

CTESIAS' ACCOUNT OF THE REVOLT OF INARUS

J. M. BIGWOOD

FEW HISTORIANS ENJOYED IN ANTIQUITY a lower reputation than the physician of Artaxerxes II, Ctesias of Cnidus.¹ On the whole in modern times his twenty-three-book history of Persia meets with only scorn. There is, however, one passage to which many allude. Some even accept the details in preference to the data of Thucydides' version.² The episode in question is Ctesias' account of Inarus' revolt in Egypt in the mid fifth century and Athens' disastrous intervention to support him. Ctesias' account of these problematic events has been partially,³ never fully, assessed. What is known of the original version? We possess after all only Photius' summary of it. What were the historian's sources? What were

¹F. Jacoby, *FGrHist* III C 688 T 11 and T 13; cf. in particular Plutarch's comment—*εἰ καὶ τὰλλα μύθων ἀπιθάνων καὶ παραφύρων ἐμβέβληκεν εἰς τὰ βιβλία παντοδαπὴν πωλαίαν* (*Art.* 1.4–T 11d). All references to the text of Ctesias will be (unless otherwise stated) to Jacoby's edition of the fragments, now the definitive edition. On Ctesias' residence at the Persian court from approximately 404 to 398/7 B.C., and on what is otherwise known of his life, see Jacoby, "Ktesias," *RE* 11 (1922) 2032–2073. This article is still fundamental for all aspects of Ctesias' work. An important contribution is made by A. Momigliano, "Tradizione e invenzione in Ctesia," *AeR* 12 (1931) 15–44 (= *Quarto contributo alla storia degli studi classici e del mondo antico* [Rome 1969] 181–212). More recent discussions are by G. Goossens, "L'Histoire d'Assyrie de Ctésias," *AntCl* 9 (1940) 25–45; R. Drews, *The Greek Accounts of Eastern History* (Washington, D.C. 1973) 103–116; T. S. Brown, *The Greek Historians* (Lexington, Mass. 1973) 77–86; W. F. König, *Die Persika des Ktesias von Knidos* (Graz 1972—completely uncritical; I do not refer to it).

²Very sceptical R. Meiggs, *The Athenian Empire* (Oxford 1972) 106 f., 475 f.; cf. also F. K. Kienitz, *Die politische Geschichte Ägyptens vom 7 bis zum 4 Jahrhundert* (Berlin 1953) 71 f.; S. Accame, "La politica estera di Pericle nei primi anni de suo predominio," *Studi in Onore di A. Calderini e R. Paribeni* (Milan 1956) 39–47; J. Libourel, "The Athenian Disaster in Egypt," *AJP* 92 (1971) 605–615. For a fairly high opinion of Ctesias' account see especially P. Salmon, *La Politique égyptienne d'Athènes* (Brussels 1965) 120 ff.; H. D. Westlake, "Thucydides and the Athenian Disaster in Egypt," *CP* 44 (1950) 209–214; W. P. Wallace, "The Egyptian Expedition and the Chronology of the Decade 460–450 B.C.," *TAPA* 67 (1936) 252–260; W. Peek, "Ein Siegegefecht aus den Perserkriegen," *Klio* 32 (1939–1940) 289–306. Others entertain the possibility of correct information; e.g. M. O. B. Caspari, "On the Egyptian Expedition of 459–4 B.C.," *CQ* 7 (1913) 198–201; A. Argentati, "La spedizione in Egitto (459–454?) nel quadro della politica estera ateniese," *Acme* 6 (1953) 379–404; J. Scharf, "Die erste ägyptische Expedition der Athener," *Historia* 3 (1954/5) 308–325; A. French, *The Athenian Half-Century* (Sydney 1971) 48 ff. The above discussions will be referred to in the following pages by author's name only. A. B. Lloyd, *Herodotus Book II Introduction* (Leiden 1975) which comments briefly on the revolt (38 ff.), appeared after this article was completed.

³By Meiggs, Accame, and Kienitz.

his biases? How accurate are the details? Not all of the questions can be answered in full. But a detailed analysis (which deals only incidentally with the controversial role of the Athenians in Egypt) should shed some light on the question of the usefulness of this account to the historian, as well as on the nature of Ctesias' history in general.

The fact that we do not possess Ctesias' version of the Egyptian episode in the original poses some problems. Before embarking on the detailed examination of the account, we must first look briefly at the questions of how and how well it has been preserved. In addition we must also look briefly at the nature of our other sources.

THE SOURCES

In the *Bibliotheca*, Photius has preserved for us, in outline, Books 7–23 of Ctesias' *Persica* (and, in more detailed form, his single volume on India).⁴ Since without the *Bibliotheca* we would know exceedingly little about large parts of Ctesias' work, the summary is of crucial importance in any discussion of Ctesias' history and a few general observations should be made.

We can be confident that the summary was based on the original, not on the epitome made by Pamphila in the first century of our era (T 16).⁵ Probably also Photius had the text before him when he made his notes. In the preface to the *Bibliotheca*, he claims to have composed his summaries from memory. This claim is not normally accepted for the longer "codices".⁶ Moreover, a passage of Ctesias' *Indica* (F 45.45), which incorporates Ctesias' own words—τὸν δὲ ἀστράγαλον κάλλιστον ὦν ἐγὼ ἐώρακα . . . suggests that Photius was working from a text.

The epitome is not a series of literal excerpts like "codices" 241, 244, and 245, which are excerpts respectively from Philostratus, *Vita Apollonii*, from books 31–40 of Diodorus, and from Plutarch, *Lives*. It is a genuine summary. In comparison with other summaries made by Photius, it is relatively detailed. The summarizing, however, as is characteristic of

⁴Both are included in "codex" 72. On the *Bibliotheca* in general see K. Ziegler, "Photios" no. 13, *RE* 20 (1941) 684 ff. and P. Lemerle, *Le premier humanisme byzantin* (Paris 1971) 189 ff. Photius was particularly interested in summarizing rare or not widely read books (Lemerle 192).

⁵Jacoby, *RE* "Ktesias" 2066.

⁶Cf. Lemerle (above, n. 4) 193 and Ziegler (above, n. 4) 690, although N. G. Wilson, "The Composition of Photius' *Bibliotheca*" *GRBS* 9 (1968) 451–455 (cf. *GRBS* 12 [1971] 559–560) argues in favour of it. T. Hägg, "Photius at Work: Evidence from the Text of the *Bibliotheca*," *GRBS* 14 (1973) 213–222, suggests that different methods of composition should be assumed for different types of "codices." He convincingly demonstrates that cod. 44 (a brief summary of Philostratus' *Life of Apollonius*) could have been made from memory, but that cod. 241 (lengthy extracts from the same work) could not.

Photius, is very uneven.⁷ Episodes are sometimes related at length, sometimes dispatched in one sentence. Whole chapters in series can disappear without a trace.

The treatment of the individual books of Ctesias' history is likewise uneven. Photius summarizes at length Books 12–13 (the reigns of Cambyses, Darius I, and Xerxes I) and Book 18 (the reign of Darius II plus the brief *interregna* of Xerxes II and Secyndianus). However, the reigns of Cyrus the Great (Books 7–11), of Artaxerxes I (Books 14–17), and of Artaxerxes II (Book 19 onwards), i.e., those reigns which Ctesias treated in greatest detail, are summarized at approximately one-third of this length or less.⁸ We thus know comparatively little about Ctesias' account of the reign of Artaxerxes I as a whole, the reign that is under present consideration.⁹

One of the most important questions to be raised about the summary concerns its accuracy. It is sometimes alleged that questionable details in the epitome of Ctesias are errors of the patriarch and not of his source.¹⁰ Such allegations place much too low a value on Photius' work. He was a scholar and read his texts attentively and with understanding. His summary of Arrian's *Anabasis* (cod. 91) contains no serious error, nor does his summary of Herodian's history (cod. 99), although brevity can distort the sense at times. If his summary of Ctesias' *Indica* is compared with the lengthy extracts made by Aelian, it will become evident that Photius summarized the work of Ctesias with considerable care.¹¹

One can suspect, of course, that there are occasionally minor explanatory additions of Photius himself, or that occasionally he re-organized to a minor extent the exact sequence of events of the original. He does this in other summaries.¹² Moreover, in the summary of Ctesias,

⁷Cf. Jacoby, *FGrHist* II D p. 554 comm. to Arrian's history of Alexander's Successors, no. 156: vol. III B p. 268 comm. to Memnon no. 434.

⁸Photius notes the book-divisions of Ctesias' history only at random, as is his normal practice. The conclusions as to his uneven treatment of the reigns must be tentative, since they are based on the assumption that the books of Ctesias were of similar length, which they might not have been. On Ctesias' disproportionate treatment of the individual reigns see Jacoby, *RE* "Ktesias" 2043 f.

⁹The summary deals almost solely with the chequered career of Megabyzus and with his family. This hero may have caught Photius' fancy and he may have simply omitted all tales which were not relevant. Ctesias' history, it is clear, centred on the court, but Photius' summarizing methods preclude, on the whole, dogmatic statements about what the original omitted. Drews' discussion (105 f.) is somewhat misleading.

¹⁰E.g., by Salmon 143 and Argentati 380.

¹¹On Photius' care in general see R. Henry, Photius, *Bibliothèque* I (Paris 1959) xxiii ff., and Lemerle (above, n. 4) 192 f. For his careful reading of Ctesias cf. G. Goossens, "Le sommaire des Persica de Ctésias par Photius," *RBPhil* 28 (1950) 519.

¹²In the case of works which are extant, these alterations (they are very minor) are partially indicated by the notes in Henry's edition. Normally Photius gives the events in the sequence of the original.

there are admittedly one or two minor confusions.¹³ Photius did not, however, make major errors. It is quite clear that the transposition of the battles of Salamis and Plataea is Ctesias' blunder, not bungling by the patriarch. The transposition cannot be explained away by the assumption that Ctesias' account did not relate the events in strict chronological sequence.¹⁴ From the summary itself it is quite evident that the sequence of events in Ctesias (like many of the details) was totally at variance with orthodox tradition. According to Ctesias, Mardonius fought at Plataea and was killed in an attempt to sack Delphi (F 13.28–29). This means that his sequence of events was either Salamis, Plataea, attempt on Delphi or, alternatively, Plataea, attempt on Delphi, Salamis (from the geographical point of view a simpler version). That the sequence was the latter is almost proved by a reference of Dio Chrysostom (11.145) to a historian who transposed Salamis and Plataea.¹⁵

Since Photius' mistakes are elsewhere quite minor, errors in the account of the Egyptian episode are not likely to be errors of the epitomizer. One can assume a high degree of fidelity to the original here as elsewhere. Accuracy apart, however, the summary of the episode has, from our point of view, certain defects.¹⁶ The original account appears to have been lengthy, but we have no means of telling how lengthy. Presumably the episode belongs to Book 14. In view of Photius' uneven summarizing, however, we cannot be absolutely certain. As in other summaries, and as in other parts of the summary of Ctesias, Photius is in certain respects vague. We are not always told precisely when events happened or precisely where they happened. Doubtless the original was more exact in these respects.

Moreover, the summary tells us very little indeed about the manner in which Ctesias' material was presented. We must infer this from our

¹³Photius states that Artaxerxes II in person mutilated the body of Cyrus the Younger (F 16.64). But this is corrected at F 16.66. According to Plutarch, who was also basing himself on the original work (cf. Jacoby, *RE* "Ktesias" 2070), Artaxerxes II, not the queen-mother Parysatis (as Photius states—F 16.67), ordered the punishment of Mitrdates (F 26.15). Photius has perhaps been led astray by the fate of the Carian eunuch, which he described in the preceding sentence. Moreover, the *Bibliotheca* as a whole may have been hurriedly edited. Ctesias' words at *Ind.* F 45.45 (above, 2) would presumably have been altered in a careful revision (on the problems of the composition of the work see Ziegler [above, n. 4] 684 ff. and Lemerle [above, n. 4] 37 ff. & 190 ff.).

¹⁴A suggestion of C. Hignett, *Xerxes' Invasion of Greece* (Oxford 1963) 9.

¹⁵Cf. Jacoby, *RE* "Ktesias" 2060–2061.

¹⁶Goossens (above, n. 11) 520 f. argues that, thanks to Photius' predilection for the more colourful episodes, we are given a one-sided representation of the whole work. This is doubtful. Clearly Photius had an eye for the picturesque. However, the nature of Ctesias' history is well known from our other sources (below, 21). Possibly in fact Photius has reduced the sensationalism and the element of the miraculous: cf. Ff 34–36, marvels which he has omitted.

other sources. In some parts of the narrative at any rate, Ctesias was extremely diffuse. The immensely detailed extracts preserved by Nicolaus of Damascus (so important for our knowledge of the early books of the history) provide an excellent illustration.¹⁷ But even Nicolaus has abbreviated his source. Ctesias was, in fact, notorious for his prolixity (cf. Demetrius *De eloc.* 212 ff.—F 14a; and Plutarch *Art.* 11.11—F 14b). Naturally Photius had to cut down tediously protracted narratives, and naturally he eliminated the speeches and dialogues, which were without doubt an important (and effective) ingredient in the original.¹⁸ What he provides is a skeleton of factual details, a version which is at times so compressed that it is almost unintelligible (cf. below n. 75).

If the summary, while adequate for an assessment of some of the qualities of the original narrative, is rather sketchy and at times more than a little problem-ridden, so too are the sources which enable us to test the accuracy of Ctesias' information. By far the most important of these is the very brief account in Thucydides' survey of the Pentecontaetia (i.e., Thuc. 1.104, 109–110).¹⁹ Herodotus, in passing, contributes one or two useful items of information (cf. 3.12 and 7.7). One suspects that he knew much more, but since he was not primarily concerned with this period, he did not care to include more. Diodorus (11.71.3 ff.) is much more informative. However he is also notoriously unreliable and in this episode absurdly biased in favour of the Athenians. Moreover, there are other problems. Ephorus, Diodorus' presumed source at this point,²⁰ although strongly indebted to Thucydides, also consulted other authorities. Elsewhere in his history he clearly made use of Ctesias, although perhaps not directly; it is difficult to distinguish between Ctesias and an imitator such as Ephorus' fellow-countryman Heracleides of Cyme.²¹

¹⁷*FGH Hist* II A 90 Ff 1–5, 66. For Nicolaus' knowledge of the original see Jacoby's commentary. R. Laqueur, "Nikolaos" n. 20, *RE* 7 (1936) 376 ff., attempts unconvincingly to demonstrate a conflation of two sources (Xanthus of Lydia and Ctesias) in Nicolaus F 66. At times Nicolaus adheres very closely to Ctesias; cf. D. A. W. Biltcliffe, "P. Ox. No. 2330 and its importance for the study of Nicolaus of Damascus," *RhM* 112 (1969) 85–93.

¹⁸Photius normally transforms direct speech into indirect speech, if he preserves it at all. The summary contains a few words of direct speech (F 13.13 and F 15.52). Direct speech also occurs in Demetrius' quotation (*De eloc.* 216—F 24) and in F 8b, a very brief papyrus fragment (part of a love-letter), which provides invaluable testimony as to the content of the original, its style, and its Attic dialect. For discussion see M. Gigante, "Lettera alla regina o dello stile di Ctesia," *RivFC* n.s. 40 (1962) 249 ff. and D. Del Corno, "La lingua di Ctesia," *Athenaeum* n.s. 40 (1962) 126 ff.

¹⁹For the problems of Thucydides' account see below 12 ff.

²⁰Cf. E. Schwartz, "Diodoros," *RE* 5 (1903) 679. The manner in which Diodorus treated a later section of Ephorus' narrative has recently been discussed by C. I. Reid, "Ephoros Fragment 76 and Diodoros on the Cypriote War," *Phoenix* 28 (1974) 133 ff.

²¹The influence of Ctesias' account is obvious when Ephorus (in Diodorus) is dealing

It is virtually certain that his version of the Egyptian episode has been influenced by Ctesias, that details from Ctesias and details from Thucydides have been (to some extent) combined.²² Since Diodorus' account cannot be deemed independent of Ctesias, its usefulness to a discussion of the latter's narrative is strictly limited.

As suggested above (4), Ctesias' account of the campaign was apparently quite detailed. However, a detailed account is not necessarily an accurate account.²³ All the details require scrutiny. In Photius' summary we are given the names of some of the participants in the campaign. Photius also supplies us with information on the numbers of troops engaged. These details (they require considerable discussion) can most conveniently be examined first, in the two sections which follow. In a final section, comment will be made on the events as they were described by Ctesias.

THE NAMES IN PHOTIUS' SUMMARY OF THE EGYPTIAN EPISODE

The names of the leading characters deserve serious attention. In the earlier part of his work, Ctesias, or the tradition which he follows, is unreliable over names and family relationships.²⁴ Is his account of the

with Persia. Even for events involving Greece, where Ephorus had much better authorities, he sometimes uses details from Ctesias. The question has been fully discussed by A. von Mess, "Untersuchungen über Ephoros," *RhM* 61 (1906) 360 ff.; cf. Jacoby, *RE* "Ktesias" 2068, who inclines towards the view that Ephorus used an intermediary, not the original.

²²Denied by French 59, Salmon 122 f., and others. But the truce between Megabyzus and the Greeks should be noted (Diod. 11.77.4; cf. 688 F 14.37) and the size of the Persian forces. Diodorus' fleet is 300 triremes (11.75.2 ff.: cf. 688 F 14.37). The land forces of both expeditions number more than 30 myriads (Diod. 11.74.1 and 11.75.1). The total is identical to Ctesias' total (40 myriads plus 20 myriads—F 14.36–37) and is unlikely to be coincidence. For Ephorus' use of army statistics from Ctesias see v. Mess (above, n. 21) 399 (Xerxes' Greek expedition) and 381 ff. (Cunaxa). Other details in Ephorus' account of the Egyptian affair may have been influenced by Ctesias (cf. below, n. 25). On some points Ephorus clearly avoided following Ctesias. On his possible use of a source which was neither Thucydides nor Ctesias see below 23.

²³Peek 299, Salmon 155, Wallace 260 comment with approval on the detail. Ephorus makes a significant statement (even though he does not always bear it in mind) when he claims that great detail in an account of an early event arouses suspicion (*FGrHist* 70 F 9).

²⁴Photius' list of the six fellow-conspirators of Darius (F 13.14) differs from the Behistun list (R. G. Kent, *Old Persian Grammar, Texts, Lexicon*² [New Haven 1953] DB column IV section 68) over 5 names. The text here is not free from corruption. However, in at least one instance Ctesias apparently confuses son with father, Gobryas being replaced by his son Mardonius; cf. Swoboda, "Gobryas" no. 1, *RE* 7 (1912) 1549. (Whether Ctesias distinguished the conspirator from the general of the Persian Wars is uncertain: Photius describes Mardonius as ὁ παλαιός at the beginning of Xerxes' reign—F 13.24.) Moreover, Amestris' father Otanes (Hdt. 7.61) is given in F 12.24 the name Onophas (= Anaphes, son of Otanes—Hdt. 7.62), apparently again a confusion of son

mid fifth century improved in this respect? Here it should have been easier for him to ascertain the facts. Had he chosen to explore this possibility, eyewitnesses should still have been available.

The opening of Photius' account of the rebellion should be noted and, in particular, his report of Artaxerxes' decision to send out, as commander of a vast army, his brother Achaemenides, a general who was subsequently defeated and killed, his body being sent back to Persia for burial (F 14.36). Here Ctesias' testimony apparently conflicts with that of our other sources. According to Herodotus (and over the name and relationship Ephorus follows him) the general defeated and killed by Inarus was not Achaemenides brother of Artaxerxes, but Achaemenes brother of Xerxes.²⁵

Some scholars, unwilling perhaps to credit Ctesias with an unorthodox tradition or with a blunder, have attempted to resolve the conflict by postulating error on the part of Photius, or alternatively, error in the manuscript tradition.²⁶ The first suggestion has little to recommend it. Photius normally read his texts with care (cf. above 3). It is unlikely

with father; cf. Lenschau, "Otanés" 4, *RE* 18 (1942) 1869. For names in the early history which are the names of contemporaries of Ctesias, see Jacoby, *RE* "Ktesias" 2049 f. For another erroneous name see below n. 73.

²⁵Hdt. 3.12, 7.7, 7.97, 7.236 f., and Diod. 11.74.1. In Pompeius Trogus (also influenced by Ctesias in matters relative to Persia—Jacoby, *RE* "Ktesias" 2068) he is again Achaemenes (Prol. 3). F. Justi, *Iranisches Namenbuch* (Marburg 1895) 124, merely notes the different name and different relationship in Ctesias. Cauer, "Achaemenes" 3, *RE* 1 (1893) 199 notes the difference of name. The form of the name Achaemenides is a surprise; the termination is, of course, Greek. In the period before Alexander the Great this form of the name appears to occur otherwise only as a clan-designation (Hdt. 7.62, 7.117, etc.); Later, Achaemenides is found as a personal name: cf. Vergil *Aen.* 3.588 ff. (further examples in Pape-Benseler, *Wörterbuch der griechischen Eigennamen*³ [Braunschweig 1884] 184). One wonders whether a scribe has added the termination of the neighbouring name Charitimides (p. 465 lines 17/18), or whether this is an invented name for an invented character (cf. below n. 69).

Achaemenes' office in Herodotus (7.7) is that of satrap of Egypt, and as satrap, he would be responsible for any trouble in his province (subject to the wishes of the Great King). Photius' description of Achaemenides might suggest a commander specially appointed to the deal with the rebellion. But it is easier to assume that he was the satrap, temporarily at the court, if Ctesias was concerned here about such niceties. The story clearly made for good drama (cf. below 21), although the satrap's absence from his satrapy does not conflict with Persian practice. We know from the career of the later satrap of Egypt, Arsames (G. R. Driver, *Aramaic Documents of the Fifth Century B.C.* [revised edit. Oxford 1957] 9 and P. Grelot, *Documents araméens d'Égypte* [Paris 1972] 297 f.) that satraps did not spend all their time in their provinces. In Diodorus' account, which presupposes that Achaemenes was sent from the court (11.74.2) we seem to have another trace of Ctesias' version (cf. above n. 22).

²⁶The first suggestion is made by Argentati 380 and Salmon 123, the second by Peek 298. Scharf 321 appears to believe that Ctesias and Herodotus differ only in the form of the name.

that he was totally confused over the identity of an individual who was clearly important (to Ctesias). The family relationships should have been obvious from at least two passages of the original if not more (F 14.36 and F 14.39). The second suggestion, however, the possibility of textual corruption, is an important question in any discussion of Ctesias' work and merits some consideration. What Ctesias himself wrote could after all have been altered at two distinct stages, firstly by those who copied the work before it reached the hands of Photius, and secondly by scribes copying the text of the *Bibliotheca*. Many errors, it is clear, were introduced at this second stage. Manuscripts A (Marcianus gr. 450) and M (Marcianus gr. 451), the two mss of the *Bibliotheca* from which all other mss derive, provide (for the summary of Ctesias) a large number of erroneous readings and particularly, as a glance at Jacoby's apparatus shows, in the episode which we are considering.²⁷

Not unnaturally, the exotic names posed a problem for the copyists. Some of the confusions are readily understandable, and the correct reading is, in some cases, obvious. In F 14.38 (p. 466 line 7) both A and M confuse Artaxerxes with Xerxes. Their reading—*ξέρην*—defies sense. Even in Ctesias the long-dead Xerxes could not be alive again. *Ἀπροξέρην*, the suggestion of the later mss, followed by Jacoby, must be read.²⁸ The vengeful queen-mother Amestris (widow of Xerxes, and mother of Artaxerxes I) is easily confused with her daughter, Amytis (wife of Megabyzus). In F 14.39 (p. 466 line 12) A and M confuse the two. Their reading, *ἄμυτις δὲ ὑπὲρ τοῦ παιδὸς Ἀχαιμενίδου δεινὰ ἐποιεῖτο* . . ., is again impossible. Amytis had no son Achaemenides. We must read with Wesseling and Jacoby, *Ἀμῆστρις*.

The copyists clearly had difficulty with many of the names. However, in order to reconcile Achaemenides and the Herodotean Achaemenes, we require more than one simple textual change. If we accept Peek's suggestion (298) that *Ξέρξου* be supplied after *ἀδελφόν* in F 14.36 (p. 465 line 14), we must also supply it later (p. 466 line 8), as can easily be done. But to preserve this transformation of Achaemenides into the brother of Xerxes, the words referred to above, i.e., *Ἀμῆστρις* (*ἄμυτις* AM) *δὲ ὑπὲρ τοῦ παιδὸς* . . . will also require alteration or emendation.

Interference with the text to procure conformity with Herodotus'

²⁷Jacoby's text is based on E. Martini's collation of A and M, and is superior to that of Henry (above, n. 11); cf. the review of Henry's edition by H. Erbse, *Gnomon* 32 (1960) 608 ff. For description of the mss see E. Martini, "Textgeschichte der Bibliothek des Patriarchen Photios von Konstantinopel, 1 Teil; Die Handschriften, Ausgaben und Übertragungen," in *AbhLeipzig phil.-hist.Kl.* 28, 6 (1911): A. Severyns, *Recherches sur la Chrestomathie de Proclo* 1 (Liège 1938) 15 ff., and briefly Henry 1 p. xxv ff. Further bibliography on the mss is given in Erbse (*loc. cit.*).

²⁸The same confusion occurs in F 15.47 lines 20 and 28; cf. the confusion between Dareiaios (Darius) and Artaxerxes in F 13.32 line 19.

account is unnecessary. Ctesias was notorious for his contradictions of his predecessor. Photius says of him—*σχεδὸν ἐν ᾗπασιν ἀντικείμενα Ἡροδότῳ ἱστορῶν* . . . (T 8).²⁹ It is preferable (and from the textual point of view certainly easier) to assume that here, once more, he welcomed the opportunity of “correcting” Herodotus, and that *his* general was, as the MSS state, the brother of Artaxerxes.

The two members of the royal family cannot be identical; Ctesias' Achaemenides is a different man from Herodotus' Achaemenes. Which historian is then correct? There are no good grounds for preferring Ctesias' version on this point. His Achaemenides is very closely linked with a series of intrigues at the court and these are, as will be pointed out (below, 19 ff.), of exceedingly doubtful historicity.

Achaemenides is clearly the wrong general for the Egyptian campaign. But Photius' summary records other names. Oriscus, the admiral of the Persian relief expedition (F 14.37) conflicts with the Artabazus of Diodorus (11.74.6 ff.). Artabazus may not be right. Oriscus is improbable.³⁰ Charitimides, presumably in Ctesias' narrative the commander of the Athenian fleet (F 14.36, 37), is unknown. The name is otherwise unattested as an Athenian name and there are problems concerning his precise role in the campaign.³¹ Byblus as the strong town

²⁹This very important aspect of his work is discussed by Jacoby, *RE* “Ktesias” 2050 ff.; cf. Drews 105.

³⁰Oriscus and Artabazus are discussed below in Appendix 1. With Sarsamas, the satrap supposedly installed in Egypt by Megabyzus at the end of the campaign (F 14.38), we seemingly have a textual error and a distortion of the facts. (I hope to discuss the problem more fully elsewhere.) The name should almost certainly be Arsames or Arsamas, as is usually claimed; cf. in Photius' summary of the reign of Secyndianus (424/3), the satrap of Egypt, Arxanes (F 15.50). Arsames is well-known from Aramaic and Accadian sources as a satrap of Egypt and as a large land-owner (G. R. Driver [above, n. 25] 9 f. and P. Grelot [above, n. 25] 280 ff.). But the evidence (which dates him to the last third of the fifth century) and Ctesias' demonstrable unreliability over chronology (cf. above 4) make it unlikely that he was appointed satrap as early as ca 454, and that he thus held office for more than fifty years, as is usually asserted.

³¹Listed as Charitimides by Kirchner, *Prosopographia Attica* no. 15497, with no other references (and by C. W. Fornara, *The Athenian Board of Generals from 501 to 404* [Wiesbaden 1971] 44 under the year 460/59); but cf. also Aristoph. *Eccles.* 293 (Bentley's conjecture). Holm's suggestion of the attested name Charmantides is accepted by Busolt, *Griechische Geschichte* 3.1 (Gotha 1897) 306. He was not the only Athenian general in Egypt; Hippodamas died there—*IG* 1².929 lines 62–63; R. Meiggs and D. Lewis, *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions* (Oxford 1969) no. 33. Westlake 215, doubting that an unknown Athenian could have been general for several years, as is apparently implied by the summary, suggests that his appearance in an early naval battle (F 14.36) is a confusion, that he would have been the general of circa 456 (cf. F 14.37 and Accame 44). Photius' language is, however, ambiguous. The words—οἱ Ἕλληνες . . . ὅσοι μὴ ἐν τῇ μάχῃ καὶ μετὰ Χαριτιμίδου ἀπέθανον . . . in reference to the Greek retreat, could bear the meaning—“those who did not perish in the battle and [had not perished earlier] along with Charitimides.”

in Egypt to which the defeated Inarus flees (F 14.37) apparently conflicts with Thucydides' island of Prosopitis (1.109). The existence of an Egyptian town of this name (it is the only geographical allusion in the summary of this episode) is uncertain.³²

These names may not all be wholly wrong. Textual corruption can be suspected, or we may be dealing with a garbled version of the truth. But given Ctesias' irresponsibility over personal names and the erroneous Achaemenides, given (elsewhere in his work) geographical negligence, we cannot assume that they are all correct. We cannot assert on the basis of these particular details that Ctesias must have been knowledgeable.

ARMY STATISTICS IN CTESIAS

Photius' summary supplies army sizes as well as names.³³ It is clear that throughout his history Ctesias was generous with statistics. How plausible are these?

All Greek authors exaggerate the size of the Persian armies. But Ctesias occasionally is more conservative than others. For Cunaxa he estimated the forces of Artaxerxes II at 400,000 (Plut. *Art.* 13.3—F 22). This is more realistic than the figure given by Xenophon (900,000, *Anab.* 1.7.12), who claims that it is based on information from deserters from the king and from prisoners. But 400,000 is still probably much too high.³⁴

Ctesias' figure for Xerxes' army on his Greek expedition (800,000 without chariots—F 13.27) may also be noted.³⁵ This is less absurd than the 1,700,000 of Herodotus (7.60). But Xerxes' army thus becomes identical in size to Darius' army on his Scythian campaign (F 13.21). This is directly contradictory to Herodotus' narrative and for that reason can be suspected. Moreover, 800,000 is exactly double the size of the army of Artaxerxes II at Cunaxa. Superior tradition can be discounted;

³²Byblus is discussed below in Appendix 2.

³³Photius does not invariably supply these details; e.g., he omits them for Cunaxa (F 16.63–64).

³⁴The theory that the Greeks confused the unit 1,000 with the unit 10,000 (reported by Hignett [above, n. 14] 351) is attractive, but perhaps too simple. Decimal organisation may not have applied to every contingent of the army; cf. R. N. Frye in *Beiträge zur Achämenidengeschichte*, ed. G. Walser (Wiesbaden 1972) 9. Deinon's estimate of Artaxerxes' army, which we do not know, was also higher than Ctesias' estimate (*FGrHist* 690 F 16; on Deinon's revision of Ctesias' history see Jacoby, *RE* "Ktesias" 2069, and Drews 116 ff.). Xenophon, who used Ctesias' history for one or two details (Jacoby, *loc. cit.* 2067), evidently chose not to follow him here.

³⁵Followed by Diod. 11.3.7 (more than 800,000). For modern estimates of Xerxes' army see Hignett (above, n. 14) 350 ff. and A. R. Burn, *Persia and the Greeks* (London 1962) 319.

the number has a stereotyped appearance.³⁶ Almost all Ctesias' figures are multiples of 1,000. The numerals 200,000, 400,000 and 800,000 are the most frequent in his narrative.³⁷

Moreover, that Ctesias is a responsible reporter of military statistics is not suggested by the early parts of his history. His predecessor Herodotus, who sometimes gives army sizes for an early engagement, but more frequently fails to do so, exercises some caution. Ctesias is able to supply exact figures for armies of all periods no matter how remote.³⁸ Nor is he better in later periods. All his figures in the account of the Persian Wars are worthless.³⁹ Some, such as the 300 Spartiates at Plataea (F 13.28—Ctesias has perhaps confused Pausanias' army with the forces of Leonidas at Thermopylae—F 13.27) are totally ridiculous.

In the Egyptian episode the infantry commanded by Achaemenides numbers 40 myriads (F 14.36), that led by Megabyzus 20 myriads (F 14.37). The figures are too high. They are also the conventional figures which occur throughout Ctesias' history.⁴⁰ The Persian fleet of 300 (F 14.37) is less unreasonable. Thucydides, who gives no figure for the Egyptian campaign, reports the loss of 200 ships at the Eurymedon (1.100). Persian fleets evidently were large. The repeated occurrence, however, of the number 300 for fifth-century and fourth-century Persian fleets causes doubts. This too may be merely a conventional figure.⁴¹

The most interesting numeral, however, and the most controversial detail of Ctesias' whole account (it is frequently cited in the debate concerning the Athenian campaign in Egypt) is the figure which he gives for the Greek fleet. Now Thucydides (1.104) tells us that the Athenian

³⁶Jacoby, *RE* "Ktesias" 2060. The numbers given by Ctesias may have some relationship to the total which the Persian Empire as a whole could expect to mobilize in Ctesias' own times. But on this subject very little is known; cf. R. N. Frye, *The Heritage of Persia* (Cleveland and New York 1963) 106.

³⁷Numbers, of course, may have sometimes been rounded off by the various summarizers.

³⁸For Ninus' army in Bactria (Diod. 2.5.2—F 1), Ctesias gave the figure which Herodotus (7.60) attributes to Xerxes' army in Greece. Semiramis' army in India numbered 3 million foot (Diod. 2.17.1—F 1), that of her opponent was twice this size (Diod. 2.17.6—F 1). On these numbers see Jacoby, *RE* "Ktesias" 2060.

³⁹I hope to discuss them in another study.

⁴⁰The incredible losses in Achaemenides' army, 10 myriads out of 40 (F 14.37) appear schematic: cf. Darius' losses on his Scythian expedition, 8 myriads out of 80 (F 13.21), or the Persian losses at Salamis, 500 vessels of a fleet of more than 1,000 (F 13.30). The statistics are not preserved fully enough to permit further comment.

⁴¹The number 300 recurs regardless of whether there is disaffection or not in the areas which supplied Persia with vessels; cf. Diod. 12.3.2—Cimon's Cyprus campaign; Diod. 15.2.1—the war against Evagoras in the 380s (more than 300 triremes); Diod. 15.41.3—the Persian attempt to reconquer Egypt in the 370s; Diod. 16.40.6—the Egyptian expedition of Ochus.

and allied fleet numbered 200 ships. In addition there is the relieving fleet of 50 (Thuc. 1.110), sent out at the end of the campaign and caught unawares at the Mendesian mouth of the Nile. According to the summary of Ctesias, however, the Athenian aid sent to Inarus was 40 ships (F 14.36). The relieving fleet is not mentioned; we do not know whether Ctesias treated this episode.

As in the case of Achaemenides (above 7), scholars have attempted to save Ctesias' reputation and to remove a major discrepancy between the sources by doubting the text of Photius' summary. Confusion of the signs μ and σ has been postulated or confusion of the number given for the fleet (p. 465 line 12) with the *τεσσαράκοντα μυριάδας* of two lines below.⁴² That the number 40 is corrupt is, however, improbable. This total (or a number not much higher) appears essential to Ctesias' narrative. The description of the Athenian victory over a Persian fleet of 80 and the tribute paid to Charitimides (*Χαριτιμίδου εὐδοκμήσαντος*) suggest a relatively small Athenian force. A fleet of 200 seems to be precluded. Moreover, Ctesias' total for the Greek survivors of the expedition, 6,000 or more (F 14.38), tolerably accords with 40 vessels.⁴³ With a fleet of 200 the losses would have been enormous and *Ctesias'* account at any rate, appears not to suggest enormous Greek losses.⁴⁴ The number 40 of the mss must stand. The conflict with Thucydides' account remains; it cannot be emended away. The problem now becomes one of assessing the credibility of both numerals.

Thucydides' 200 triremes pose well-known and formidable difficulties. His account implies that the whole fleet remained in Egypt for the duration of the campaign. But to reconcile this with Athens' very heavy commitments elsewhere at the same time is by no means simple. Again, Thucydides implies that the entire fleet was destroyed (as well as the greater part of the relieving fleet of 50). How could such losses have been sustained by Athens without far-reaching repercussions in the Athenian

⁴²The first suggestion was made by Krüger, *Phil.-Hist. Stud.* 1 (1836) 163 (which I have not been able to consult), the second by Momigliano, "La spedizione ateniese in Egitto," *Aegyptus* 10 (1929) 199.

⁴³Cf. Accame 42. Caspari suggested (199) that the number 40 represented the Athenian contribution only, and that the total fleet in Ctesias would have been about 60 ships. He correctly points out that, at the beginning of the episode, Photius talks of Athenians. From the defeat of Inarus onwards, he talks of Greeks. However, it is doubtful whether Ctesias made this distinction and very unlikely that he would have known how many ships were supplied by Athens and how many by her allies (cf. Meiggs 475).

⁴⁴Meiggs 475 assumes that Ctesias described heavy Greek losses at Memphis, hence his suggestion that the number of survivors is too high for a fleet of 40. The original, however, mentioned heavy Egyptian losses (*καὶ πίπτουσιν ἀμφοτέρωθεν πολλοί, πλείους δὲ Αἰγύπτιοι*). The Greek losses in Ctesias might not have been more than one quarter of the total.

Empire and in other parts?⁴⁵ Ctesias' figure of 40 ships provides a very attractive alternative. But its attractions should be more closely scrutinized.

It should be noted that in Ctesias the number 40 occurs as the number of ships initially sent by Athens to Egypt.⁴⁶ As such, it is much too low. Thucydides (1.104—and Thucydides' narrative raises no difficulties which compel us to doubt him on this point), implies that, if not all 200 ships operating round Cyprus went to Egypt, a very large number did so.⁴⁷ Common sense indeed demanded that the Athenians initially send a large fleet to secure Egypt before Persia could move in with reinforcements.

Can one then argue that the number 40 deserves serious consideration as the number of ships which remained in Egypt after a theoretical withdrawal of the majority? This has often been claimed. Ctesias, so the

⁴⁵The later tradition believes in enormous losses, but is worthless: Isocrat. *De pace* 86 (cf. Ael. *V.H.* 5.10)—200 lost in Egypt and 150 off Cyprus (his argument demands very heavy losses). In Diod. 13.25.2 (300 lost in Egypt) the context again demands very high losses.

The difficulties of Thucydides' account are best stated by Wallace and Westlake. However, the problem of the size of the fleet does not, without supporting evidence, prove that Thucydides knew little about the expedition. Ignorance and error are entirely separate issues. Hellanicus' account was undoubtedly brief. But surely Thucydides had talked with relatives of the dead (Meiggs 106)? He was in a much better position to learn the truth as regards the Athenian participation than Ctesias (whether Ctesias was in Asia Minor or at the Persian court). And Thucydides would have known much more than he states; he ignores, for example, the details (Achaemenes etc.) mentioned by Herodotus. There is nothing in his account which is implausible or which suggests ignorance (apart from the very real problem of the size of the fleet). Of Westlake's three further arguments for ignorance, two are unconvincing (below, 18). The third argument is that the Athenians, after the beginning of the blockade at Prosopitis, could not have voted to replace (rather than extricate) the fleet. But surely the problem of the *τρήρεις διάδοχοι* is Thucydides' compressed language? Some of the relief fleet would replace lost or damaged vessels as "successors," the true meaning of the word. But one can infer other functions (e.g., aid) for the squadron as a whole (a similar argument in Libourel 612 f.).

The case for ignorance is weak. But there may be an error in the account. Thucydides, who clearly implies that the disaster was a major one, may have wished (for whatever reasons) to exaggerate the Egyptian losses. Or (as is more probable) there may be an error of omission; Thucydides may have failed to state that part of the fleet was withdrawn. An error of either kind does not invalidate the rest of his account of the expedition. It is clearly our best source. That Ctesias' account contains errors and a very large number of questionable items can be demonstrated without reference to Thucydides (see especially 6 ff. and 19 ff.). It is obvious that as a whole it cannot be preferred to that of Thucydides.

⁴⁶Salmon 142 argues for confusion on the part of Photius.

⁴⁷The whole fleet went to Egypt according to the later tradition—Diod. 11.74.3; Aristodemus, *FGrHist* 104 F 1 section 11.3. On the 300 ships of Diod. 11.71.5 see Meiggs 452 f.

argument runs, had no reason to get the number wrong; his Persian informants would not have depreciated the size of the opposing fleet.⁴⁸ This argument is unsatisfactory; the allusion to Persian informants is disconcertingly vague. Who were they, Ctesias' royal patients, Artaxerxes II and the queen-mother Parysatis? The cooks in the palace kitchens? Were his informants indeed Persian? What is known about the sources of Ctesias' entire work?

Ctesias claimed to have based his history on what he heard from Persians (Photius—T 8, presumably from the preface to Book 7), and for much of his account of the fifth century Persian informants are not unlikely.⁴⁹ Some tales, however, may have a different origin. Possibly his sources were sometimes Greek. Ctesias may have picked up certain items in his native Cnidus. Moreover, at the end of the fifth century, as at other times, there were Greeks at the court. Plutarch (*Art.* 21.3) mentions a Cretan dancer (cf. 688 F 31) and a doctor from Mende. Many Greeks found their way into the heart of Persia as mercenaries or as artisans.⁵⁰

It is not always easy in Ctesias' narrative to distinguish what is Persian fantasy from what is Greek fantasy, and it can be emphasized that very little is known about Ctesias' informants in general. Although we cannot in fact pin-point his sources for the Egyptian campaign, speculation about them may help clarify the issue of whether they would or would not have depreciated the size of the Athenian fleet.

These unknown informants, first of all, may have been more concerned, as Ctesias himself was (below, 21), with telling a good story than with telling an accurate one. A very small Athenian fleet ranged against mighty odds makes (conceivably) for a more dramatic tale.⁵¹ Alternatively, these

⁴⁸Scharf 321, Westlake 210, Argentati 397, Salmon 155 etc.

⁴⁹For the first books of his history the question of sources is much more complex. There, literary sources (Herodotus, and perhaps Hellanicus), local tradition, and Ctesias' own fantasy appear to have been blended together in such a way that the precise contribution of each ingredient is very difficult to assess. Jacoby emphasises (perhaps too much) the use of Herodotus and Ctesias' imagination (*RE* "Ktesias" especially 2045 ff.). Momigliano rightly stresses the traditional element.

⁵⁰Some of the details of Ctesias' account of Cyrus the Younger's expedition and its aftermath (F 16.63 ff.) suggest a debt to Clearchus. On Greek mercenaries in Persia prior to Cunaxa see H. W. Parke, *Greek Mercenary Soldiers* (Oxford 1933) 15 ff., and J. Roy, "The Mercenaries of Cyrus," *Historia* 16 (1967) 322; on the references in Greek authors to Greeks in Persia see G. Walser, "Griechen am Hofe des Grosskönigs," *Festgabe Hans von Greyerz* (Bern 1967) 189–202. J. P. Guépin, "On the Position of Greek Artists under Achaemenid Rule," *Persica* 1 (1963–1964) 34 ff., discusses Greek artists and artisans in Persia. Extensive bibliography, with discussion of the controversial question of Greek influence, is given by C. Nylander, *Ionians in Pasargadae: Studies in Old Persian Architecture* (Uppsala 1970) 13 ff.

⁵¹That the Persian fleet of 80 is exactly double the Athenian fleet is interesting (F 16.36). Accame 45 suggests that Ctesias might have arrived at the number 40 by halving the Persian fleet.

sources, or Ctesias himself, could have confused the fleet initially sent to Egypt with the relieving fleet. As pointed out above (4 f. and 11 f.), there are confusions in his account of the Persian wars (the sequence of battles is wrong; Pausanias' army seems to have been confused with Leonidas' army). The possibility of a confusion here cannot be entirely ruled out. Finally we must raise the question of biased sources, a difficult question given our limited knowledge of the original and one which is often ignored.

No one who glances at Photius' summary of Ctesias can fail to be impressed by the very prominent role accorded to Megabyzus and to members of his family.⁵² Photius' account of the reign of Artaxerxes I deals with little else (cf. above, note 9) and must at least in part reflect the preoccupations of the historian. The treatment of Megabyzus throughout the work does not suggest impartiality. One need mention only his honourable refusal to pillage a Greek sanctuary (F 13.31),⁵³ his glorious victories (e.g., F 14.40–41) or the true nobility of his rescue of an opponent on the battlefield (F 14.40). Other passages can be cited.

Similarly, much of the account of the Egyptian episode focuses on the activities of Megabyzus. In part, most notably in the narrative of the aftermath of the expedition (below, 18), the treatment seems biased.⁵⁴ It is possible that a large part of Ctesias' information on the expedition derived from informants who were particularly interested in Megabyzus. Sources of this kind were not necessarily too concerned about the exact size of the Athenian forces.

If Ctesias seems very favourably disposed to Megabyzus, his attitude to another party in the affair, namely the Athenians, also deserves attention.⁵⁵ That the success of Charitimides and the 40 Athenian vessels

⁵²Herodotus also was interested in Megabyzus and the son Zopyrus who fled to Athens, as well as in the earlier members of the family (cf. the interesting but out of date article of J. Wells, "The Persian Friends of Herodotus," in his *Studies in Herodotus* [Oxford 1923] 95 ff.). But Ctesias has much more to report of them (I hope to discuss the family elsewhere). For his partiality cf. Accame 43 f. (not always correct on details). Jacoby, *RE* "Ktesias" 2061, followed by Accame 43, suggested that these tales about Megabyzus might have been derived from a member of the family. We do not know whether any member survived to the end of the fifth century. Ctesias' list of Darius' fellow-conspirators (F 13.14; cf. n. 24), which does not include Megabyzus, perhaps suggests that some of the stories originate in a source which was not particularly close to the family.

⁵³I plan to discuss the identification of this shrine elsewhere.

⁵⁴However, the account seems not to have lauded Megabyzus' every endeavour (cf. below 18).

⁵⁵Jacoby, *RE* "Ktesias" 2061, felt that the 40 Athenian vessels might reflect anti-Athenian bias (as well as the very low figure given for the Athenian fleet at Salamis—110 ships out of a Greek fleet of 700—F 13.30). The later books of Ctesias' *Persica* were markedly pro-Spartan; cf. especially Plutarch's description of the historian as φιλολάκων καὶ φιλοκλέαρχος (*Art.* 13.7—T 7b). But pro-Spartan bias apparently did not colour

should be emphasized (F 14.36) is not particularly remarkable; we know that at the beginning of the campaign the Athenians had the upper hand (Thuc. 1.104). However, Ctesias' account of the end of the reign is significant. Megabyzus found Byblus unassailable (F 14.38). He had to come to terms with the Greeks. It is not easy to reconcile this tale with Thucydides' account and in itself it is a suspect one (below, 18). Ctesias, who was not writing pro-Persian propaganda as is too easily assumed, may have overestimated the Athenian achievements in Egypt.

The final suggestion is then that the number 40 derives from a biased source which, to highlight the Greek actions, underestimated the total strength of the Athenian contingent. This again is merely a possibility, but all the possibilities should be taken into consideration. Although (and this one must admit) it is not absolutely inconceivable that Ctesias' numeral is some kind of reflection of the truth, perhaps a much distorted one, it need not reflect the truth at all. Ctesias, so far from having no reason, had every reason to get the number wrong. Most of his other figures for armies and fleets can be totally discredited. In short, his evidence contributes nothing towards a solution of the problems of the Athenian campaign in Egypt.⁵⁶

CTESIAS' ACCOUNT OF THE CAMPAIGN AND ITS AFTERMATH

The number 40 is not the only item in Ctesias' account which has found favour with modern scholars. Some details have been considered trustworthy since they can allegedly be reconciled with Thucydides' narrative. Some items have been considered preferable. They betray, it

the entire work (cf. Jacoby, *loc. cit.*). The role of Militades (F 13.22), Themistocles, and Aristides (F 13.30) seems to have been not inglorious.

⁵⁶This is not the place for a detailed discussion of possible solutions. Libourel and Meiggs (92 ff.) believe that the whole fleet remained in Egypt. But neither deals with all the problems, including those of reconciling 200 ships in Egypt with Athens' activities on other fronts; e.g., no explanation has been given for the large army fielded by Athens at Tanagra (the blockade of Aegina was still in progress), while the reserves had to be called out for the Megara campaign (cf. Wallace 259, Westlake 215 n. 21). But, if Thucydides is guilty of an error of omission, and if part of the Egyptian fleet was withdrawn, was it reduced by circa 150 ships, as the supporters of this theory argue? Those Athenians who were left in Egypt were dangerously exposed to a renewed Persian offensive. The situation demanded that the force which remained be larger than a normal blockading force (on which see A. W. Gomme, *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides* 1 [Oxford 1950] 18 f.). As Westlake points out (216 n. 34—he cites a parallel in Herodotus) the size of the relief fleet has no bearing on the size of the fleet already in Egypt. Ctesias' numeral simply cannot be trusted and most supporters of the theory that the fleet was reduced in size are to some extent influenced by it. The major disaster of Thucydides may have been the loss of 100 vessels (plus about 35 of the relief squadron) or some other number.

is claimed, Ctesias' superior knowledge. But plausible details may mislead. A review of the whole account sheds light on the general nature of Ctesias' version as well as on its accuracy.

As has just been mentioned, fortune initially favoured Inarus and the Athenians. Photius reports a victory by land over the Persian forces, then a victory by sea, that of the Athenians and Charitimides (F 14.36).⁵⁷ It has been alleged that Ctesias' account of this naval battle is corroborated by a fragmentary inscription from the Heraeum at Samos recording a Greek victory over a Phoenician squadron. It has also been claimed that the corroboration is so substantial that a reassessment of the merits of our literary sources is demanded.⁵⁸ Are these claims justified?

The inscription (as restored by Peek) alludes to Memphis.⁵⁹ Ctesias' battle occurred in Photius' words *κατὰ θάλατταν*, in the Nile or off the coast. We do not know its location. The inscription concerns Samians, Hegesagores, and 15 captured vessels. Photius speaks of Athenians, of Charitimides, 30 vessels captured, 20 destroyed.

The inscription confirms that there was a naval battle (cf. Thucydides' words "gaining control of the river" 1.104, and, in a later chapter, "there were varied kinds of fighting" 1.109).⁶⁰ But the clash at Memphis was not necessarily an engagement of the dimensions of Ctesias' battle; it may have involved only the Samian contingent. Since the inscription confirms none of Ctesias' details, it does not prove him well-informed. It corroborates Thucydides' statement that allies participated in the campaign (1.104, 109). It convicts him of brevity, scarcely of ignorance.⁶¹

For the first years of the revolt the rebel cause prospered. However,

⁵⁷The land battle (unlocated) is possibly the battle of Papremis, Hdt. 3.12: cf. Diod. 11.74.3, although the report of Athenian participation here may be only the result of pro-Athenian bias (cf. above 16). Typically Photius gives no indication of when Inarus' revolt began. In the epitome the palace-conspiracy at the end of Xerxes' reign (F 13.33–F 14.34) is followed by the suppression of a revolt in Bactria (F 14.35). Then comes the Egyptian revolt. Diodorus dates the revolt to 463/2 (11.71.3), which must be approximately correct; cf. Kienitz 69.

⁵⁸Peek 301 followed by Westlake 209. The inscription is discussed at length by Peek; cf. also Meiggs and Lewis (above, n. 31) no. 34 pp. 76–77.

⁵⁹This location is accepted by L. H. Jeffery, *The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece* (Oxford 1961) no. 21 p. 331. Meiggs and Lewis (above, n. 58) think no other occasion remotely probable. Kienitz (72) is doubtful and Salmon (150) rejects the location. Names which terminate in -phis are uncommon outside Egypt. Peek, who dates the inscription to around the mid-fifth century, makes a strong case for Memphis. But perhaps the possibility of an unknown location in Egypt (Peek [300] gives three examples of admittedly ill-known names which will fit the line), and the possibility of a slightly later date (Cimon's Cyprus campaign; cf. Thuc. 1.112.3) should not be entirely ruled out.

⁶⁰For fighting in (or off the coast of) Phoenicia see *IG* 1².929; Meiggs and Lewis (above, n. 31) no. 33, p. 73 ff.

⁶¹*Pace* Westlake 209. The identification of the battle of the inscription with Ctesias' battle is not accepted by Kienitz 72, Salmon 150, Scharf 320. Whether Egyptians partici-

the tide turned when Megabyzus arrived with powerful reinforcements.⁶² The differences between Thucydides' report and Ctesias' narrative are, at this point, significant. According to Thucydides, Inarus and the Athenians were forced to retire to the island of Prosopitis and endure siege. Eighteen months later Megabyzus drained the canals and captured the island. The few survivors made their way to Cyrene (Thuc. 1.109–110). Where Thucydides was terse, Ctesias was apparently expansive. The wounded Inarus fled (with the surviving Greeks) to Byblus.⁶³ Success evaded Megabyzus. He came to terms with the rebel leader and the Greeks. The tale ends at the court. Five intrigue-laden years later the queen-mother Amestris got her way. Inarus and fifty of the Greeks were put to death (F 14.37–39).⁶⁴

Ctesias' account is not totally at variance with that of Thucydides. The two agree over the grim fate of Inarus—death by impaling. But there is little else that clearly harmonizes. Byblus, as noted above (10), apparently conflicts with the Thucydidean Prosopitis. In Thucydides' account Megabyzus appears to be eminently successful from the military point of view. Simple treachery delivers Inarus to his foe. There is no mention of a truce between Megabyzus and Inarus or between Megabyzus and the Greeks. Apparently also Thucydides' Greeks were not deported to Persia. The majority perished. A few escaped. Moreover, for Inarus apparently death came with reasonable speed. Surely Thucydides in the midst of a discussion of the year 454 is not inserting (awkwardly) an allusion to 449 (1.110)? The capture of Inarus and his death belong together, to 454.⁶⁵

pated in the battle in which 50 of a total of 80 Persian vessels were eliminated is not entirely clear, although Photius' wording may suggest this. We do not of course know how many triremes the historical Inarus could muster. Nor do we know whether there was a Persian-controlled fleet of triremes stationed in Egypt (for the military forces see E. Bresciani in H. Bengtson [ed.], *The Greeks and the Persians from the Sixth to the Fourth Centuries* [New York 1965] 344 f.). In Xerxes' expedition the Egyptian fleet numbered 200 according to Herodotus (7.89), but there is no reference in our sources to this fleet after the expedition.

⁶²Presumably in 456, if the Athenian intervention is dated to 460–454, the conventional dating. Recent discussion of the dating in P. Deane, *Thucydides' Dates 465–431 B.C.* (Don Mills, Ontario 1972) 34, and Salmon 99 ff.

⁶³The major Persian victory of the summary was perhaps at Memphis, but neither the city nor the siege of the White Castle are mentioned.

⁶⁴Megabyzus made a truce with 6,000 or more Greeks. How many were taken to Persia is not stated, certainly more than 50, since, besides the 50 who were beheaded, there were escapees (F 14.40). *τῇ στρατιᾷ* (F 14.38 line 11), if it means the Greek army, would suggest that the whole army was deported. Westlake 213 suggests that the story of the Greeks at the Persian court possibly refers to the men of the relieving fleet, who would be unprotected by the "agreement." Ephorus appears to have rejected Ctesias' tale of Greeks taken to Persia (Diod. 11.77.5).

⁶⁵*Pace* Salmon 179 and French 60–61. Ctesias' dating of the death of Inarus is accepted

Thucydides is scarcely perfect, but it is difficult to argue that he was either ignorant or wrong concerning these particular issues if the argument is based on Ctesias' narrative alone.⁶⁶ Ctesias' account deserves a scrutiny which it rarely receives. Very little of it is convincing as history.

We should note the battle-scenes, the vast forces, and the combat between Inarus and Achaemenides (F 14.36),⁶⁷ then Inarus and Megabyzus (F 14.37). These episodes are heroic rather than historical. Duel scenes between opposing leaders appear with remarkable frequency in Ctesias' narrative.⁶⁸ But other aspects of the narrative demand attention. The story appears biased (cf. above 15 f.). It seems directed towards exonerating Megabyzus from all share in the fate of Inarus. Moreover, the similarities between this tale and other episodes in Ctesias' history are astonishing. They cannot, all of them, be coincidence.

The court intrigues (a major preoccupation of Ctesias) and Amestris' gruesome revenge (F 14.38–39) are significant. They clearly duplicate the circumstances of Ctesias' own life-time. The queen-mother Parysatis who dupes one son, Artaxerxes II, in order to avenge herself on the murderers of her second son, Cyrus the Younger (Plut. *Art.* 17 ff.—F 26; cf. Photius F 16.66), has become here Amestris (the queen-mother) duping Artaxerxes I (her son) to avenge Achaemenides (the luckless second son, unknown, as was discussed above 7 f., to our other authorities).⁶⁹ Essentially the same bloodthirsty story reappears in Ctesias' account of Cambyses' reign.⁷⁰ Although in this version the queen-mother is un-

by A. W. Gomme, (above, n. 56) 322–323 and by H. R. Hall, *Cambridge Ancient History* 6 (Cambridge 1927) 139. The seeming conflict between Ctesias and Thucydides is noted by Meiggs 437. Meritt, Wade-Gery, McGregor, *The Athenian Tribute Lists* 3 (Princeton, N.J. 1950) 180 refer all the events to 454.

⁶⁶Westlake's allegation of ignorance (213 f.) is not, of course, based only on Ctesias (cf. above, n. 45). For Thucydides on Persia see A. Andrewes, "Thucydides and the Persians," *Historia* 10 (1961) 1–18, and Meiggs 444 ff.

⁶⁷But cf. Herodotus 7.7—'Αχαμένεια . . . μετέπειτα ἐφόνευσε 'Ινάρως . . .

⁶⁸In Herodotus we have duels at 5.110 ff.; 6.92 (cf. 9.75); 9.26. In the extant fragments of Ctesias (besides the examples noted) we have Megabyzus versus Ousiris (F 14.40); Megabyzus versus Menostates (F 14.41); Semiramis v. Stabrobates (Diod. 2.19.7—F 1); Stryangaeus v. Zarinaia (F 7 and F 8a); and, of course, Artaxerxes II v. Cyrus the Younger (F 20—Plut. *Art.* 11.1 f.).

⁶⁹His non-Persian name, and the fact that he is the wrong general for the campaign (above, 9) suggest that he is possibly a complete fiction.

⁷⁰The queen-mother, Amytis (F 13.13) attempts to persuade her son, the king Cambyses, into giving up the murderer of her second son, Tanyoxarces, i.e., Bardiya (Behistun Inscr.), or Smerdis (Hdt. 3.30 etc.). The fact that we possess these tales in summary form only, may emphasize their basic similarity, since details which perhaps differed may have been removed. For another variation on the theme see the tale of Amestris' punishment of the murderer of Zopyrus, one of Megabyzus' sons (F 14.45). In this case we have the queen-mother avenging the death of her grandson. The date of the death of Zopyrus is discussed by Meiggs 436 f.

successful, one notes the fatal "five years later" present also in the Inarus episode.⁷¹

Other details recur. 6,000 Egyptians were deported to Persia in Cambyses' reign (cf. the deportation story involving Inarus).⁷² Ctesias' account has clearly confused the three historical episodes (Cambyses' Egyptian expedition, the revolt of Inarus, and the contemporary period).⁷³ But there is more than mere confusion. In both earlier episodes history has apparently been reshaped to make it conform to the events of Ctesias' own life-time.⁷⁴

Those who are charitably disposed to Ctesias will argue that not everything in the Inarus story is necessarily false, that the truce is plausible, and also the deportation tale, since deportation of a number of the enemy was a fairly common Persian procedure. But can we be sure that these items really belong to the mid fifth century? The end of the Inarus narrative is striking, i.e., the story of a relatively small force of Greeks whose military expertise precludes an honourable Persian victory on the battlefield, of a truce made, then broken (and somehow the truce must have been violated if the Greeks were to fall into Persian hands),⁷⁵ of

⁷¹The detail suggests sensationalism (cf. below 21). Amytis in the Cambyses story learns about the murder five years after the deed (F 13.13). This does not necessarily have any historical basis. J. Marquart, "Die Assyriaka des Ktesias," *Philol. Suppl.* 6 (1891/3) 619 ff. argued that Ctesias dated the murder prior to the Egyptian expedition, as does the Behistun Inscription, DB column I section 10 p. 119 (Kent, above, n. 24). But Photius' summary leaves this quite uncertain. The five-year interval occurs again in Megabyzus' five year exile (F 14.43). One should also recall here Ctesias' unreliability over the sequence of events (above, 4).

⁷²It is not of course certain that all the Greeks were deported (above, n. 64). For Ctesias' deported Egyptians cf. Diod. 1.46.4, where the Persians (in the period of Cambyses) are said to have taken artisans from Egypt for constructing their palaces at Persepolis and Susa and in Media. (The presence of Egyptian workmen in Persia is well attested for the reigns of Darius I and Xerxes I, though not for Cambyses' reign—G. Goossens, "Artistes et artisans étrangers en Perse sous les Achéménides," *NouvClio* 1 [1949–1950] 32 ff., and G. G. Cameron, *Persepolis Treasury Tablets* [Chicago 1948] 11).

⁷³In the Cambyses episode, the Egyptian king is called Amyrtaeus (F 13.10), instead of Psammetichus (Psammenitus in Hdt. 3.10 ff.). But the name Amyrtaeus in fact belongs to the mid-fifth century (Hdt. 3.15; Thuc. 1.110 and perhaps Ctesias—Jacoby, *app. crit.* p. 465 line 10), and to Ctesias' own times (Amyrtaeus II, 405/4–400/399, Manetho *FGrHist* 609 F 2–3, dynasty 28: Kienitz 166 ff.).

⁷⁴Kienitz (34 n. 6) finds the account of Cambyses' expedition historically worthless. Other items in the account of this reign look very much like projections from Ctesias' times (discussed by Marquart [above, n. 71] 619 f.). That a number of characters in the early books of the history bear the names of Ctesias' contemporaries has been mentioned (above, n. 24). Responsibility for these duplications and anachronisms may rest (at least in part) with Ctesias' "sources." How far Ctesias himself "invented" his history is a very difficult question. Jacoby, *RE* "Ktesias" 2045 ff., argued for a considerable amount of "invention," but Momigliano's objections are substantial.

⁷⁵According to the terms of the truce, the Greeks were to return home whenever they

capture, incarceration in the heart of Persia, and death at the Great King's treacherous hands, all this makes for a sensational tale. And historically it is a true tale (more or less)—of the year 401, after Cunaxa.⁷⁶

The whole episode is a tangled web of items which are intrusions from the events which surround Cunaxa (or from Cambyses' reign) or are perhaps even stock themes of the raconteur. To base on it any historical conclusions would be an absurdity.⁷⁷ If Thucydides was ignorant of these details, his ignorance can be considered only a virtue.

Ctesias' story of the revolt and its aftermath was undoubtedly a dramatic one. The opportunities for sensationalism and pathos, characteristics of his history as a whole,⁷⁸ are considerable, if one recalls the wounding and death of Achaemenides and Amestris' grief and revenge, as well as other passages. But it is scarcely history. Although certain items may reflect the truth, or the truth in garbled form, it is clear that in this section of the work Ctesias has not belied his reputation. There are erroneous characters, the numbers given for military forces are doubtful, the geography can be questioned. One suspects bias, simplification, confusion. The duplications and anachronisms astound. This account of the Egyptian episode may afford us some amusement. But there is no major historical problem which it will help us to resolve.

APPENDIX I: THE ADMIRAL OF THE PERSIAN RELIEF FLEET

Thucydides, for whom the naval operations are clearly secondary, does not allude to an admiral. Neither Ctesias' naval officer Oriscus (F 14.37), nor the Artabazus of Diodorus is satisfactory.⁷⁹

It is difficult to reconcile the name Oriscus (otherwise unattested and

wished (F 14.38). Some such explanation is necessary if the summary is to make any sense. Westlake's explanation (above, n. 64) assumes that Ctesias mentioned the relief fleet, which he might not have done (cf. above 12).

⁷⁶Photius—F 16.65, the truce; F 27.68, Persian treachery; F 27.69, Clearchus and his fellow generals are taken in fetters to Babylon, imprisoned, and put to death; cf. Plut. *Art.* 18—F 28. Assimilation to the role of the 10,000 explains, at least in part, the apparently too favourable account of the Athenians in Egypt (above, 16).

⁷⁷Tarn, *Cambridge Ancient History* 6 (Cambridge 1927) 3 apparently believed that Amestris had a hand in the death of Inarus. Amestris' character in Ctesias is of course very similar to her character in Herodotus (cf. especially 9.109 ff.).

⁷⁸Photius' comment, in his summary of the characteristics of the history, should be noted—τῇ τῶν διηγημάτων . . . διασκευῇ, τὸ παθητικὸν καὶ ἀπροσδόκητον ἐχούσῃ πολὺ . . . T 13; cf. Demetrius (*De eloc.* 216—F 24 and T 14a) and Apsines (*Ars rhet.*—F 25) on Ctesias' account of the death of Cyrus the Younger: T 11e (Plutarch) and F 8b.

⁷⁹In Diod. 11.75.1 ff. Artabazus is not explicitly stated to be in command of the fleet, as he is in Cimon's Cyprian campaign (Diod. 12.3.2).

of course possibly corrupt)⁸⁰ with what is known of the status and nationality of Persian naval commanders. Although our sources of information are meagre, there are indications that until the final years of the fifth century, the nominal heads of major Persian fleets were normally Persians (or Medes) and often men of high status.⁸¹ The four admirals of Xerxes in the Persian Wars (i.e. Ariabignes son of Darius, Prexaspes son of Aspathines, Megabazus son of Megabates, Achaemenes son of Darius—Hdt. 7.97) seem to be of impeccable pedigree. The admirals at Mycale, Mardontes son of Bagaeus, Artayntes son of Artachaees, Ithamitres nephew of Artayntes (Hdt. 8.130), are all Persians.⁸² At the Eurymedon, the fleet, according to Ephorus, was commanded by Tithraustes, an illegitimate son of Xerxes.⁸³

The relieving fleet which accompanied Megabyzus was effective and probably large (cf. above 11). We should expect its commander to have at least a Persian name, not one which seems more Greek than Persian.⁸⁴

On first appearances Artabazus is attractive. Usually identified with Xerxes' general, the son of Pharnaces, installed as satrap of Dascylium around 477 and founder of a well-known and very important line of hereditary satraps,⁸⁵ he is appropriately a high-ranking Persian. The

⁸⁰'Ορίσκον Α Ὠρίσκον M, according to Martini (in Jacoby). 'Ορίσκον AM, according to Henry. *RE* no entry. Justi, *Iranisches Namenbuch*, 233–234, merely notes that his nationality is not stated by Ctesias.

⁸¹For the importance of Persians in the imperial administration cf. M. A. Dandamayev in *Beiträge zur Achämenidengeschichte*, ed. G. Walser (Wiesbaden 1972) 25. H. Hauben, "The King of the Sidonians and the Persian Imperial Fleet," *Ancient Society* 1 (1970) 1–8, discusses the subordinate position of the king of Sidon in the 5th and 4th century Persian fleet.

⁸²Artayntes is possibly an Achaemenid. For his family see A. R. Burn (above, n. 35) 336. What is known about the admirals of 480 is summarized by H. Hauben, "The Chief Commanders of the Persian Fleet in 480 B.C.," *Ancient Society* 4 (1973) 24 ff.

⁸³*FGrHist* 70 F 192 (Plut. *Cimon* 12); cf. Diod. 11.60.5 and Justi, *Iranisches Namenbuch* 164. According to Callisthenes, the commander in chief was Ariomandes son of Gobryas (*FGrHist* 124 F 15). For Artabazus as admiral at the time of Cimon's Cyprus campaign see below 23.

⁸⁴Oriscus is not Persian, as Prof. R. M. Smith (Dept. of Sanskrit and Indian Studies) kindly informs me. Greek names with this termination are not uncommon. For examples from Caria and neighbouring territories see the reverse index in L. Zgusta, *Kleinasiatische Personennamen* (Prague 1964) 672. It is of course possible that Oriscus is the name of a subordinate of the admiral and even that he was the actual (though not the titular) commander. For naval matters the Persians notoriously depended on the expertise of sea-faring peoples.

⁸⁵The identification of Diodorus' Artabazus with the satrap is accepted by Justi, *Iranisches Namenbuch* "Artabazos" 3; Judeich, "Artabazos" 1, *RE* 2 (1895) 1299; J. Barns, "Cimon and the First Athenian Expedition to Cyprus," *Historia* 2 (1953) 165. The date of his installation as satrap is based on Thuc. 1.129 and presumably can be accepted, even though the account of Pausanias' intrigues is questionable (cf. most recently Meiggs 465 ff., and P. J. Rhodes, "Thucydides on Pausanias and Themistocles,"

chronology does not rule him out; his active life, if he took part in Xerxes' invasion of Greece and in the Egyptian campaign (and in Cimon's Cyprus campaign) would be lengthy, but not impossible. We have good evidence that Megabyzus was active from 480 to at least 454.⁸⁶ Moreover, it is conceivable that Ephorus found the name in a well-informed source.⁸⁷

Doubts, however, remain. Diodorus' narrative of the Egyptian episode is scarcely impressive (above, 5). His accounts of the fighting between Persia and Greece in the Pentecontaetia in general are intolerably confused.⁸⁸ Artabazus may be merely a correction of a difficult or unknown name in Ctesias' account.⁸⁹

APPENDIX II: EGYPTIAN BYBLUS

There is no evidence which supports the existence of Byblus, the strong town in Egypt to which the defeated Inarus withdrew (F 14.37; cf. Thuc. 1.109, Prosopitis). Stephanus of Byzantium alludes to it in his article on Phoenician Byblus. But Stephanus does not distinguish between the real and the fictitious⁹⁰ and his comment may derive ultimately from Ctesias himself. Aeschylus' Bybline mountains (*P.V.* 811) from which the

Historia 19 [1970] 387 ff.). The dynasty is discussed by K. J. Beloch, *Griechische Geschichte*² (Berlin and Leipzig 1923) 3.2.145 ff.

⁸⁶And for very much longer, if we believe Ctesias. We have, however, no good evidence for the later career of *Artabazus*. According to the 20th "Letter of Themistocles" (*Epistolographi Graeci*, ed. R. Hercher [Paris 1873] 741 ff.), he was satrap at the beginning of the reign of Artaxerxes I. But the reliability of this author is very uncertain (cf. the implausible suggestion [p. 760] that Artabazus was the satrap of Sardis, as well as of Dascylium). R. J. Lenardon, "Charon, Thucydides and 'Themistocles,'" *Phoenix* 15 (1961) 28 ff., has argued that Charon of Lampsacus might have been a source for the letter: for a sceptical attitude towards the information contained in the Themistocles Letters see A. J. Podlecki, *The Life of Themistocles* (Montreal and London 1975) 129 ff.

⁸⁷Possible sources are Hellanicus, Charon of Lampsacus, Heracleides of Cyme.

⁸⁸On the absurd descriptions of the Eurymedon and Cimon's Cyprus campaign see E. Meyer, *Forschungen zur alten Geschichte* 2 (Halle 1899) 7 ff., and E. Schwartz, "Kallisthenes' Hellenika," *Hermes* 35 (1900) 106 ff. The epigrams are discussed by H. T. Wade-Gery, "Classical Epigrams and Epitaphs," *JHS* 53 (1933) 83 ff. and by W. Peek, "Die Kämpfe am Eurymedon," in *Athenian Studies presented to W. S. Ferguson (HSCP Supp. 1, Cambridge, Mass. 1940)* 97-120.

⁸⁹For the transformation of Oriscus into Artabazus cf. the alteration of Ctesias' Aspamitres (F 13.33; cf. F 14.34) to the more common name Mithridates (Diod. 11.69.1—the account of the plot to assassinate Xerxes, modelled on Ctesias or a reviser of Ctesias). Here again it is uncertain whether the change was made by Ephorus, by a source of Ephorus (Heracleides?), or by Diodorus. The so-called Ephorus papyrus clearly mentioned Mithridates (*FGrHist* 70 F 191 p. 97 line 29), but T. W. Africa, "Ephorus and Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 1610," *AJP* 83 (1962) 86-69, doubts whether this papyrus can really be assigned to Ephorus' history.

⁹⁰Honigmann, "Stephanos Byzantios," *RE* 3 A 2 (1929) 2390; for the source of Stephanus' comment on Egyptian Byblus see Jacoby, *app. crit.* p. 465.

Nile springs may be imaginary (their name may be derived from the famous Egyptian reed).⁹¹ Papyri references, which are very few, are to the Phoenician city.⁹²

It is, moreover, doubtful whether Ctesias troubled himself about geographical accuracy. His endeavour after all to outdo Herodotus on the site of Niniveh involves him in the sorry blunder of locating this city on the Euphrates (Diod. 2.3.2—F 1 etc.), when his predecessor had located it correctly on the Tigris (Hdt. 1.193, 2.150).⁹³ His concern for the miraculous in his ethnographical writing (although only a small part of this has been preserved) does not suggest that he was a conscientious geographer.⁹⁴

Although Byblus may have been a township on the island of Prosopitis,⁹⁵ which Herodotus describes as being quite large and as containing many towns (2.41), it could equally well represent a confusion, a garbled reminiscence perhaps of some event which in reality took place in Phoenicia. The Phoenician town, although not an important harbour in

⁹¹Cf. H. J. Rose, *A Commentary on the Surviving Plays of Aeschylus* 1 (Amsterdam 1957) 304.

⁹²F. Preisigke, *Wörterbuch* Suppl. 1 (1940–1966) ed. Kiessling (Amsterdam 1971) 406. There are no references to Byblus (Biblus) in F. Preisigke, *Wörterbuch der Griechischen Papyrusurkunden* 3 (Berlin 1931). Sethe, "Byblos" no. 2, *RE* 3 (1897) 1100 describes the Egyptian town as unknown.

⁹³The error in Diod. 2.3.2 ff. (and Diodorus here is summarizing the original work [Jacoby, *RE* "Ktesias" 2070 f.], not an intermediary as Goossens 25 ff. attempts to argue), is not likely to be a mistake of Diodorus (cf. Jacoby, *RE* "Ktesias" 2042). Niniveh is correctly located in Diod. 17.53.4, where Diodorus is using a different source. Nicolaus of Damascus (cf. n. 17) evidently corrected Ctesias (*FGH Hist* 90 F 3 line 23).

⁹⁴For Ctesias' ethnographical treatises see Jacoby, *RE* "Ktesias" 2036 ff. That in his *Indica* the emphasis is on wonders is obvious (and understandable), but this seems also to have been the emphasis of the geographical descriptions of the *Persica*; cf. Ff 34–36, Diodorus' summary in general, and Ctesias' reputation (T 11).

However, Ctesias' knowledge of Egypt (acquired not from a visit, but from the ample literary sources, or from what he heard in Persia, his chief source in the *Indica*) cannot be assessed. Almost nothing remains of his ethnographical writing on Egypt. From the *Periegesis* we have one Egyptian reference, the problematic F 55 (cf. Jacoby, *app. crit.* p. 513). Diodorus who summarized the first six books of the *Persica*, but who had dealt with Egypt fully in Book 1, preserves, from what may have been a substantial ethnographical section, some Ethiopian marvels (Diod. 2.14.4–15.4—F 1; cf. F 1 L), one detail about Egypt itself. According to Ctesias, Egyptian Troy and Babylon were founded by the Assyrian queen Semiramis (Diod. 1.56.5—F 1 k). Both have been identified (A. Burton, *Diodorus Siculus Book I, A Commentary* [Leiden 1972] 174 f. and 246). Whether there was any Egyptian ethnographical material in the later books of the *Persica* is unknown. It is Photius' normal practice to omit geographical or ethnographical descriptions (an important element in the original work, cf. the testimony of other excerptors, Ff 10–12 and Ff 34–38, and Diodorus' summary).

⁹⁵Cf. Salmon 173.

the 5th century and possibly ill-known to the Greeks of this period,⁹⁶ lay on the Persian route to and from Egypt (cf. Diod. 11.75.2, and for some fighting in Phoenicia, *IG* 1². 929).

⁹⁶It fell to Alexander in 332 (Arr. *Anab.* 2.15.6). Our earliest literary source is Strabo 16.2.18 (755). Further references in Benzinger, "Byblos" 1, *RE* 3 (1897) 1099 f.

This article represents second thoughts on some problems which I discussed in my unpublished Harvard dissertation *Ctesias of Cnidus* (1964). I am very grateful to Professors J. R. Grant and C. I. Rubincam and to an unknown reader for their criticisms of earlier drafts.