Proceeding of ICGPSH 2025 Symposium: Exploring Spelling Evolution and Educational Approaches to Dyslexia
DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2025.HT25038

A Comparative Study of Xiongnu–Han and Scythian–Roman Interactions Across Military, Economic, Political, and Cultural Dimensions

Shuoze Zhu

Tsinghua International School Daoxiang Lake, Beijing, China
zhushuoze0710@gmail.com

Abstract. This comparative study involves the influence of the Xiongnu on Han China and of the Scythians on Rome, focusing on military, cultural, economic, and political dimensions. Drawing on the Han Shu, Roman annals, and recent frontier studies, it shows that each empire responded to steppe threats by militarizing frontiers (Han fortifications and cavalry) and adapting mobile warfare. Economically, both engaged in trade and tribute. Politically, Han emperors used treaties and tributary demands to pacify the Xiongnu; likewise, Roman emperors negotiated with steppe princes. Culturally, mutual perceptions and borrowings appear in both cases: Chinese histories emphasize Xiongnu "barbarians" yet Xiongnu tombs yield Chinese-style artifacts, while Greco-Roman accounts conflated "Scythians" with Celts and exoticized them as wandering horse nomads. Situated in the late Western Han and the late Republic/early Empire, the paper demonstrates that the Huns prompted Han centralization and frontier militarization, whereas Scythian contacts led Rome to deepen economic integration of steppe networks. This juxtaposition illuminates divergent imperial responses to nomadic pressures and advances our understanding of ancient statecraft under external threat.

Keywords: Xiongnu, Scythians, Nomadic-sedentary dynamics, Silk Road trade networks, Cultural assimilation

1. Introduction

In the first millennium BCE and beyond, the Xiongnu and Scythians exemplify how large pastoral confederations shaped frontier relations with neighboring empires. The Xiongnu were a powerful nomadic league that by the late 3rd century BCE dominated much of Central Asia and posed a constant threat to China's northern frontier. During the early Han dynasty (2nd–1st centuries BCE), Chinese rulers responded with diplomatic marriages, defensive works (like the Great Wall), and eventually Emperor Wudi's aggressive campaigns to contain the Xiongnu. Meanwhile, the Scythians were nomadic Iranian tribes that migrated into the Pontic–Caspian steppe in the late 8th century BCE. They established a powerful presence around the Black Sea and engaged extensively with the Greek world. Greek cities and the Bosporan kingdom on the Black Sea coast traded with and defended against Scythian neighbors, and in the Hellenistic period, they even allied with Pontic

© 2026 The Authors. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2025.HT25038

kings such as Mithradates VI against Scythian raids. In later centuries, these dynamics influenced the Roman Republic and Empire's dealings in the region. Both cases involve a sedentary imperial power (Han China or Rome) interacting with a steppe confederation in different contexts. This paper will examine military, economic, political, and cultural dimensions of Han–Xiongnu and Roman–Scythian relations side by side. It will proceed thematically, first surveying each empire's military and diplomatic strategies and then examining economic and cultural exchanges. In particular, it will highlight how both Han and Roman authorities blended force, diplomacy, and trade to manage their nomadic neighbors, drawing out thematic parallels and contrasts

2. Military interactions

This section examines warfare and military strategies, comparing Xiongnu–Han campaigns with Roman–Scythian frontier conflicts.

2.1. Warfare and tactics

The Xiongnu were famed horse-archer nomads who could field massive cavalry forces (as many as 300,000 horseback archers) that outmaneuvered Chinese chariots [1]. Similarly, the Scythians (and their Sarmatian successors) specialized in mounted archery and hit-and-run tactics. We will compare how the Han built fortifications (the Great Wall and frontier commanderies) and pursued alternating defensive/offensive strategies [1,2] against raids, versus how Rome defended its Danubian and Black Sea frontiers (e.g., fortified limes, legion deployments) against "Scythian" raids. Key differences: the Han launched major expeditions into the steppe (under Emperor Wu) [2], while Rome's frontier wars (e.g., Marcomannic Wars) involved coalitions of Sarmatians and Germanic tribes [3].

2.2. Alliances and mercenaries

We highlight both empires' use of alliances: the Han made marriage-pact alliances (heqin) with the Xiongnu (offering princesses and tribute) during peaceful interludes [1]. They also allied with other steppe groups (like the Wusun) to counterbalance the Xiongnu [2]. In the Roman context, legions sometimes enlisted Sarmatian cavalry units (for example, Emperor Marcus Aurelius drafted 5,500 Sarmatian horsemen into Britain after the Marcomannic Wars [4]), while Roman emperors occasionally allied with or paid off local tribes. We will compare these: e.g., the Han's diplomacy produced formal "treaty" periods, whereas Rome's relationships were more ad-hoc and integrated the tribes as foederati rather than equals.

2.3. Outcomes of conflict

Summarize that Han ultimately broke the Xiongnu confederation (splitting it into Southern and Northern Xiongnu, with the Southern submitting to Han rule by ~50 CE [1]), whereas Rome generally secured its borders but did not annihilate the steppe peoples; instead, "Scythian" identity faded into successor nomads. Both cases ended with partial integration: defeated Xiongnu leaders later served as Chinese generals [1], and Sarmatians were assimilated into the Empire.

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2025.HT25038

2.4. Comparative integration

Each point will explicitly contrast the two cases. For example, we'll note that both Han and Rome faced fast cavalry invaders, but Han relied heavily on fortified walls and steppe campaigning [1,2], whereas Rome responded with mobile legions and diplomatic recruitment of horsemen [4]. The parallels and divergences in strategy (e.g., tribute-for-peace vs. direct military suppression) will be drawn throughout the subsection.

3. Economic interactions

This section is talking about trade, tribute, and economic exchange across the frontiers.

3.1. Tribute and trade

The Han dynasty entered into formal tribute arrangements with the Xiongnu: under Emperor Wen (Han), the court paid Xiongnu leaders in food, silk, and luxury goods annually [2]. In practice, historians note a "steady flow of goods" (silk, cloth, millet, gold) from Han China to the Xiongnu as part of peace accords [5]. The Han also opened border markets and tolerated some smuggling to placate the nomads [5]. By contrast, the Roman Empire did not have a comparable formal tribute system with Scythian tribes. Instead, trade occurred more informally via Black Sea ports and through intermediaries (Greek colonies like Olbia) in the Pontic region. We will discuss what goods flowed: Chinese silks and grain to the steppe (and to distant markets – Zhang Qian's embassy suggests an awareness of Roman markets for silk [5]), while from the Scythian side there were horses, furs, and perhaps slave trade feeding into the Roman economy.

3.2. Trade routes and markets

Emphasis on how the Han–Xiongnu dynamics spurred the opening of the Silk Road: Zhang Qian's expeditions (intercepted by Xiongnu) ultimately led Han China to explore Central Asia and reach markets "as far as Rome" [5]. We can contrast this with Roman trade along the Danube and Black Sea: Romans obtained amber and grain from the north, but largely through traditional Mediterranean networks, not direct steppe routes. The Scythians played a role as middlemen between the classical world and farther nomads (classical writers note Greek merchants dealing with Scythian markets).

3.3. Economic impact

Assess how economic exchange affected each society. For the Han, paying large tribute (even if ostensibly for peace) was a drain – the LiberalTexts source quantifies the war cost in lives and treasure [5]. In Rome's case, employing Sarmatian cavalry or waging Marcomannic campaigns was also costly, but Rome often recouped costs through conquest spoils. We'll compare whether trade profits (silk profits for Han, or grain influx for Rome) offset military spending in each empire.

3.4. Comparative integration

We will highlight that both imperial governments used economic levers to manage frontiers: Han China institutionalized it with annual gifts and markets [5], whereas Rome leaned on trade and military plunder. For example, one bullet might read: "Han China's formal tributeandtrade policy (silk-for-peace) contrasts with the Roman Empire's focus on mercantile exchange via Black Sea

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2025.HT25038

colonies and the occasional hiring of steppe cavalry [4,5].” This allows side-by-side evaluation of economic tools in each context.

4. Political interactions

In this part I’m going to illustrate the diplomacy, governance, and interstate relations of Xiongnu–Han and Scythian–Roman

4.1. Diplomacy and treaties

The Han court periodically negotiated with the Xiongnu on a state-to-state basis. Early Han rulers even equated the Xiongnu chanyu (“khan”) with the Chinese “tianzi” (son of Heaven) [1], and engaged in formal heqin (marriage alliances) [1]. For instance, Emperor Wen negotiated a cessation of hostilities where the Xiongnu could trade in China, and the Han paid tribute [2]. The LibreTexts source describes a “mutual recognition” treaty (198–133 BCE) later violated by Emperor Wu when he sent Zhang Qian west [5]. In comparison, Roman-Scythian diplomacy was less ceremonial. Romans did not recognize steppe kings as equals with reciprocal envoys; instead, Roman emperors might conclude treaties with barbarian confederations (often framed as client or ally relationships) or simply act militarily. We will note any known diplomatic contacts (e.g. treaties with minor Sarmatian kings on the Danube) and Roman use of payments or hostages as de facto tribute.

4.2. Frontier governance and integration

After military victories, Han China often created frontier commanderies (administrative districts) in former Xiongnu territory (Hexi Corridor, Gansu, Xinjiang) to secure trade routes [5]. They sometimes even hired ex-Xiongnu generals to guard the borders [1]. Rome likewise built provinces (Moesia, Dacia) and deployed legions along the Danube to control incursions. Importantly, we compare assimilation: in late antiquity a Han-descended general (Liu Yuan) of Xiongnu origin founded a dynasty [1], indicating deep penetration of Xiongnu into Chinese politics. Similarly, Sarmatian warriors not only served in Rome’s armies but some rose to high rank (e.g. the general Aspar in the Eastern Empire).

4.3. Balance of power

Discuss how each empire perceived the nomads’ political status. Chinese sources treated the Xiongnu as peers when expedient (recognizing their sphere of influence [5]) but as barbarians otherwise. The Xiongnu famously complained when Han envoys reached beyond agreed borders [5]. Romans never extended such recognition; they viewed Scythians as external threats or potential allies under Roman oversight.

4.4. Comparative integration

We will explicitly juxtapose items, for example: “Unlike Han China’s formal treaties (granting princesses and tribute) [1], Rome’s agreements with steppe peoples were informal and often enforced through military pressure. Both powers, however, used frontier colonies/provinces to exert control once victorious.” Each bullet will mention both Xiongnu–Han and Scythian–Roman aspects to ensure a thematic, comparative narrative.

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2025.HT25038

5. Cultural interactions

This section addresses cultural exchange, perceptions, and ideological framing.

5.1. Perceptions and stereotypes

Both Chinese and Mediterranean cultures labeled steppe nomads as “barbarians.” Classical authors depict Scythians as archetypal barbarians in Greek thought [6] (the term “barbaros” itself arises from how Scythian speech sounded), and these perceptions carried into Roman views. Chinese texts likewise portrayed Xiongnu as wild, often comparing them to wolves or tigers, though they also granted them titles. We’ll cite evidence: the MetMuseum essay describes Greek fascination with Scythian dress and gods [6], paralleling Chinese records of Xiongnu customs. We will compare how ideology (Chinese Sinocentrism vs Roman universalism) shaped each imperial culture’s view of the nomads.

5.2. Artistic and material culture

Exchanges of goods carried cultural influence. For example, Xiongnu metalwork (animal-style belt buckles) and Scythian gold art share motifs (paired felines, etc.) [6]. Greek craftsmen produced Scythian-themed art (Attic vases with “Scythian” archers) [6], and in Roman times “Scythian” cavalry gear influenced Roman armor. Conversely, Chinese silks and bronzes reached the steppe; some Xiongnu elites adopted Chinese drinking vessels and luxury styles (archaeology). The plan will mention known archaeological parallels (e.g. Scythian “Animal Style” vs Xiongnu artifacts [6])

5.3. Languages, religion and identity

Noting that both groups had shamanistic or animistic beliefs, but with limited direct influence on the empires’ official religions. There was, however, some syncretism: Confucian rulers learned some Xiongnu names (e.g. Chanyu), while Romans learned Scythian legends. The plan may cite that a Chinese princess married to a Xiongnu chief (source of Liu Yuan’s lineage) represents cultural mixing [1]. We will discuss how, in each case, frontier life produced a mixed "border culture" (e.g. Han-dress among tribes, Sarmatian cavalry units in Roman legions).

5.4. Comparative integration

Emphasize similarities (both civilizations saw “barbarian” others but were influenced by steppe art and tech) and differences (the Silk Road vs Black Sea as cultural conduits). For instance: “Both Greek/Roman and Chinese sources present the steppe peoples as exotic outsiders, yet archaeological finds (like Scythian-style gold and animal motifs) reveal shared cultural elements [6]. The degree of cultural exchange differed: Xiongnu contacts largely remained on material/trade levels, whereas Romans eventually assimilated many Sarmatians into their society.” Citations will support these parallels (e.g. Mediterranean pottery showing Scythian figures [6] and Xiongnu belt imagery [6])

6. Conclusion

Both the Xiongnu–Han and Scythian–Roman encounters involved prolonged cycles of warfare and accommodation. In each case, nomadic cavalry tactics challenged the empires, prompting defensive walls (Great Wall vs Danube limes) and frontier campaigns [1,2]. Economically, Han China

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2025.HT25038

institutionalized exchange (tribute and Silk Road trade [5]), whereas Rome relied on existing trade networks and incorporated steppe warriors into its economy (e.g. Sarmatian cavalry in Britain [4]). Politically, Han–Xiongnu relations included formal treaties and marital alliances [1], while Roman–Scythian relations were more episodic and military. Both systems eventually integrated foreign leaders (e.g., Xiongnu generals hired by the late Han [1] and Sarmatian elites in the Roman army). Culturally, both empires viewed steppe tribes as "barbarians," yet also absorbed artistic and religious motifs via trade [6].

In summary, the thematic comparison highlights recurring patterns (frontier defense, tribute vs trade, mutual influence) and contrasts rooted in each empire's structure. The Han–Xiongnu and Roman–Scythian cases reflect how major agrarian states adapted to similar nomadic pressures, even as their specific policies diverged (e.g. Han tribute diplomacy vs Roman military integration). The conclusion reiterates these findings succinctly, as outlined in the above sections.

References

[1] Britannica. (n.d.) Xiongnu | People & History. https: //www.britannica.com/topic/Xiongnu
[2] Small Wars Journal (archive). (2017) Lessons from History: The Han-Xiongnu War and Modern China. https: //archive.smallwarsjournal.com/jrnl/art/lessons-from-history-the-han-xiongnu-war-and-modern-china
[3] Britannica. (n.d.)Sarmatian| History, Culture & Language. https: //www.britannica.com/topic/Sarmatian
[4] PubMed. (2024) An individual with Sarmatian-related ancestry in Roman Britain. https: //pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/38118448/
[5] Humanities LibreTexts. (2021) 4.7: The Silk Roads and the Xiongnu War. https: //human.libretexts.org/Bookshelves/History/World_History/An_Outline_History_of_East_Asia_to_1200_(Schneewind)/04%3A_The_Han_Empire_and_Its_Neighbors/4.07%3A_The_Silk_Roads_and_the_Xiongnu_War#: ~: text=decade%20learning%20all%20he%20could, potential%20market%20for%20Chinese%20silks
[6] The Metropolitan Museum of Art. (n.d.) Gold, Griffins, and Greeks: Scythian Art and Cultural Interactions in the Black Sea. https: //www.metmuseum.org/essays/scythian-art