their march to Central Asia at this date.

As for the Khotanian,<sup>16</sup> it must have been spoken by one of

<sup>16</sup> The problem we are faced with is to find out why the documents in the two languages are so late. Considering the very liberal religious policy practiced by Kanishka (in the second century A.D.) we find ourselves asking the Buddhists

the Scythian peoples, very probably by the Sakas or the Massagetae. The kingdom of the Scythians or Northern Iranians stretched from the Dniester in the west of the Black Sea as far as the frontiers of China, at the south-east of the present Kazakstan, that is, almost to the edge of the "Tokharian" and "Khotanian" areas: the Lake Issykkol, the basin of the Tarim and Khotan itself. It is therefore not surprising that they should be dislodged, by the second century B.C., by the approach of the redoubtable Mongol cavalry (hunnic<sup>17</sup>), reunited under the command of Shan'yuy Modé.

The Sakas made their way towards India and the Tokharians in the direction of the province of Bactria. But on their route they encountered the Massagetae, a Scythian people, close relatives to the Sarmatians. We can conjecture a compact made between the Massagetae and the Cimmerian Tokharians, after which the latter would have renounced all expansion in the west, over the territories occupied by the Northern Iranians, but were to have free play in the direction of the East. Given the common danger they had in the advance of the ferocious squadrons of the united Mongols, the Tokharians and the Massagetae, united also, but under the supreme command of the Massagetae, the *Asioi*, *Asiani* of the classical historians.

Van Vindekens, p. xviii: "The Tokharians would be the *Ta-hia* of Chinese tradition, while the *Yue-chi* would correspond to the *Asioi*, *Asiani* of the classics."

R. Ghirshman, *Begram*, p. 113: "*Ta-Yue-chi* fought the *Ta-hia*, a weak people afraid of war" ... The *Yue-chi* occupied the Eastern part of Bactria—Tokharestan—and Eastern Sogdiana. It is probably in Tokharestan that the Tokharians settled. We do not believe that the *Ta-hia*, "afraid of war," could be the Tokharians. The *Ta-hia*, in this context, would be, we believe, the aboriginal races of the countries mentioned, where the Tokharians were established, giving their name to these regions: Tokharestan. It is thus a matter of a slip of chronology:

"In nomad or semi-nomad Asia, ethnic names had two alter-

---

did not leave any other traces earlier. Of course it is possible to believe that they were destroyed.

<sup>17</sup> *Hu*: "barbarian" in Chinese.



native fates: either they are attached to a people who originally carried the name, and in this case, (like the Tokharians, Turks and Mongols) the names travel across the map; or they stay attached to a district (Tokharestan, Turkestan) and so are applied to the different successive peoples during the different periods.”<sup>18</sup> So, in spite of their “blue eyes and red hair,” the Tokharians played only a secondary role in the dynasty of the Kushans, who were of Northern Iranian origin, Massagetae. Thus we can understand why the Kushans, and then the Hepthalites wore the same clothes, fought with the same weapons, and were characterised by the same predilection for a polychrome ceramic and trinkets in red gold and iridescent precious stones. All together, the cultural unity during the rule of the Kushans is remarkable, at a time when the peoples of Central Asia continued to develop their own culture, which was driving its roots deep into the epoch before the conquest of Alexander.<sup>19</sup>

Here follow some words about the principal representatives of northern Iranians:

1. *Scythia* proper included the regions situated between the Dniester and the Don. The Scythians were divided into various groups: royal (cf. Rajputs), nomads, land owners and labourers. The territory named corresponded approximately to that occupied by the Cimmerians who, according to Herodotus, had abandoned it at the approach of the Scythians towards the ninth and eighth centuries. The unification of the Scythian tribes came about towards the ninth century A.D., and “Scythia” kept up on the borders of the Black Sea till the third century A.D. The Scythians have created an authentic and brilliant culture which left a deep mark on the populations of Central and Eastern Europe, and has played so great a cultural and political role that this period in the history of Russia is called the “Scythian epoch.”<sup>20</sup>

<sup>18</sup> F.W. Thomas, “Tibetan Documents concerning Chinese Turkestan,” in *J.R.A.S.*

<sup>19</sup> *Istorija SSSR*, p. 291.

<sup>20</sup> *Istorija SSSR*, p. 214-225; and *Sokrovitsa skifskich tsarei*, Moskva 1967, 128 p.

II. *The Savromates*, known under the name of Sarmatians<sup>21</sup> towards the fourth and third centuries B.C. They were nomads in the steppes stretched between the Don and the south of the Urals. Stock-breeding was their main resource. They were masters of metallurgy. Like the other nomad tribes, the Scythians and the Mongols, the Sarmatians in their turn achieved the creation of a redoubtable cavalry. All the authors agree in affirming that their social organisation was characterised by matriarchy. It is the Sarmatian women gave rise to the legends about the Amazons. Indeed, they participated very actively in all social life with their husbands, in peace as well as in war. The same armour has been found in the women's tombs as in the men's. The Sarmatian warriors always united with the Scythians against the invasions of the Persians. Sometimes they fell like lightning on the Scythians themselves, and plundered them. They liberated prisoners of war for a ransom.

III. *The Massagetae*<sup>22</sup> occupied approximately all the south of the present Kazakhstan and Turkmenistan; and the *Saces* (Sakas), the region to the south of Lake Balkhash and the present Kirghiz. Like the other peoples of Central Asia, they formed kinds of oligarchies or military democracies, and there was little room for the priests. While worshipping God under the guise of the sun, the image of light and the power of God, they *tolerated all religions*. Herodotus notes, apart from matriarchy, the suppression of the old and probably impotent, an act which was accompanied by certain rites and animal sacrifices. Ktesius, the Greek writer at the end of the fifth century B.C., writes that "the women of the Saka race brave and help their husbands in the dangers of war." Often the women were at the head of tribes or the confederation of tribes. These were called "Queens" and among the most celebrated *Tomiris* is quoted, queen of the Massagetae, and *Zarina* and *Sparetra*, queens of the Sakas. Herodotus tells how Cyrus demanded Tomiris in marriage after the death of her husband. Tomiris, understanding that it was a matter of the annexation of her country, and not of love, flatly refused Cyrus' ambassadors. He, offended, led a huge army against the Massa-

<sup>21</sup> *Istorija SSSR*, p. 226-229.

<sup>22</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 275-278.

getae and their Queen. It was the most cruel of all the battles in which the "barbarians" took part, says Herodotus. The majority of the army were exterminated and Cyrus was killed...

The recent facts about the Massagetae and the *Saces* are furnished by the excavations carried out in Central Asia, in the region of Jan-Darya, at Cirik-Rabat, and in southern Kazakstan, at Cilikit.

If we identify the Yue-chi with the Tokharians because of their blue eyes and red hair, why not suppose that all the Indo-European nomads of Central Asia, who were not in prolonged contact with the populations of the Middle East, also had fair and light eyes? In any case, this would not take us very far, seeing that dark eyes and hair are dominant according to anthropological terminology. Personally, we would like to draw attention to the following two facts, observable in the Rajputs of the high caste and the Panjaras (not yet crossed with the aborigines): 1) dolichocephaly and macroskely; 2) a warm, copper-coloured tan, particularly in individuals of a blond complexion. The second phenomenon is rare than the first, but it is very striking. In Rajasthan we have met among the Jains some fair-haired men and women with brown eyes. The first fact led us to exclude the hypotheses of certain authors<sup>23</sup> on the "proto-Turk" or "proto-Mongol" origin of the Svetas Hunas, that is to say the Hephtalites. In fact, without being as brachycephalic as the Mongols, the Gauls in France have preserved brachycephaly in spite of the dolichocephalic environment of the Franks, the Normans and probably the Romans; not a mere environment, indeed, but a mixture, an extraordinary racial ferment. For all that, even in cross-breeding, the predominance of brachycephaly is often noted, side by side with duskier skins. Consequently, if there had been Mongol penetration in Rajasthan, it would have left some traces.

#### CONCLUSION

1. It does not seem prudent to conclude the prolonged presence of a people in a part of the globe because a piece of pottery or

<sup>23</sup> Cf. for instance J. Naudou, *Histoire Universelle*, p. 1496.

armour belonging to that people is found there: it could have been brought by nomad merchants. That is why the reconstruction of the Indo-European migrations must always remain highly hypothetical. It is probable that the *Drang nach Osten* of the Indo-Europeans did not pass beyond Kashgaria, and that all these battle-axes and ceramics were transported by the Mongol merchants into China and Burma. Indeed, when studying — even superficially — the history of Central Asia, one notices a certain cultural homogeneity which is due to a similar nomadic mode of life, and to very close contacts of all kinds: commercial, artistic, etc., lasting for whole centuries. One can note the same tribal confederations bordering on the oligarchies and military democracies, whether it be among the Scythians, the Cimmerians, or the Hiong-nu (called by the Chinese *Hu*: “barbarian”, the name that gave rise to the famous *Hun*). So the Hiong-nu and the other nomads of Mongolia were, for the Chinese, as barbarian as the Cimmerian and Iranian nomads were for the sedentary world of the Middle East.

Thus all the polychrome, *cordée* ceramic and these battle-axes scattered over all four corners of the earth, at different periods, but starting from the second century, incline us to believe that the Iranian people detached themselves from their Indo-European *home* not only at the same time as the Hittites and the Indians, but, maybe, much earlier, which led Ghirshman to look for the Iranian *home* in Central Asia.

Jean Deshayes<sup>24</sup> goes further, and places the *home* of not only the Iranians but all the Indo-Europeans in what is now Turkestan. In his remarkable book he demonstrates that the origin of all the bronze instruments and weapons must be placed in the Iranian plateau, which was inhabited by the non-Indo-European populations, which were the founders of the Sumerian civilisation, and probably that of the Indus (Harappa) also. It is the Iranian prototype which served as a model for all the instruments and arms, first of all in the Middle East, and afterwards in Europe. It is difficult for us to say anything about the value of these assertions, since the study of bronze is not within our competence.

<sup>24</sup> Jean Deshayes, *Les outils de bronze de l'Indus au Danube du IV<sup>e</sup> au II<sup>e</sup> millénaire*, Paris 1960, p. 405 ff.

Nevertheless, this discovery shows once again that any assertion about Indo-European migrations contains a large amount of hypothesis.

In any case, whether the people who led a nomadic life between the Dniester and the borders of China were Indo-Europeans or merely Indo-Iranians, it was the latter who were the ancestors of the Romanies (the Tsiganes, or Gypsies).

Thus, unless we consider all the peoples coming from the ancient nomads of Central Asia as “eternal nomads,” we cannot apply this term arbitrarily to the Romanies.

Finally, knowing the people from which the Romanies found their beginnings: the proud Kshattriyas (“Black Gypsies”) and the wild Sons of the Wind, the Scythians (“White Gypsies”), we can with greater certainty and skill envisage the growth of Romanian culture.